idea to raise taxes instead of cutting spending to balance the budget, then we ought to do it, in my view, with a supermajority two-thirds vote.

It makes imminently common sense to me, because history has shown that over and over and over again, this institution and the President have chosen to try to control the deficit by increasing taxes. It has not worked. We need to recognize that. The supermajority provision in the balanced budget amendment seems to me to be one safeguard against the Congress falling into that trap yet again.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the comments made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COOK]. They are very poignant regarding the importance of balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield back the balance of my time and ask the Speaker to consider making the Speaker's designee the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUTKNECHT]

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for the remainder of the 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey [MIKE PAPPAS] who has joined the discussion tonight to talk a little bit about the budget and balancing the budget and from his perspective as a new Member of this body. We welcome him to this special order tonight and hope it will not be the last time he will join us.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress last year because I believe very strongly that if we as a nation could not get our Nation's fiscal house in order, the future will not be as bright as it should be. Everyone in this city says they are for a balanced budget, yet some of those same people opposed the balanced budget amendment, which would have forced both the administration and the Congress to do what every American in this country has to do each and every year: balance their own budget; that every small business person has to do each year, to balance their budget.

I think it is unfortunate that while they say they want to balance the budget, they present a plan, a plan, not a budget but a plan, that sees the budget in imbalance to the tune of $69 billion.

I can recall back in 1992 when Mr. Clinton was running for office, that he said that he had a plan to balance the budget in 5 years. Now we are in the fifth year of his administration, and yet we are looking beyond to another 4 or 5 years when he is out of office. I am here to act, I am here to vote. I am here to do what the people of the 12th District in central New Jersey sent me to do, to see a balanced budget within our lifetime. I am absolutely committed to do that.

I am disappointed, yet at the same time I am hopeful, because at least now within the administration there is at least agreement that we need to balance our budget. That is tremendous progress from what we may have seen many, many years ago, where there was even a difference of agreement with regard to that.

So I am here to literally roll up my sleeves, to make the tough decisions now, over the next year or two, at least within this term while I am serving the people of my district. Back home in New Jersey our State government, our county, our municipal governments, our school districts, each are required by our Constitution to have a balanced budget. I think it works very well for the people that I represent.

There are those I have even heard that have said, at least in New Jersey, those that have opposed the concept and voted against balancing the budget, they have said that when they were a local official in their community that they balanced their budget. They did not add that the Constitution requires them to balance their budget, and if that requirement was not in existence, I have to wonder and we all would have to wonder whether that would be the reality.

So I am here just to add my voice to the chorus here on both sides of this aisle that wants to see this budget balanced. I want to, as I said earlier, roll up my sleeves, make the very, very tough decisions that each of the people out there, throughout this country, have to make every day. People elected us to do that. They did not elect us to come up with a plan.

It seems even in some of the committees that I serve on, there are people that talk about specific needs that need to be filled for various segments of our population. Some of those things I think have to be addressed today, or within the next year or two, versus saying we have a plan and we are going to project that in 10 years or in 8 years, that this particular need will be met and that this particular program will be initiated.

It is great to have a plan, but the plan is only as good as the paper it is written on. If we do not follow the plan that the American people have expected us to do, or expect me to be part of instituting, then I think we will have failed. I do not think they want us to do that. I do not want to do that, and I believe that the majority of the people, at least in this Chamber, do not desire to do that.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would just share, just to follow up with some of those comments, that what the gentleman was talking about, I think if the voters had been told last fall that part of the plan would be to increase the deficit by $24 billion this year, and ultimately wind up with a 5-year plan, and that according to our official scorekeepers, the Congressional Budget Office, that would actually leave us with a $69 billion deficit in the year 2002, my sense is that the voters would have been incensed. They would have said no way.

I want to point out, this is one more chart that describes what we are talking about. In some respects it is like a person who says I am going to go on a diet. I am going to lose 50 pounds. But first I am going to gain 10 pounds. I will actually do most of the weight loss program in the last week of this plan of the diet.

That is crazy. That is not the way the world works. That is not the way human beings work. Frankly, we know that is probably not going to happen. At least we have a start.

I want to point out some other things. I want to get the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] back involved in the discussion as well. Today the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin, came and testified before the Committee on the Budget. I wrote down some quotes of things that he said. I agreed with much of what he said today. I did not agree with his analysis, I did not agree with his final budget plan, but at least there were a number of points that he did say that I really agree with.

One of them, he said, was that we have an historic opportunity. I think that is absolutely true. One of the unfortunate things, and the gentleman from New Jersey used the term ''disappointing,'' and I think disappointment is the right term. For the first time in a very long time we have an electorate who wants us to make those tough decisions, we have a body politic who has said we want to balance the budget, we have a President who says that he wants to balance the budget, and we have a Congress that is prepared to make the tough choices.

Unfortunately, when we start with this kind of a plan, it makes the job even tougher. That is why I think it is disappointing.

He also said, and this is a quote:

> Financial markets will punish bad behavior and they will reward good fiscal behavior.

It was interesting, because the Secretary previously had been, I believe, the CEO of Goldman Sachs, and they recently put out a newsletter, an economic analysis of what was happening in Washington. The headline on this newsletter was ''No Meaningful Fiscal Restraint Before the Millenium.''

They go on to say, ''The prospects for a balanced budget agreement remain excellent. Republicans plan to use the Clinton plan as a starting point in the construction of their own proposal,'' which I think is accurate. Then they say, ''The bad news is that it appears increasingly likely that a deal will not result in meaningful fiscal restraint until the next millenium. In the Clinton budget plan the fiscal restraint is

extremely backloaded,'' which we have pointed out. Here is the point: ''This suggests that a budget deal will not have near term implications for the conduct of monetary policy.''

What does that mean to the average family who wants to buy a new home and a new car? What it means is that interest rates probably will not come down. As a matter of fact, they may go up. That goes back to the point that the Secretary made: Financial markets punish bad behavior. They reward good fiscal behavior.

What does this mean to families? We need to talk a little bit about that, and I want to get the gentleman from New Jersey involved in this discussion, because he probably understands this better than I do, but it is a chart I want to show of what happens to interest rates. They mean a lot because it affects what people can buy. It affects how many new homes are built and how many new cars are purchased. That affects how many new jobs are available, and good-paying jobs to the people who need them. In the end, this is really about how is it going to affect the American family.

This is an interesting chart. I think it tells some interesting things. This was November 1994, when I and 72 of my colleagues became part of the Republican majority, and we called ourselves the majority makers. You can see interest rates were trending up until the election day. Then they trended down all through 1995, until we got to where the budget negotiations broke down. Then, guess what? Interest rates started to trend back up.

After the elections of 1996 and conservative majorities were kept in the House and Senate, interest rates started trending back down. The President introduced his budget, interest rates have trended up slightly since then. Maybe it is just coincidence, but I think it is too great a coincidence. I think money markets do watch what we do here in Washington. They do reward good behavior and they do punish bad behavior.

Ultimately what this means—we want to talk a little bit about what a balanced budget ultimately means to the families. If we can balance the budget without raising taxes, a number of the leading economists in this country have said we can expect significantly lower interest rates.

□ 1930

As a matter of fact, we can expect somewhere between 1.5 to 2 percent lower interest rates. That means a savings of $1,230 per year on the average home mortgage for a small home. For a larger home it can mean as much as $2,100, $2,160. On an average car loan, we are talking about a difference of $180 a year; on a student loan, $216 a year. That is real money.

What that means is if American families have to spend less for interest, if the Federal Government has to spend less for interest, it means that we have more money to spend on other things. It means we can afford more homes and cars. It means that families can afford to send their kids to college.

In the end, that is what this debate is all about. It really is about improving the quality of life for American families.

I wonder if Congressman SAXTON would want to jump back in here and talk a little bit about the impact. You have probably studied the correlation between taxes and between spending and budget balancing and interest rates and how it is going to affect families more than anybody else in the Congress.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding on this point. I think it is a very important one.

Obviously, a good part of what has caused the economic growth to take place, this growth period started in 1991 incidentally, the last quarter of 1991, the growth that has taken place has been encouraged to a large degree by the Fed holding down short-term interest rates. And I think it is very important to recognize that that is one of the factors that has caused the economic growth that we have sustained through that period of time to take place.

It has been dampened somewhat, however, and I think most economists will agree that the tax increases that occurred in 1990 and 1993 had just the opposite effect. While the Fed was trying to hold down short-term rates to cause growth in the economy, at the same time Congress put a damper or a wet blanket on economic growth and caused what I see as moderate, at best, economic growth taking place.

If we had not had the tax increases on the other hand and if the economy had performed in a more robust way, while interest rates were low, we certainly would have had more job opportunities. We would have had higher wages, in my opinion, and certainly a higher rate of growth in the economy generally. So interest rates have played a very, very key role in this entire scenario.

Aside from the Fed controlling to some degree short-term rates, long-term rates are controlled to a large extent by investor expectation. If investors expect that inflation will be low and if investors expect that we are going to do our job and stop borrowing on the Federal level to the extent that we have and then they will expect that credit will loosen, then that expectation causes long-term rates to come down as well, which is all certainly very, very positive for job growth, growth in wages and growth in the economy generally.

Our job here is to be partners with the Fed and the Fed has done its job extremely well in controlling short-term rates. Our job is to help control long-term rates by doing the responsible thing and moving in a steady decline in terms of deficit spending to the point where we actually have a balanced budget and every American family will benefit through a program like that, particularly when it comes, as you correctly point out, Mr. GUTKNECHT, to interest rates coming down.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. And that affects families. That affects their ability to buy, their ability to buy new homes, remodel homes.

I want to point out one other thing, I want to get Mr. PAPPAS back involved in this discussion a bit, too, but this chart sort of shows some of the bad news that we are, according to the Congressional Budget Office, we are still about $69 billion short under the President's plan in the year 2002. That is sort of the bad news. But it gets worse. Because if this chart were extended, and we are going to have to get this chart extended, if you just leave everything else the same, when people my age begin to retire in about the year 2011, 2012, when we begin to really make demands upon the Social Security system, the Medicare system, and other things, and as our income levels begin to go into retirement mode, this chart begins to go right straight up. It is almost like an F–16 taking off in a completely vertical takeoff.

While I think this chart is kind of bad news, it gets a lot worse if we do not get serious about solving Medicare, solving Social Security, a lot of those underlying problems and begin to make some modest changes today so we can save the fund for the future.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I notice on the chart that it shows on the President's plan that the deficit begins to decrease rather rapidly after or the last year of his administration or after that. The problem with that expectation is that is making certain assumptions about what the next administration would propose and what that Congress would dispose.

And those are assumptions that I think could be rather dangerous if, again, we are just working off of a plan. Again, I think we have to do what we can do when we can do it. And today is the time that I believe that the people that we represent, each of us represent, expect us to act.

I think the chart that you are demonstrating or displaying once again shows that the difficult decisions are being passed on to the next President and to a subsequent Congress. We are here to act now. And I think that if I wrote back or if I was at a town hall meeting in my district and I told people that I am representing that you are going to have to reelect me three or four more times before we are going to start making some meaningful decisions to bring that budget into balance, I do not think they would be very happy with me.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I might just point out, too, that I was with some school

kids yesterday. One of the things, when I am with school kids, I show them my congressional pin and this nice little card case and this voting card, which one of our colleagues, I think 2 years ago, reminded me is the most expensive credit card ever invented in the history of human beings. And it is on this credit card that previous Congresses have run up about $5.3 trillion worth of debt on those schoolchildren.

I think it is very graphic when you explain this to schoolchildren. I think most Americans can relate to credit card debt. Every so often we read about someone or we hear about a friend or a neighbor or maybe it is us where we get into trouble with our credit cards, where we are charging more and we have reached a point where we are having more and more difficulty just making the monthly minimum and paying the interest. The Federal Government in some respects is like that person who is having some problems with their credit card debt. They are having more and more difficulty just making the interest payments.

If you had a person like that, the last thing you would do for that person, the last thing you would do is say, why do you not start out by going up and running up another $24 billion worth of debt on that credit card.

No, I think the American people say, the first thing you ought to do is cut out the credit card. Stop spending more than you take in and do it quickly. Do not do it 5 years from now; do not do it 3 years from now. Do it this year and next year, because every dollar that we can save this year begins to multiply in the outyears.

One of reasons we are doing as well as we are, and they were modest changes but I think they will have a profound impact long-term, are the cuts that were made in the last Congress where we eliminated some 289 different programs. Some of them were not great big programs but when you pull a program out by the roots, you do not have to feed it year after year. So the savings actually multiply as you go forward.

This is the number that concerns me, and I think it concerns the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the Committee on the Budget and, frankly, should be of concern to all the Members of Congress and the American people, because you do not start out going on a diet by gaining 10 pounds. That is just not good. And you do not try to solve your credit card debt problems by running up even more debt on your credit card in the very first year of the budget.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a point here. I think this is very important, because I would not want any of our colleagues or anybody who might be listening to this discussion to get the notion that we stand here talking about this ready to dismantle on a large scale Federal programs that are important to people.

Two years ago, we began to slow the growth of some programs, which is what we still think we need to do in order to accomplish the objectives that we are talking about here tonight. We suggested, for example, that the School Lunch Program that was growing at a rate in excess of 10 percent, seems to me it was growing at something like 11.5 percent, every year we were spending 11.5 percent more than we had spent the year before, and we suggested that one way to begin to get a handle on the huge increases that we had seen in Federal spending that was driving this deficit and national debt problem would be to slow that growth rate down from about 11.5 percent, I think it was to about 7 percent. And we suggested similar kinds of things in many programs that had been growing at very high rates across the board.

At the same time, during all those years, in real terms, we were reducing defense spending. So we had a disproportionate increase in some programs and no growth at all in other programs. And what we said was, what we say today is that if we can continue to hold down those programs that are currently held down and begin to get a handle on the large increases in the programs that are growing too fast, that we can maintain the services to the American people in a very similar mode that we are today and that we have over the past several years, but they just will not grow as fast. And so I think that is an important part of the discussion as well.

There is one other point that I would like to make. I do not want to confuse the discussion about how important it is, for all the economic reasons and all the reasons that had to do with families, that we balance the budget. But there is one idea that is floating around here that I think we ought to be very cautious with, and that is that recently a commission gave a report on the Consumer Price Index. And the report suggested that the Consumer Price Index is not accurate, that it overstates the rate of inflation.

And I think it is very important to understand that, yes, while we want accurate data in terms of the Consumer Price Index, that the CPI is used in our tax code to determine how much taxes people pay from year to year. The brackets in the marginal rate structure of our Internal Revenue Code actually are indexed to go up with inflation. And if we rush out without having all the information that we can possibly get and arbitrarily legislate a change in the Consumer Price Index, it will mean a tax increase that a JEC study recently pointed out that at the end of a 12-year period will be an additional $405 a year that the average taxpayer will pay in taxes, a very significant tax increase.

So while we want to balance the budget, we do not want to look for the oversimplified ways to do it which means slashing programs that are going to hurt people or finding a gimmicky thing like adjusting the Consumer Price Index. Because an adjustment downward in the Consumer Price Index of 1.1 percent, as the Boskin Commission suggested, means at the end of 12 years every American taxpayer will be paying an additional $405 every year in taxes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I am glad that you made that point. I certainly did not want to suggest that we are going to eliminate important programs that Americans count on. But I do want to make the point that there is an enormous amount of duplication, and there are a lot of programs that the Federal Government funds even today that are not necessarily effective.

We have so much duplication, overlap between the States, the Feds, and so forth. I think you also make a very good point about whether or not we should tamper with the CPI for political or budget reasons. If we are going to change the CPI, it ought to be done by professionals, and it ought to be done for the right reasons, not simply just to balance our budget.

Mr. SAXTON. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman will continue to yield on that point, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which has the responsibility, along with calculating employment and unemployment figures, also is responsible for managing the Consumer Price Index process and the formula through which they measure the rate of increase in prices or price stability.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics I have asked to report back to us by this summer on the structural makeup of the Consumer Price Index process and to make recommendations as to how the situation might be managed without legislating an arbitrary reduction which I think would be a mistake.

I think your point is absolutely correct. There are people who eat and live and breathe issues that have to do with statistical analysis and how to measure the basket of goods that the Consumer Price Index measures. Our leadership is incidentally making a lot of these same points. So I am very pleased about that and hope that we will show some restraint and not look at this as an easy fix to move toward a balanced budget because I am not so sure it gets us there.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The other gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS], any other closing thoughts?

Mr. PAPPAS. I was just going to ask my colleague from New Jersey, since he has been a long-standing member of the Joint Economic Committee and he has been here in the House for a few terms, if he would tell us through his tenure here, when just the early part of this decade, when there was a tax increase that was instituted, what was the, I think we all know but just from your perspective here as a member of that committee, what was the response by the Congress and just the response of the economy to that way to address what was perceived the way to go about making progress on the deficit?

□ 1945

Mr. SAXTON. Well, today, the economy is growing at a little over 2 percent. Some quarters had been better. I think we had 3.9 percent growth in the last quarter of, I guess it was the last quarter of last year. But overall, the economy has grown since 1990, the last quarter of 1991 by a little over 2 percent.

Now, the average growth since World War II has been over 3 percent. That is 1 percentage point, but it makes a big difference, because while 1 percentage point, when we are talking 2 or 3 percent, is like 50 percent faster at 3 percent than at 2 percent.

So it is very important to realize that for some reason all of us agree that the economy is not performing as well as we would like it to. We would like it to be growing at least at the historic average since World War II, which is over 3 percent and it is growing at 2.

So when we begin to look at why that could be, one of the unmistakable conclusions we have to come to is we had the biggest tax increase in 1990, followed by an even bigger one in 1993. That, to me, seems to be what we did differently. And therefore this recovery, which I believe is part of the normal economic cycle, we are now in a growth period, this growth period is slower than I believe any other growth period since World War II.

I personally believe that it is because of the two tax increases, the gentleman correctly points out, and certainly has had an effect on our economy.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. And I asked him that question because I believe that balancing the budget is tied into, and achieving the kinds of economic growth we all want to see is tied into significant across-the-board tax relief.

Many people argue that no, we need to cut spending first before we can then do something about taxes. Again, I will go back to a point I made earlier. If that had been the case, then we would not be talking about graphs, showing graphs where we are seeing the deficit remain in existence or going up before it is going down. We would not be talking about that. We would be talking about all the other new things that we are able to do for the American people because we have the kind of economic growth that we all desire to have.

If we do not cut taxes and see the kind of economic growth that we have seen, that we saw in the early 1960's under President KENNEDY, under President Reagan in the early 1980's, we will not see the kind of growth that will in fact raise revenues and assist us in cutting that deficit.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. More important even than that, Congressman PAPPAS, is it will help those people.

We passed very important welfare reform last year and it is already beginning to show some benefits. We are seeing welfare rolls going down. I have been doing some research in my home State, and we have seen a dramatic drop in welfare rolls just since we passed that legislation last year. The real answer is we need more jobs in the private sector. We need more people on payrolls.

When we talk about economic growth, that can become almost a nebulous term that people do not understand, but they do understand good-paying jobs and more of them. That is really what we are talking about, is making it possible so that more folks who need good-paying jobs can find those good-paying jobs in the communities and in the neighborhoods where they live.

Mr. PAPPAS. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I have to make one other point. I think one of the things that is only fair to expect from the administration under the President and the Vice President, who we all assume is going to aspire to succeed Mr. Clinton, our President, is what will the plan be? Quite frankly, whoever might be President after President Clinton leaves office, what is their plan?

If in fact this is the only thing that we are able to see enacted or proposed by the administration, what is the plan to move forward beyond that time? Again, I do not want to wait. I want to act now.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. We only have about 10 minutes left, but we have been joined by our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], if he wishes to grace us with some of his thoughts relative to the budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I wanted to respond to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] the distinguished chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, regarding his comments to Mr. PAPPAS' comments about the tax proposal and the reduction in taxes.

I am not on the Joint Economic Committee, and quite often I see their 30- and 40-page documents, and I have difficulty reading them; but I was an economics major at the University of Georgia and one of the things that we often did with economics is we delved into the theory. But it is good to just shut the book every now and then and to think about the man on the street; what it would mean to him.

Throw out the theory for a second and think about what would happen if we had more money in our pockets. If we had a guy just running around, and I will call him a friend of mine, Bill Granger. Bill is a working guy. He is a friend of mine and lives in Alma, GA. I am going to change some of the names of the cities to be a little careful here. I do not have his permission.

Say Bill gets a $500 per child tax credit. He has three kids, so he will have $1,500 more in his pocket. Let us say his dad does not get that, his dad gets something from Social Security earnings limitations. Whatever the case, we confiscate less money out of their wallets in Alma, GA. What that means is they would have anywhere from, I will go ridiculously low, from $50 a person to maybe as much as $1,000 a person.

That means they will be able to buy more shoes, more shirts, go out to eat more often, maybe go for a longer vacation, go to Atlanta and have a big time for the weekend or something like that. When they do that, they stimulate the economy.

Let us think about approximately 150 million people with $50 more in their wallet because we are confiscating less through a tax. So what happens is we have all that money out on the street; people going out to eat more, buying more toys, more clothes, shoes, and so forth. When they do that, small businesses expand because they are stimulated by the new growth, the new prosperity out there. When they do that, they create more jobs. And the more jobs that are created, the more people that can find work.

All the folks on welfare now, there would be a lot more job opportunities for them. They go to work. Less people are on public assistance and more revenues coming in.

Both President Kennedy and Reagan cut taxes, and when they did, actual money paid in to taxes in Washington increased. It did not decrease it.

We always hear from some people how are we going to pay for the tax cut? It is not a matter of paying for the tax cut. The revenues, because of the taxes being out on the street, the revenues actually increase. So we do have this phenomenon that if we cut taxes, revenues will increase and America has more prosperity.

I think it is a very basic thing that the person on the street can understand and appreciate. They do not need to have the charts and diagrams about it because they know. Give them their money and they can spend it better than we can.

Mr. SAXTON. If I may, I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for the very articulate analysis or statement on behalf of what this will do for the American family.

One thing I am sure he did not mean to do, but he left out something, which is also important that causes economic growth to take place, is some of that money on the street will get saved, put into a savings account or go into a mutual fund, which creates a supply of savings which others can borrow to increase the size of their business and hire more people.

That is what creates the business cycle, when economic activities take place. Whether we believe it is the supply that creates the better economy or the demand, either way, by the inefficient Federal Government consuming less of GDP and people who are out working in the private sector consuming more of GDP, it makes the economy better when the efficient part of our economy handles the money rather than the inefficient part.

So I wanted to say that I think that the gentleman's statement on behalf of

the average American worker is very well placed.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If I could, gentlemen, our time is just about expired. We will have to wrap it up here, but I do want to thank my colleagues for participating tonight.

I want to say, in part, with the spirit of what transpired in Hershey, PA, that we do look forward to an honest and civil debate about the great issues facing this country, and nothing can be more important than stopping the business of mortgaging our children's future and, in the end, it provides real benefits.

Not only is it the morally right thing to do to balance the budget, but it is the economically smart thing to do. I think if we work together and have a civil debate, then I think we ultimately can succeed in that.

Important now is that we all begin to speak the same language. If the President is speaking OMB and we are speaking CBO, it is going to make that job even more difficult. So in the next several weeks, what we hope to do is try to get the White House and the Congress to at least be speaking the same language.

Then we can have that civil debate and, ultimately, I think we can reach an agreement during this Congress which will be historic, which will leave a legacy that we can all be proud of and ultimately lead to a stronger economic growth, more jobs, better jobs, and the ability of more American families to have the American dream.

So again I want to thank my colleagues for joining me.

TRIBUTE TO ARNOLD ARONSON, A GREAT CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute this evening to one of our Nation's greatest civil rights leaders: Arnold Aronson. Arnold Aronson has been active in civil rights for nearly 60 years.

In 1941, he, along with A. Philip Randolph, mobilized a campaign that led to President Roosevelt's Executive order which banned discrimination on the basis of race, creed or national origin in war-related industries. This Executive order established the first Fair Employment Practice Committee.

In 1941, Mr. Aronson headed the Bureau of Jewish Employment Problems, a one-person agency located in Chicago. Discrimination against Jews at that time was overt and widespread. Help wanted ads specifying gentile only were commonplace, and employment agencies accepted and filled orders in accordance with such specifications.

Rather than attempting to deal with the problem as it affected Jews alone, he decided to attack employment discrimination per se, no matter the victim. Accordingly, he organized the Chicago Council Against Religious and Racial Discrimination, a coalition of religious, labor, ethnic, civil rights and social welfare organizations. As council secretary, Arnold Aronson directed the campaign that led to the first municipal Fair Employment Practices Commission in the Nation.

In 1943, he organized a statewide coalition, the Illinois Fair Employment Council, and initiated the campaign for a State FEP legislation.

In 1945, he became program director of the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, a coalition of national and local Jewish agencies. He developed policies and programs for Jewish agency involvement on issues of civil rights, civil liberties, immigration reform, church and State separation, Soviet Jewish immigration and support for Israel.

In 1946, Arnold Aronson became secretary of the National Council for a Permanent FEPC, a coalition which was headed by A. Philip Randolph, and together they directed campaigns for Federal civil rights legislation in the 79th and 80th Congresses.

In 1949, he became the secretary of the National Emergency Civil Rights Mobilization, which was chaired by Roy Wilkins, and together they organized a lobby in support of President Truman's proposed civil rights program.

Around this same time, Mr. Speaker, Arnold Aronson and a few men, a small group, set out to professionalize people who were working in civil rights and allied fields by establishing the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials. The name of that group has since been changed, and today it is called the National Association of Human Rights Workers.

Arnold Aronson held many offices in that organization, including a term as president. In fact, it is my great honor to have been one of his successor presidents in this organization, and I was pleased to meet with them in Shreveport, LA, 3 weeks ago, and look forward to their annual meeting in October of this year.

□ 2000

During Arnold Aronson's term as president, he established the Journal of Intergroup Relations, which continues to the present time and is an organization to which I very often contribute.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Arnold Aronson's lasting legacy, although he has been involved in every major civil rights effort in this century, is his enduring legacy with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights which he cofounded with NAACP President Roy Wilkins. In 1950, he and Mr. Wilkins convened over 4,000 delegates from all over the country to urge the Congress to enact employment, antidiscrimination, and antilynching laws.

Along with Martin Luther King, Jr., Arnold Aronson was one of the 10 organizers of the 1963 March on Washington. During the Leadership Conference's first 13 years, Arnold Aronson served as its secretary and directed the day-to-day operations of the organization. Along with NAACP Washington bureau director Clarence Mitchell, Aronson and the Leadership Conference coordinated the successful lobbying efforts which resulted in the passage of the 1957 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and the 1968 Fair Housing Act.

Arnold Aronson's lasting legacy, I believe, is summed up in a quote of his, and I would like to quote it. Arnold Aronson once wrote: The struggle of civil rights cannot be won by any one group acting by or for itself alone, but only through a coalition of groups that share a common commitment to equal justice and equal opportunity for every American.

Mr. Speaker, Arnold Aronson's life is a model for us all. I consider it a privilege to have known him and to have worked with him. I am honored to join with my colleagues this evening in saluting this giant on today, his 86th birthday. Happy birthday, Arnold Aronson, and we thank you.

Mr. Speaker, joining with me in this special order this evening are Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, and Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

It is my pleasure at this time, Mr. Speaker, to yield to Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend from the great State of South Carolina for yielding. I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for organizing this special order in honor of our friend Arnold Aronson. It is fitting and appropriate that we gather here on the floor of the House of Representatives to pay tribute to this great man on this, the occasion of his 86th birthday. I want to personally wish Mr. Aronson a happy, a very happy birthday.

As Americans, we owe a debt of gratitude to Arnold Aronson. We live in a better country, a better society, and a better world because of the work of this civil rights pioneer. I would not be here, I would not be a Member of Congress but for the hard work, dedication, and commitment by Arnold Aronson and others like him.

These were people who took up the cause of equal rights and civil rights long before they became politically popular, before they became the fashion of the day. Arnold Aronson was one of the original founders of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and