

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, December 14, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ENSIGN].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 14, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN E. ENSIGN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Your blessings, O God, are new every morning; Your favor looks over us and gives us peace; Your benediction speaks the words of forgiveness and new life and Your everlasting arms give support and strength. Through illness and health, through hope and tears, through joy and sorrow, and in all the moments of each day, we are grateful, O God, for Your gifts of faith and hope and love. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DICKEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes per side.

UNR WOLF PACK WILL POUNCE ON THE TOLEDO ROCKETTS

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of vital importance, the Las Vegas Bowl. Tonight at 9 p.m., the Big West Conference champions, the University of Nevada-Reno Wolf Pack, will take on the University of Toledo Rockets. The Washington Times said today the Las Vegas Bowl will showcase some unnoticed talent.

Disregard what my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], says about the teams' previous meeting, never mind that they beat us 49 to 35. The statistics that we have to concentrate on are:

No. 1, UNR has the No. 1 passing attack in the Nation, not Toledo; No. 2, UNR is the No. 1 in total offense in the Nation, not Toledo; No. 3, UNR has a quarterback that became the first player to lead the Nation in total offense in consecutive seasons. Toledo does not. Alex Van Dyke and Toledo's Wasean Tait are a pair of overachievers on teams that have been largely overlooked this year despite some very impressive statistics. UNR played in the inaugural Las Vegas Bowl in 1992; Toledo has never played in a Las Vegas Bowl.

I will match the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR's, glass bowl bet with a University of Nevada-Reno sweatshirt. The bottom line is: Tonight, the UNR Wolf Pack will pounce on the Toledo Rockets. Go Wolf Pack.

ROCKETTS' TRAJECTORY TAKES THEM TO THE LAS VEGAS BOWL

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this evening the undefeated University of Toledo Rockets will take to the field in the Las Vegas Bowl and once again display their awesome offensive prowess as they defeat the University of Nevada Wolf Pack—for the second time this year. It's an uncommon event to have a rematch in post-season college football, but tonight Toledo and Nevada will reprise their September contest—a game in which the Rockets beat the turnover-prone Wolf Pack 49 to 35.

This is the Rockets' sixth bowl appearance. They have prevailed in all—

with five solid wins and one forfeit. Now I'm sure the Wolf Pack has no intention of forfeiting, but the Rockets will prevail again nonetheless.

As is the custom in the House, I offer my friend from Reno and colleague on the Appropriations Committee, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, a congenial wager that Toledo's irrepressible Rockets will defeat Nevada tonight. So, as Toledo is known as the glass capital of the world, I will risk a set of Libbey Glass wine glasses and Ohio Catawba non-alcoholic Sparkling Grape Juice to fill them on my conviction that Toledo's Rockets will blast off from Las Vegas victorious.

PENS, DISAPPEARING INK, AND SHARPENED PENCILS

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will withstand the temptation to talk about football because I did that most of my professional life. Instead I would simply offer the following observations:

It is my sincere and solid hope that President Clinton did not take the pen Lyndon Johnson used to sign the Tonkin Gulf resolution with him to Paris to sign the treaty. Of course last week President Clinton took LBJ's Medicare pen to discover it was out of ink, and about a month ago President Clinton, amidst great fanfare, signed a public law, a budget agreement agreeing to get to a balanced budget in 7 years using honest numbers, but I suppose the President believes he used disappearing ink in signing that agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the President should take out a sharpened pencil and, with his budgeteers, work toward an honest balanced budget within 7 years. That is our mission. The American people will settle for no less.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 325. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for an optional provision for the reduction of work-related vehicle trips and miles travelled in ozone non-attainment areas designated as severe, and for other purposes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1136. An act to control and prevent commercial counterfeiting, and for other purposes;

S. 1331. An act to adjust and make uniform the dollar amounts used in title 18 to distinguish between grades of offenses, and for other purposes;

S. 1465. An act to extend au pair programs; S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding Wei Jingsheng; Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, the next Panchen Lama of Tibet; and the human rights practices of the Government of the People's Republic of China; and

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060.

REPUBLICANS FILLING THEIR CHRISTMAS STOCKINGS WITH MORE GOODIES

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today's paper reports that the Republican leadership has again dropped the ball in terms of trying to limit Members of Congress' outside income. We know this past year there have been great scandals about the book deal with the Speaker, and in the past, this problem is nothing new, because it occurred with past Speakers and with other Members of the House and Senate. But now, after the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the embarrassment that this body has gone through this past year, the report is that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct that has passed a proposal to limit outside earned income from book deals is going to be rejected. It is going to be put off so that the leadership, the Republican leadership in this House and across this country, can continue to fill their Christmas stockings with more goodies, not just this year in December, but throughout the next year. Happy New Year to the book deals—business as usual.

It is time to properly limit the outside earned income and the book deals and get back to the work we were elected to do, not writing political fiction about our glory days in the 104th Congress.

The 104th Congress should be about—delivering on a balanced budget that is both balanced fiscally and balanced

fairly for the people of this country we represent, not to take away from the Medicare recipients and the Medicaid recipients and the less fortunate to provide and give tax breaks to our rich friends. Congress ought to get on with the task that we are elected to do to finish up the work that is 2 and 3 months past due, and get home so we can be with our families and friends and serve our constituents, not make bad history for political trash novels—with fat incomes for the congressional sponsors holiday stocking and a lump of coal for the taxpayers.

WITHOUT A REPUBLICAN MAJORITY WOULD BILL CLINTON BE NEGOTIATING A BALANCED BUDGET?

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, this morning our national debt stands at 4 trillion, 988 billion, 438 million, 854 thousand, 514 dollars and 79 cents.

All this year, Republicans have devoted tremendous effort and energy to doing something about this debt. We have passionately advocated balancing the budget and doing the right thing for America. Everybody in America knows that balancing the budget is sane and responsible. The debt that previous Congresses have saddled on our Nation is a form of bondage. And our children and our grandchildren will pay for our failed governmental experiments.

And what has been the response from the President? Last week, he vetoed the first balanced budget in a generation. And today, he is at least negotiating a balanced budget with the Congress. But does anyone here believe that if there were no Republican majority that Bill Clinton would be negotiating a balanced budget? The answer is clearly, "no."

Mr. Speaker, let us end the excuses and balance our budget.

REPUBLICANS MANUFACTURING ANOTHER CRISIS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the stage is set for another Government shutdown tomorrow night. That means that citizens will not be able to apply for Social Security or veterans' benefits.

We find ourselves in this situation because the congressional Republicans have not sent a continuing resolution to the President. They are manufacturing another crisis because the President will not cut Medicare and education the way the Republicans want him to.

This poster was given to me by a constituent of mine, a small businessman in the Houston Heights area of Houston, that he is worried about what is happening up here, and obviously he is a fan of the Speaker when he says the rich get richer, we see the end of a great Nation in Godnewtzilla. What he is worried about is we are seeing the destruction of our country by cutting most seniors and the education for our children, and yet he wants to make sure that he can earn his living as a small business person in Houston.

Mr. Speaker, this crisis is contrived, and it is taking place because the Republican leadership has not been able to get their own appropriation bills to the President.

WHY WE HAVE TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, balancing the budget is not about Republicans or Democrats. It is not about partisan victory. It is not about a victory of one group over another group. It is about setting priorities. It is saying that we care more about the future and worry about our children's future than just getting re-elected. Balancing the budget is not just about economics, and it is not just about accounting. It is about the fact that we live in a great country, we live in the greatest country the world has ever seen, and yet we can live in an even greater one if we live within our means.

There are a lot of economic reasons to balance the budget, but what would it mean to the person back home? Mr. Speaker, experts have said, including Alan Greenspan, that living within our means under a balanced budget could mean a drop in the interest rates, perhaps as much as 2 percent, and, if the interest rates drop 2 percent, the average homeowner could have a lower mortgage. If a family has a 30-year mortgage on a \$75,000 house, then over the lifetime of the loan that family will save and pocket \$37,000.

That is why we need to balance the budget, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Democrats and Republicans will all step forward, put partisanship aside, and do the right thing.

WORK OUT OUR DIFFERENCES

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the deadline for the continuing resolution, and once again it appears the Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, is prepared to shut down the Government because of the disagreements over the budget.

I have said before, and I will say it again, we may have differences between Democrats and Republicans on the budget, but the negotiations should continue and the Government should not shut down because the Speaker cannot come to an agreement.

Already the President has said that he wants to continue the Government operations for at least another week, if not beyond. The Senate leadership on the Republican side has also agreed to that. Speaker GINGRICH once again says "no" because of his own ideology.

We should work out our differences on the budget. I think right now there is no question that the American people feel that Medicare and Medicaid must be preserved and the Republican leadership in the House must come up with a budget proposal that protects Medicare and Medicaid, protects our environmental protection, our education programs. They have not done so. The President has agreed even to the 7-year balanced budget that the Republicans have proposed, but now it is up to Speaker GINGRICH and the Republicans in the House to come up with a program that agrees with the priorities of the American people.

LOWER TAXES AND SPENDING RESTRAINT

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the liberal Democrats love to chant over and over that "heartless" Republicans are "slashing" Government to give tax breaks to their friends. False. But it is true that in some areas of Government, like foreign aid, we are cutting. In other areas, like Medicaid and Medicare, we are increasing spending.

And it is also true that we advocate tax cuts. Remember, higher taxes means more spending in Washington. I am proud that Republicans are going to give a \$500 tax credit to children and to working families. The money that Americans make belongs to them; it does not belong to the Government. And let me say this about lower taxes: We need lower taxes to help grow the economy. It is essential to balancing the budget that we have strong economic growth. This time lower taxes will be coupled with spending restraints in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, let us end the excuses and let American families keep more of what they earn.

□ 1015

DEMOCRATS STAND FOR MEDICARE, REPUBLICANS STAND FOR MEDIOCRE HEALTH CARE

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I hope our colleagues focus on this chart, which says "Medicare." It is one little word, but I think it says more about the differences between Democrats and Republicans than any other word. Mr. Speaker, Democrats care very much about Medicare, and Republicans want to take the care out of Medicare. They want to slash Medicare by \$270 billion to give a tax break for their wealthy friends.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans would like to take the "care" out of Medicare. By their budget they are taking the "care" out of Medicare. I hope we look at this. When they take the care out of Medicare, this is what happens to health care in this country. It becomes mediocre care. Democrats stand for Medicare. Republicans stand for mediocre health care for our seniors, mediocre care so our seniors cannot get the care they need; mediocre care so people go without health care; mediocre care so senior citizens have to suffer, all to give a tax break for the rich. For shame.

THE DEMOCRATS SHOULD GET THE FACTS

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would love to respond to the gentleman who has just addressed us and tell him that we have a standing offer: It is \$1 million if he can find those cuts. We are still waiting. The challenge has been out there.

It is not working. The people in this country no longer are being deceived. The polls show that. I have been to town meetings. I find that people are angry that Democrats are trying to mislead them, that the Clinton administration is trying to mislead them. People do not like to be scared unnecessarily. I think that is a very good thing that they do not.

I would suggest that the gentleman might want to talk to our new colleague, Tom Campbell, when he arrives here and find out just exactly what is going on out there in America, because people know the truth. We are providing for Medicare. We are increasing Medicare. We are going from \$4,700 per capita to over \$7,100 per capita in our budget. President Clinton's budget does not balance. CBO says it one more time, it does not balance. We will stand behind our challenge. Get some facts.

OUR COUNTRY AND OUR TROOPS DESERVE CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

(Mr. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats alike, cast votes of conscience on our mission to Bosnia. Some Members endorsed the mission, some expressed serious concerns, and some opposed it altogether. That is the way democracy should work. But there can be no excuse, there can be no justification, there can be no rationalization for prohibiting this House last night, which the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER], did, from having a unanimous vote in support of our troops that are already in Bosnia.

Let me read the resolution the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER], and his colleagues who supported him killed last night on this floor:

Resolved: That the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

For anyone to stop this simple resolution is at best a lapse in judgment and, at worst, mindless partisanship. Our country and our troops deserve better than that.

A CONTINUING RESOLUTION ON A BIRTHDAY

(Mr. DICKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day. It is my birthday. I am either 56 or 65. I cannot remember which. But I want you to know I am a little concerned about something. It is 10:20. I have gotten a call from my daughter, Laura, and my son, Ted, and one other person from Maryland, but I have gotten no gifts. I know that time has been rushed and we have been doing a lot of things.

What I am going to propose today is that we have sort of like a continuing resolution so my birthday can extend from the 14th through the 21st, to give you all a chance to give me a gift. I do not want this to be a partisan affair. We should be bipartisan in this effort in every way. I do not want you to worry about the gift ban either, or about the fact that I missed your birthday and did not give you a gift. If you all start the charity, then I can respond. I want to thank you for this opportunity. Please keep me in your minds and your thoughts.

REPUBLICAN PARTISANSHIP WILL WRECK THE REPUBLIC

(Mr. PETERSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

until they had their arms twisted by their leaders. NEWT GINGRICH should live up to his commitment to a balanced budget that gives veterans what they deserve.

**PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS OF
H.R. 1020**

(Mr. ENSIGN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1020, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1995. My colleagues have heard many, many reasons why H.R. 1020 is not a good bill. I have discussed at length how H.R. 1020 would preempt States rights, slash environmental standards, bust the budget agreement by \$4.2 billion, and today I will tell my colleagues how it endangers the rights of private property owners.

H.R. 1020 proposes that thousands of shipments of high level nuclear waste be shipped from the 109 reactors around the country, across 43 States to Nevada. As written, there is no language in H.R. 1020 to protect private property rights. I know that and many of my colleagues and I are strong supporters of private property rights. As this nuclear waste travels across our local communities, there is no protection for private property owners if their property is devalued. A recent case was decided in Santa Fe, NM, that accurately describes the reality of this situation. The New Mexico State Supreme Court ruled that Mr. John Komis, of Santa Fe, NM, be awarded more than \$884,000 for damages resulting from devaluation of his land due to the transportation of radioactive waste past his property. Your constituents, whether in Wichita, KS; Medford, OK; or Charleston, WV, or anywhere along the transportation routes, could suffer from this very same experience.

I intend to offer an amendment to H.R. 1020 to ensure that private property owners be compensated for any property devaluation. While this single amendment could in no way ever correct all the drastic problems with the legislation, it does provide a mechanism to protect the innocent property owners from erroneous Government action. I urge my colleagues to protect their constituents and support my amendment.

**THE SPEAKER SHOULD SUPPORT
A BUDGET WHICH REFLECTS
AMERICA'S PRIORITIES, NOT HIS
OWN**

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last month, the gentleman from Georgia

[Mr. GINGRICH] shut down the Government because he did not like his seat on Air Force One. But now he is at it again, and while the President and the Republican leaders of the other body work together to negotiate a budget deal, Speaker GINGRICH can only offer obstruction. Why is the Speaker determined to shut down the Government again?

□ 1030

Was he invited to breakfast at the White House and got only one piece of toast and President Clinton got two? Who knows. What we do know is that the Speaker is using the threat of a Government shutdown to force his budget priorities on the American people.

My colleagues on the other side have said that the polls show that the American people know what is going on. In fact, they do know what the Republicans are doing here, and they do not like it. They oppose a budget that cuts Medicare, education, environmental protection to finance a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans.

So, Mr. GINGRICH, quit playing games. Give the American people an early Christmas present, a budget which reflects America's priorities, the priorities of the people of this country, not yours.

LINGANORE LANCERS ARE NO. 1

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there is life outside the Congress.

I rise today to recognize the achievements of Linganore High School—the Lancers—and its three 1995 State championships. This fall, the Linganore girls cross-country team and team member Kristen Ritter won the State Division 2-A team and individual State championships.

Most recently, Linganore's football team won its third State championship in Division 2-A.

It last won the championship in 1991.

The Lancers' first State football championship was earned in Division 3-A in 1989. I am very proud that a member of my staff, Jeff Jones, started as the middle-linebacker on that first championship team.

First year Linganore head football coach Bill McIntosh deserves a lot of credit for nurturing these fine young men into a winning team.

The 1995 State championships were a great and difficult goal.

The Lancers set their sights on achieving that goal. Then they went out and made it happen—three times so far this year.

May the example of the 1995 Maryland State Champion Linganore High

School girls cross-country team, Kristen Ritter, and the football team inspire those of us in Congress to achieve our goal of a balanced budget in 7 years.

**ETHICS COMMITTEE NAILS DOWN
BOOK ADVANCE LOOPHOLE**

(Mr. POMEROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of this body 1 year ago felt embarrassment when we learned that the incoming Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, was about to pocket \$4.5 million under an extraordinarily book deal that would have richly benefited him and the individual seeking to pay him, an individual with substantial stake in the legislation to come before this Congress.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, in a bipartisan, unanimous vote, has voted to make certain that never again will we have a Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, or a Republican or a Democrat ever again try and cash in in this fashion by nailing down the book advance loophole.

I was shocked to learn in this morning's papers, Speaker GINGRICH is trying to delay indefinitely this measure from coming up for a vote in the House, and other Members of the Republican leadership are on board in trying to delay us or stop us from having a vote on this good Government reform.

Think again, Mr. Speaker. Think again, Republican leaders. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has spoken and we will have a vote, either under your auspices or under a discharge petition.

**ETHICS COMMITTEE'S REFORM
STALLED**

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has unanimously voted to close the loophole on outside income limitations for Members of Congress from book royalties. Now the Speaker and the majority leader and the Committee on Rules chair all inform us that there will be a stall in that reform. I think that is a very sad day.

I wrote the code of ethics under which 18 Members of this House have been disciplined, and at that time, at the request of people of the highest integrity, we made an exception for book royalties because we wanted to make room for legitimate exchange of ideas, and we had in mind books by people such as Mo Udall, Dick Bolling, and John Anderson. But we never dreamed

that that exception would be used by any Member to cash in big on his public fame.

The Speaker's book deal has done such incredible damage to the public confidence in this House by making it appear that all of us are money grubbers, that that rule must be changed to eliminate it, and it must be changed now.

NO BUDGET, NO CONGRESSIONAL PAY

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, when the Republicans failed to pass the necessary appropriations bills, they precipitated a crisis last month which led to the longest Government shutdown in our Nation's history. The Government shutdown cost American taxpayers \$100 million a day because Mr. GINGRICH and the Republican leaders failed to pass a spending bill to keep the Government open. That sort of tragedy should not be repeated, and yet, tomorrow, it may be.

We now have another threat from the Republican leadership to close down the Government again, this time to send home some 300,000 Federal employees and once again leave the American taxpayers holding the bag.

Mr. GINGRICH insists that closing down the Government and sending home these employees is a matter of principle. Let me suggest something to the Speaker. It is a matter of principle if your paycheck is on the line, not if the paychecks of 300,000 Federal employees are on the line.

Mr. GINGRICH, you can put your paycheck on the line by supporting my bill: No budget, no pay. If Congress fails to keep the Government open, Congress does not get paid.

Mr. GINGRICH has killed this bill five times. We have to push forward to make sure that Congress does the responsible thing.

STATES NEED BETTER CONTROL OVER MEDICAID

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, this is what a prominent Governor has to say about reforming Medicaid: "If the Federal Government would just release us from its bureaucracy and nonsense, we'd make these programs better for those they serve, and we'd do it for less money."

Any guesses on who said this? It was Massachusetts Governor Bill Weld in a Wall Street Journal article from Monday.

Here's quote from another well-known Governor: "Medicaid mandates

have put great stress on State budgets and undermined the States' ability to properly fund education and other important services."

Any guesses on this one? Well, this quote is from a document coauthored by Governor Bill Clinton in 1989.

As Governor, Bill Clinton warned that Medicaid mandates were too burdensome and in need of more State-level control.

Now, as President, Mr. Clinton has the opportunity to take care of that problem, but he has changed his position, and he has vetoed a bill that would have accomplished that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to join us in giving the States better control over our Medicaid system.

WELFARE REFORM MUST NOT PUNISH CHILDREN

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of inside-the-beltway talk during the welfare reform debate about family caps, block grants, and maintenance of effort.

But I tell you, my friends, we have not heard much about the children. Let me lay out the facts plain and clear.

By shredding the safety net—by ending for the first time in 60 years the Federal guarantee of assistance for poor children—The Gingrich welfare bill will push at least 1.2 million more children into poverty, 1.2 million more children into poverty.

The bill tells children: If you're poor, don't get sick; don't get hungry; don't get cold because we don't think you're important. And, we don't want to guarantee that you have health care; food, and general assistance.

Mr. Speaker, welfare reform is not supposed to be about punishing poor children.

It should be about improving their lives by giving their parents the education, job training, and child care needed to get a job and get off welfare permanently.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on National Security, Committee on Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce to the House that under rule IX, I plan to offer a privileged resolution and ask for its consideration to be scheduled within 2 days, as are required by the rules, as follows:

Whereas, on November 29, 1995, the House of Representatives considered S. 1060, a bill which had been passed by the Senate on July 25, 1995 to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government and for other purposes;

Whereas, on such date the House passed the bill without amount, the effect of which was an identical lobbying reform bill passed by both the House and the Senate;

Whereas, as of December 14, 1995, the bill passed by both Chambers has not been enrolled by the Senate and presented to the President in violation of constitutional requirements to so present;

Whereas, an unreasonable delay in the presentation of an enrolled bill to the President affects the integrity of the proceedings of the House of Representatives: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint a committee of two Members of the House, one from each major party, to determine whether there has been unreasonable delay in transmitting the enrolled bill, S. 1060, to the President, and such committee shall promptly inform the Senate of the concern of the House of Representatives over the delay in the bill's presentation to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days of its being properly noticed. The Chair will announce the Speaker's designation at a later time. In the meantime, a form of the resolution proffered by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair is not making a determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated by the Speaker for consideration of the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my question would be as to

the point you just made, as to whether or not this would be recognized as a legitimate question of privilege, would the fact that a virtually identical resolution under identical circumstances offered by then-minority whip GINGRICH in 1991, that that was ruled to be a question of privilege, would that be relevant to this decision?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will consider that at the time that the resolution is offered.

ENFORCING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT AND PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND AND OTHER FEDERAL TRUST FUNDS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 293 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 293

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2621) to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security trust funds and other Federal trust funds and accounts invested in public debt obligations. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules and the former chairman, and my good friend and distinguished Member of this body, pending which I yield myself such time as I

may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 293 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2621, a commonsense measure designed to ensure that the promise made by this Government to the people who depend on Social Security and similar trust funds will be kept. We have repeatedly promised Americans that the money they pay into Government trust funds is being kept in trust for them, safe from being raided for short term fiscal and political emergencies. And the majority party in Congress intends to keep that promise even if the Clinton administration doesn't. This bill is necessary now because the Clinton administration—particularly the Treasury Secretary—has violated that trust in recent weeks by dipping into these reserve accounts in order to extend the Nation's credit and wiggle out of a commitment to put this Nation on a 7-year glide path toward a balanced budget. The new congressional majority has told the administration that we will not grant an extension of our national debt—which now stands at nearly \$5 trillion—until we have in place a plan to balance the budget. It would be irresponsible and immoral of us to keep writing uncovered checks from our children's accounts without such a plan in place. But fulfilling this commitment means making sure the administration can't stretch the rules and raid the trust funds to keep the red ink flowing. And so, on November 14 of this year, the House passed H.R. 2621 under suspension of the rules. Although the bill received a majority of the votes that day—247 ayes to 179 nays—it fell short of gaining the necessary two-thirds needed to pass under suspension. That's why the Rules Committee was asked to grant this rule. As is customary for legislation stemming from the Ways and Means Committee, House Resolution 293 is a closed rule. However, since the time that the House first considered this bill, the Treasury

Secretary has in fact borrowed from the trust funds. This rule therefore incorporates an amendment offered by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. ARCHER, to restore those trust funds to their full value. This amendment will be adopted upon passage of the rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. In addition, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, during our Rules Committee hearing on this bill last week, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. GIBBONS, suggested that passing H.R. 2621 is a waste of time since the President is surely going to veto it. I am extremely puzzled and, frankly, quite dismayed to hear that this President would veto a measure designed to ensure the solvency and integrity of the Government trust funds, including the Social Security trust fund. Is President Clinton really in favor of raiding the Social Security trust fund? If in fact the President has made this ill-advised decision, I hope he will reconsider. If he doesn't, I hope America is listening. Those trust funds are based upon the trust of the people who have paid into them in good faith. They expect us to ensure that their money is being held safely by the Federal Government. Those funds are not designed to bail out the overspending of the Clinton administration nor are they to assist this administration in its effort to avoid agreeing to a balanced budget in 7 years. I know the President has previously said that preserving Social Security is a priority for his administration. He can live up to that rhetoric by joining us in this effort to enforce the public debt ceiling while protecting the trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

(As of December 7, 1995)

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	56	65
Modified Closed ³	49	47	20	23
Closed ⁴	9	9	10	12
Total	104	100	86	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

(As of December 7, 1995)

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of December 7, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/1/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	O	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235-193; A: 228-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241-173; A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231-194; A: 227-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235-184; A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191; A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	O	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 263 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/15/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/23/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	

Codes: O—open rule, MO—modified open rule, MC—modified closed rule, C—closed rule, A—adoption vote, D—defeated, PQ—previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

□ 1045

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an outrage. It is dangerous, it is irresponsible, it plays politics with the American people, and is wrong.

I am opposed to this bill.

I am opposed to this closed rule, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, there is one reason why this country is about to default on its loans for the first time in history—because my Republican colleagues will not pass a clean debt limit extension. Plain and simple.

Now I wish we did not have to raise the debt limit—but I also recognize that it is something we must do.

If this horrible bill passes, our payments to our creditors will stop immediately and it will be much harder for the United States to borrow money in the future. We will have to pay extremely high interest rates and the American taxpayers will pay for it.

This bill will force this country to default on its loans and that will hurt a lot of people.

People with pension plans will be hurt; people with adjustable rates mortgages will be hurt; people with payroll deduction plans will be hurt; and people who served in the military will be hurt.

Mr. Speaker, this debt limit extension should be above politics—it is a very serious issue and has no place whatsoever being used as a political football.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question to provide for short-term increase in the Federal

debt of \$85 billion. Secretary Rubin requested this amount in a letter to Speaker GINGRICH on October 27 of this year and we should grant it.

There is no reason for my Republican colleagues to play these games. All we need to do to prevent default is pass a simple debt ceiling bill. It is not that hard. Congress has done it 33 times between 1980 and 1995.

But, instead of acting responsibly and passing a simple debt ceiling increase, my Republican colleagues are offering a bill that takes away the Treasury Department's ability to deal with the debt ceiling crisis. All for the sake of politics.

My Republican colleagues are using the debt ceiling bill as a way to play politics with other budget issues. It holds the American people and the credit of this country hostage and it is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is dangerous, this closed rule is unfair, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

The fiscal integrity of the United States is much too important to be sacrificed on the altar of partisanship.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive; Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive; only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive; considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment; waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive; Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments, 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R.
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 650*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive; Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa.	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive; Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive; Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive; Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	NA.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive; Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	SR; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	NA.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	NA.
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	NA.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min. each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	NA.
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl. 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl. 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	NA.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	NA.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority. *RULE AMENDED*.	NA.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	NA.
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	NA.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min.); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	NA.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive; 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); if motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 201(5) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	NA.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive; waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bilely amendment (30 min.) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bi-partisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min.), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	NA.
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open; 2 hr of gen. debate. Makes in order the committee substitute as original text	NA.
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive; waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl. 7 of rule XVI and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	NA.
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open; waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl. 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open; waives section 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl. 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute; provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) if adopted, it is considered as base text.	NA.
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min.) if adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive; waives cl. 2(L)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open; waives cl. 201(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	NA.
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; pre-printing gets priority	NA.
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open; self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	NA.
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive; waives cl. 2(L)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a Senate hook-up after adoption.	1D

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5(c) of rule XXI (¾ requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive; makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all points of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5(c) of rule XXI (¾ requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; Makes in order the Walsh amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Bonilla, Gunderson and Hostettler amendments (30 min.); waives all points of order against the amendments; debate on any further amendments is limited to 30 min. each.	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; self-executes 4 amendments in the rule; Solomon, Medicare Coverage of Certain Anti-Cancer Drug Treatments, Habeas Corpus Reform, Chrysler (MO); makes in order the Walker amend (40 min.) on regulatory reform.	5R
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open; waives section 302(f) and section 308(a)	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 30 min. of debate; makes in order the Burton amendment and the Gingrich en bloc amendment (30 min. each); waives all points of order against the amendments; Gingrich is only in order if Burton fails or is not offered.	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open; waives cl. 2(i)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; waives all points of order against the Istook and McIntosh amendments.	N/A
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; provides one motion to amend if offered by the Minority Leader or designee (1 hr non-amendable); motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by Minority Leader or his designee; if Minority Leader motion is not offered debate time will be extended by 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the Transportation substitute modified by the amend in the report; Bill read by title; waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order a managers amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.); waives all points of order against the amendment; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open; makes in order the committee substitute as original text; makes in order a managers amendment which if adopted is considered as original text (20 min.) unamendable; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res.	Closed; provides for the adoption of the Ways & Means amendment printed in the report. 1 hr. of general debate.	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 55% restrictive; 45% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I just took this time because I think it is important to correct the record.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not protect the trust funds. We do not protect the trust funds by causing fiscal chaos for this Nation. If we want to ensure that our Social Security recipients receive their Social Security checks, we do not jeopardize the payment on our debt of this Nation.

If this bill were to pass, it would cause an immediate default on the national debt. I do not think anybody wants to see that happen. Why are we not passing a clean debt extension? It has already been passed a couple of times by this House.

This is not anything new. This debt limit has already been approved and voted on by just about every Republican in this House. But they are playing games with the ability of people to receive their Social Security checks.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can get a clean debt extension that will really protect our Social Security recipients.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I announced earlier, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that includes a substitute for the debt management repeal bill offered by the Republicans.

My substitute is a clean, short-term debt extension of \$85 billion. This amount will allow the orderly conduct of the Nation's financial affairs until January 19. After that date, the debt ceiling will revert to the current level.

The extension will allow additional time for continued budget discussions between the administration and Congress. I ask that the amendment to the rule be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The text of the proposed amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT MODIFYING THE TEXT OF H.R. 2621, TO PROTECT FEDERAL TRUST FUNDS (CONSIDERED AS ADOPTED BY THE ADOPTION ON THE RULE)

Strike section 2 of the bill and insert the following:

SEC. 2. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (j), (k), and (l) of section 8348 of title 5, United States Code, and subsections (g) and (h) of section 8438 of such title are hereby repealed.

(b) RETENTION OF AUTHORITY TO RESTORE TRUST FUNDS WITH RESPECT TO ACTIONS TAKEN BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The repeals made by subsection (a) shall not apply to the restoration requirements imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Executive Director referred to in section 8438(g)(5) of title 5, United States Code) with respect to amounts attributable to actions taken under subsection (j)(1) or (k) of section 8348, or section 8438(g)(1), of such title before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RESTORATION REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "restoration requirements" means the requirements imposed by—

(A) paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (j), and subsection (l)(1), of section 8348 of such title, and

(B) paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (g), and subsection (h)(1), of section 8438 of such title.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All I would simply say is that despite the very important comments of the gentleman from Maryland, I would disagree. That the most important threat to our children and our Nation and our people on Social Security is in fact that the national debt has gotten so far out of control that the credit of our country indeed is in question. I would

suggest that the right vote is to get responsible now. This is not a question of politics. This is a question of the well-being of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 183, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 859]

YEAS—223

Allard	Ensign	Kolbe
Archer	Everett	LaHood
Bachus	Ewing	Latham
Baker (CA)	Fawell	LaTourette
Baker (LA)	Fields (TX)	Laughlin
Ballenger	Flanagan	Lazio
Barr	Foley	Leach
Barrett (NE)	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Bartlett	Fowler	Lewis (KY)
Barton	Fox	Lightfoot
Bass	Franks (CT)	Linder
Bateman	Franks (NJ)	Livingston
Bereuter	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Bilbrakis	Frisa	Longley
Billey	Funderburk	Lucas
Blute	Galleghy	Manzullo
Boehner	Ganske	Martini
Bonilla	Gekas	McCollum
Bono	Gilchrest	McCrery
Brownback	Gillmor	McDade
Bryant (TN)	Gilman	McHugh
Bunn	Goodlatte	McIntosh
Bunning	Goodling	McKeon
Burr	Goss	Metcalf
Burton	Graham	Myrick
Buyer	Greenwood	Neumann
Callahan	Gunderson	Ney
Calvert	Gutknecht	Miller (FL)
Camp	Hall (TX)	Molinar
Canady	Hancock	Moorhead
Castle	Hansen	Morella
Chabot	Hastert	Myers
Chambliss	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Chenoweth	Hayes	Neumann
Christensen	Hayworth	Norwood
Chrysler	Hefley	Nussle
Clinger	Heineman	Oxley
Coble	Herger	Packard
Coburn	Hilleary	Parker
Collins (GA)	Hobson	Paxon
Combest	Hoekstra	Petri
Cooley	Hoke	Porter
Cox	Horn	Portman
Crapo	Hostettler	Pryce
Creameans	Houghton	Quillen
Cubin	Hunter	Quinn
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Radanovich
Davis	Hyde	Ramstad
Deal	Inglis	Regula
DeLay	Istook	Riggs
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)	Roberts
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Doolittle	Jones	Rohrabacher
Dorman	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Kelly	Roth
Duncan	Kim	Roukema
Dunn	King	Royce
Ehlers	Kingston	Salmon
Ehrlich	Klug	Sanford
English	Knollenberg	Saxton

Schaefer	Stearns
Schiff	Stump
Seastrand	Talent
Sensenbrenner	Tate
Shadegg	Tauzin
Shaw	Taylor (NC)
Shays	Thomas
Shuster	Thornberry
Skeen	Tiahrt
Smith (MI)	Torkildsen
Smith (TX)	Traffant
Smith (WA)	Upton
Solomon	Vucanovich
Souder	Waldholtz
Spence	Walker

NAYS—183

Abercrombie	Gordon
Ackerman	Green
Andrews	Gutierrez
Baesler	Hall (OH)
Baldacci	Hamilton
Barca	Hastings (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Hefner
Becerra	Hilliard
Bellenson	Hinchey
Bentsen	Holden
Berman	Hoyer
Bevill	Jackson-Lee
Bishop	(TX)
Bonior	Jacobs
Borski	Jefferson
Boucher	Johnson (SD)
Brewster	Johnson, E. B.
Browder	Johnston
Brown (CA)	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Kaptur
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)
Chapman	Kennelly
Clayton	Kildee
Clement	Kleccka
Clyburn	Klink
Coleman	LaFalce
Collins (IL)	Lantos
Collins (MI)	Levin
Condit	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Lincoln
Costello	Lipinski
Coyne	Longley
Cramer	Lowe
Danner	Luther
de la Garza	Maloney
DeLauro	Manton
Dellums	Markey
Deutsch	Martinez
Dicks	Mascara
Dingell	Matsui
Doggett	McCarthy
Dooley	McDermott
Doyle	McHaie
Durbin	McNulty
Edwards	Meehan
Engel	Meek
Eshoo	Menendez
Evans	Miller (CA)
Farr	Minge
Fattah	Mink
Fazio	Moakley
Fields (LA)	Mollohan
Flitner	Montgomery
Flake	Moran
Foglietta	Murtha
Frank (MA)	Nadler
Frost	Neal
Furse	Neal
Gedjenson	Oberstar
Gibbons	Obey
Gonzalez	Olver
	Ortiz

NOT VOTING—26

Army	Ford
Bilbray	Gephardt
Boehrlert	Geren
Brown (FL)	Harman
Clay	Largent
Crane	McInnis
DeFazio	McKinney
Dixon	Mfume
Emerson	Nethercutt

Walsh	Wamp
Watts (OK)	Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)	Weller
White	Whitfield
Wicker	Wolf
Young (FL)	Zeliff
Zimmer	

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina) announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 184, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 860]

AYES—228

Allard	Fowler	McCollum
Archer	Fox	McCrery
Army	Franks (CT)	McDade
Bachus	Franks (NJ)	McHugh
Baker (CA)	Frelinghuysen	McIntosh
Baker (LA)	Frisa	McKeon
Ballenger	Funderburk	Metcalf
Bartlett	Galleghy	Meyers
Barton	Ganske	Mica
Bass	Gekas	Miller (FL)
Bateman	Gilchrest	Molinar
Bereuter	Gillmor	Moorhead
Bilbray	Gilman	Morella
Bilbrakis	Goodlatte	Myers
Billey	Goodling	Myrick
Blute	Goss	Nethercutt
Boehner	Graham	Neumann
Boehrlert	Greenwood	Ney
Boehner	Gunderson	Norwood
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Nussle
Bono	Hall (TX)	Oxley
Brownback	Hancock	Packard
Bryant (TN)	Hansen	Parker
Bunn	Hastert	Paxon
Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Burr	Hayes	Porter
Burton	Hayworth	Portman
Buyer	Hefley	Pryce
Callahan	Heineman	Quillen
Calvert	Herger	Quinn
Camp	Hilleary	Radanovich
Canady	Hobson	Ramstad
Castle	Hoeckstra	Regula
Chabot	Hoke	Riggs
Chambliss	Horn	Roberts
Chenoweth	Hostettler	Rogers
Christensen	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Chrysler	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Clinger	Hutchinson	Roth
Coble	Hyde	Roukema
Coburn	Inglis	Royce
Collins (GA)	Istook	Salmon
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Sanford
Cooley	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Cox	Jones	Scarborough
Crapo	Kasich	Schaefer
Creameans	Kelly	Schiff
Cubin	Kim	Seastrand
Cunningham	King	Sensenbrenner
Davis	Kingston	Shadegg
Deal	Klug	Shaw
DeLay	Knollenberg	Shays
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Shuster
Dickey	LaHood	Skeen
Doolittle	Largent	Smith (MI)
Dorman	Latham	Smith (TX)
Dreier	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Duncan	Laughlin	Solomon
Dunn	Lazio	Souder
Ehlers	Leach	Spence
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
English	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Ensign	Lightfoot	Talent
Everett	Linder	Tate
Ewing	Livingston	Tauzin
Fawell	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Fields (TX)	Longley	Thomas
Flanagan	Lucas	Thornberry
Foley	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Forbes	Martini	Torkildsen

Mrs. SMITH of Washington and Mr. ZELIFF changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

Traffant	Wamp	Whitfield
Upton	Watts (OK)	Wicker
Vucanovich	Weldon (FL)	Wolf
Waldholtz	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)
Walker	Weller	Zeliff
Walsh	White	Zimmer

NOES—184

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Orton
Ackerman	Gordon	Owens
Andrews	Green	Pallone
Baesler	Gutierrez	Pastor
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bellenson	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Bentsen	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hinchee	Pickett
Bevill	Holden	Pomeroy
Bonior	Hoyer	Shroed
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Boucher	(TX)	Rangel
Brewster	Jefferson	Reed
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Rush
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Chapman	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Clayton	Kennelly	Sawyer
Clement	Kildee	Schroeder
Clyburn	Klecicka	Schumer
Coleman	Klink	Scott
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Sisisky
Condit	Levin	Skaggs
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Costello	Lincoln	Slaughter
Coyne	Liptinski	Spratt
Cramer	Lofgren	Stark
Danner	Lowe	Stenholm
de la Garza	Luther	Stokes
DeFazio	Maloney	Studds
DeLauro	Manton	Stupak
Dellums	Markey	Tanner
Deutsch	Martinez	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	Mascara	Tejeda
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson
Doggett	McCarthy	Thornton
Dooley	McDermott	Thurman
Doyle	McHale	Torres
Durbin	McNulty	Tortorelli
Edwards	Meehan	Towns
Engel	Meek	Velazquez
Eshoo	Menendez	Vento
Evans	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Farr	Minge	Volkmer
Fattah	Mink	Wald
Fazio	Moakley	Waters
Fields (LA)	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Flner	Montgomery	Waxman
Flake	Moran	Williams
Foglietta	Murtha	Wilson
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Wise
Frost	Neal	Woolsey
Furse	Oberstar	Wyden
Gejdenson	Obey	Wynn
Gephardt	Olver	Yates
Gibbons	Ortiz	

NOT VOTING—20

Baldacci	Ford	Pombo
Barr	Geren	Rose
Bishop	Harman	Smith (NJ)
Clay	Jacobs	Stockman
Crane	McInnis	Tucker
Dixon	McKinney	Young (AK)
Emerson	Mfume	

□ 1135

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

FIRING INAPPROPRIATE AT CHRISTMASTIME

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry of the Speaker or anyone knowledgeable of the issue to clarify it, because there is a good deal of concern on the part of Members on both sides of the aisle over the status of 11 people who served all of the Members of this body in a nonpartisan way, and who, we understand, have been fired without advance notice just before Christmastime.

I do not think it is a partisan issue, but it is something that affects all of us, because these are people who are responsible for the tallying, for the enrollment of bills, for checking the accuracy of the bills; and the only common bond we can find among those people that have been peremptorily fired is that they had accumulated a substantial amount of compensatory time.

Since this body will have to abide by all of the private sector laws as of January 1, we would be responsible for compensating these people for the compensatory time they built up for working late hours when we are still in session.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the common bond that caused their firing, then I think it would be helpful for all of us to understand, because this affects the ability of all of the Members of this body to carry out their functions and to make sure that no mistakes are made in the wording of the bills, and that the tally of the votes, and so on is accurate.

Mr. Speaker, I also think that it reflects on all of the Members of this body if we fire our own employees just before Christmastime for a reason that does not seem consistent with the values—the family values and the integrity—of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has risen, the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, and perhaps he would respond.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that perhaps these kinds of discussions on the floor, without having all of the facts in front of us, are probably not as useful as they should be, and that I believe the gentleman ought to avail himself of all of the facts prior to making some rather strong statements.

Of course, as the gentleman knows, given the dismissal policy around here, these individuals will be with us through the Christmas season.

As a matter of fact, they will be with us through the beginning month of the year, and probably beyond that because simply, around here when you talk about removing people who, in the re-

view of the needs, are no longer necessary, to make a statement that they are not going to be here through the Christmas session is simply not factually correct; and I would very much like to invite the gentleman to sit down and take a look at all of the facts surrounding the circumstances.

I would have been more than willing to do that had the gentleman approached me, without taking the time of the House to make some statements.

I think the gentleman will find, after he looks at the facts, that he was perhaps a bit extreme. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that was the purpose for making it an inquiry rather than a speech: To determine why it occurred. I hope we can get some further light on the issue. I think it is a serious one.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 293, I call up the bill (H.R. 2621) to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security trust funds and other Federal trust funds and accounts invested in public debt obligations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

H.R. 2621

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPLICABILITY OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT TO FEDERAL TRUST FUNDS AND OTHER FEDERAL ACCOUNTS.

(a) PROTECTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no officer or employee of the United States may—

(A) delay the deposit of any amount into (or delay the credit of any amount to) any Federal fund or otherwise vary from the normal terms, procedures, or timing for making such deposits or credits, or

(B) refrain from the investment in public debt obligations of amounts in any Federal fund,

if a purpose of such action or inaction is to not increase the amount of outstanding public debt obligations, and

(2) no officer or employee of the United States may disinvest amounts in any Federal fund which are invested in public debt obligations if a purpose of the disinvestment is to reduce the amount of outstanding public debt obligations.

(b) PROTECTION OF BENEFITS AND EXPENDITURES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), during any period for which cash benefits or administrative expenses would not otherwise be payable from a covered benefits fund by reason of an inability to issue further public debt obligations because of the applicable public debt limit, public debt obligations held by such covered benefits fund shall be sold or redeemed only for the purpose of making payment of such benefits or administrative expenses and only to the extent cash assets of the covered benefits fund are not available from month to month for making payment of such benefits or administrative expenses.

(2) ISSUANCE OF CORRESPONDING DEBT.—For purposes of undertaking the sale or redemption of public debt obligations held by a covered benefits fund pursuant to paragraph (1),

the Secretary of the Treasury may issue corresponding public debt obligations to the public, in order to obtain the cash necessary for payment of benefits or administrative expenses from such covered benefits fund, notwithstanding the public debt limit.

(3) **ADVANCE NOTICE OF SALE OR REDEMPTION.**—Not less than 3 days prior to the date on which, be reason of the public debt limit, the Secretary of the Treasury expects to undertake a sale or redemption authorized under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the expected sale or redemption. Upon receipt of such report, the Comptroller General shall review the extent of compliance with subsection (a) and paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection and shall issue such findings and recommendations to each House of the Congress as the Comptroller General considers necessary and appropriate.

(c) **PUBLIC DEBT OBLIGATION.**—For purposes of this section, the term "public debt obligation" means any obligation subject to the public debt limit established under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code.

(d) **FEDERAL FUND.**—For purposes of this section, the term "Federal fund" means any Federal trust fund or Government account established pursuant to Federal law to which the Secretary of the Treasury has issued or is expressly authorized by law directly to issue obligations under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, in respect of public money, money otherwise required to be deposited in the Treasury, or amounts appropriate.

(e) **COVERED BENEFITS FUND.**—For purposes of subsection (b), the term "covered benefits fund" means any Federal fund from which cash benefits are payable by law in the form of retirement benefits, separation payments, life or disability insurance benefits, or dependent's or survivor's benefits, including (but not limited to) the following:

- (1) the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund;
- (2) the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund;
- (3) the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;
- (4) the Government Securities Investment Fund;
- (5) the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund;
- (6) the Unemployment Trust Fund;
- (7) each of the railroad retirement funds and accounts;
- (8) the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund and the Post-Vietnam Era Veterans Education Fund; and
- (9) the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund.

SEC. 2. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsections (j), (k), and (l) of section 8348 of title 5, United States Code, and subsections (g) and (h) of section 8438 of such title are hereby repealed.

(b) **RETENTION OF AUTHORITY TO RESTORE TRUST FUNDS WITH RESPECT TO ACTIONS TAKEN BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The repeals made by subsection (a) shall not apply to the restoration requirements imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Executive Director referred to in section 8438(g)(5) of title 5, United States Code) with respect to amounts attributable to actions taken under subsection (j)(1) or (k) of section 8348, or section 8438(g)(1), of such title before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **RESTORATION REQUIREMENTS.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "restoration

requirements" means the requirements imposed by—

(A) paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (j), and subsection (l)(1), of section 8348 of such title, and

(B) paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (g), and subsection (h)(1), of section 8438 of such title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 293, the amendments printed in the House report, 104-388, are adopted.

The text of H.R. 2621, as amended, is as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 2621.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today the House is again debating H.R. 2621, a bill to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security trust funds and other Federal trust funds and accounts invested in public debt obligations.

As everyone will recall, we have already sent to the President two debt limit extensions, a long-term extension as part of the Balanced Budget Act, which he vetoed, and a short-term extension which he vetoed on November 13. Accompanying the short-term limit were the trust fund protections which are embodied in the bill that we are now considering.

As a result of the President's veto of the debt limit, the administration took some extraordinary steps to avoid the legal debt limit that, to me, are very disturbing. On November 15, the Treasury gained access to \$61.5 billion from the Civil Service Retirement trust fund and the G fund in the thrift savings account.

Recent public statements indicate that the Treasury can go through the end of January and perhaps into the first week of February before facing further debt constraints. However, it is not clear what move Treasury will next take to create further borrowing authority.

H.R. 2621 would prevent the kind of steps that the Treasury has been undertaking. Quite simply, the bill requires Federal trust funds and similar accounts to be fully invested in Government securities. Surplus income cannot be held in cash to avoid hitting the debt limit.

Furthermore, funds cannot be disinvested unless it is done to pay authorized benefits. During a debt limit period, Social Security benefits and other benefits to individuals financed through the redeposition of U.S. securities would be paid.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that was incorporated in the rule updates the legislation for the events that have occurred in the last few weeks. It would restore the Civil Service trust fund and G fund to their proper financial levels for actions taken by the Secretary of the Treasury to date. This would be a one-time-only restoration, and Treasury's current authority to use this as a loophole around the debt limit would be repealed.

Mr. Speaker, when the President vetoed the short-term debt limit, he cited as one of his reasons the limitations it placed on Treasury's statutory power to manage the debt, but this argument between the two branches of Government is not about debt management. The power to borrow money on the credit of the United States is clearly a constitutional function of the U.S. Congress; whether this debate should be about controlling the level and growth of the debt burden on our children, and it is about balancing the budget.

□ 1145

It is also about controlling the runaway growth of Federal spending and the tax burden placed on working people in this country.

On November 15, the Treasury used a Federal pension law intended to protect retiree benefits to seriously weaken the constitutional authority of the Congress of the United States. Even though it has not shown up on the official books to date, when the trust funds are automatically restored—and, Mr. Speaker, there is a legal obligation to restore these funds—the Nation will be \$61 billion further in debt, without the Congress, the constitutional authority as the voice of the people, having acted upon it. This legal obligation to restore the disinvestment of these trust funds in fact is extra debt and effectively pierces the debt ceiling.

The U.S. Government cannot continue to act like a spendthrift, that having reached its limit on its credit card, goes out and simply gets another credit card. Already we have handed our children the bill of \$187,000 in their lifetimes just to pay the interest on the existing debt, and now the Secretary has incurred an additional liability already of \$61 billion. That is why we must pass this law, using our constitutional authority to protect these children and the generations to come.

But the young are not the only ones who should have an interest in this legislation. The Social Security trust funds, as I mentioned before, are not

legally protected from this kind of a manipulation already done to the other pension trust fund. The 43 million recipients who paid their taxes and rely on those benefits expect us to stand behind their investments.

The administration says it will not use Social Security trust funds in the debt limit game, and we know that they have not yet touched the Social Security fund. But, make no doubt about it, this bill is the only way to legally protect Social Security from being raided during this or any future debt suspension period.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is both necessary and responsible. It takes back the Congress' constitutional right to determine the level of debt on the people of this country, it protects our senior citizens' trust funds and benefits, and it closes the loophole the administration has used to increase the debt that every American must carry.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in most of America this is a happy time of the year in which we are wishing each other good wishes, and I think we genuinely feel that.

But in the 30-something years I have been here in Congress. I have noticed there is a propensity at this time of the year as Congress begins to close down for a little recess that it develops into the silly time.

I know this is not the idea of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER]. The leadership over there forced him to this, in the most mismanaged session that I have ever seen in my congressional career.

We have wasted more time this year on silly things that have never gone anywhere but have made a lot of fancy headlines for a brief day or so. But this continues on.

No President in his right mind would ever sign this bill. Whether he be Democrat, Republican, Independent, or who done it, he would never sign this bill.

I think it would behoove my Republican friends to realize that power changes around this place, and maybe sometime in the future they may face a situation where they are in the White House and we are in control here in the Congress, and we get cantankerous like they have done on this debt ceiling thing and they have got no room to maneuver for the good of the country.

I have never met anybody who really in their right mind wants to shut the Government down. I am not talking about just shutting down the Grand Canyon or the Washington Monument. I am talking about not paying the military, not paying the Social Security benefits.

That is what could happen if this silly bill became law. None of the bills

would be able to be paid. There would be financial chaos in the United States and in the world if we do not have the maneuver room that we have now got under the law.

So this bill will never get out of the Senate, it will never become law, and we are wasting an hour here today because if we did not waste an hour doing this, we would do something else silly around this place. That is the only reason.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Social Security fund is safe. It has already been invaded twice to pay benefits. If we cut it off and do not allow them to invade it, and that is what this would do, to pay benefits, we are going to have checks bouncing just like that all over the United States, immediately.

Everybody's check would bounce. The Government could not do a single thing. It could not pay the police, it could not pay the FBI, it could not pay the prison guards, it could not pay the FAA, the air traffic controllers. It just could not do anything.

Now, none of you want to do that and I do not know why you go through this silly drill. It is never going to become law, and maybe you ought to get around to managing the time so that we could do something useful for the American public.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have said a number of times from this well and also in the Third District of Georgia that the greatest challenge to this Congress is the deficit, and the greatest threat to this Nation is the national debt, and the best and the most important responsibility of this Congress is balancing the budget.

What we are doing here today is trying to prevent and stop the delay of balancing the budget. The process of using trust funds rather than disburse them into the accounts that they should be in is simply a way to balance-budget dodge, and that is it in a nutshell. It is wrong. Those funds are deducted from employee checks, they are matched by taxpayers' money, and they should be deposited in the trust funds. Those dollars do not belong to the Federal Government or the Treasury any longer. Once they come out of a person's payroll check, they should go to the place of responsibility and that is the trust funds.

When in the private sector, those of us who are in business and employ people, have to do the same thing. When we have funds that we deduct from an employee's check, we have so many banking days that we have to make a deposit at the bank and those funds go into the Treasury and then supposedly into trust funds. The same thing

should be required of the Treasury and the Federal Government. The Federal Government, the Treasury, should be required, also, to make those deposits within a short period of time and not use them to circumvent the process of balancing the people's books.

Passage of this legislation will not completely stop the balanced-budget dodging, but it will sure help. It will sure help to protect those dollars that are deducted from the employees of this Government and from those who work for many other employers and have Social Security funds deducted from their paychecks. It is important that we pass this legislation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. While it pretends to protect our various Federal trust funds, in fact, by forcing a default on our national debt the bill virtually ensures that our Social Security beneficiaries and our civil service retirees will not be paid on time.

This bill repeals the debt management tools given to the Secretary of the Treasury in 1986 and 1987. These tools were used by Secretary Rubin on November 15 to avoid a default. The bill also requires the Secretary to immediately invest all cash balances and incoming receipts for all trust funds, even if the debt limit would be exceeded in doing so. This will force our Nation into default in a matter of days.

While the bill makes a pretense of protecting our trust fund beneficiaries, in reality it would have exactly the opposite result. Millions of citizens entitled to various kinds of payments would not be able to receive what they are owed. Military personnel, including our troops in Bosnia and around the world, would not get paid, nor would their support supplies be paid for. Medicare and Medicaid recipients, food stamp recipients, and holders of Government securities, many of whom absolutely rely on the timely delivery of their checks to survive, would be left waiting.

In addition to these short-term impacts, forcing our Nation into default would have serious long-term financial implications. Investors will demand a risk premium to purchase future Government debt, and disruption of normal borrowing procedures will result in delay costs, resulting in higher interest rates which will cost taxpayers billions of extra dollars annually. Virtually all interest rates are keyed to Treasury rates. If they go up, so will mortgage rates, and rates on consumer loans and personal loans and student loans.

This bill is irresponsible and it is unwise. We should defeat it. We should pass a clean temporary extension bill, as we have done at similar times in the

past and we should get on with the important business of balancing the budget in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to attempt again to protect Social Security and other Federal trust funds during the budget negotiations by putting up a vote, hopefully a successful one, on this debt limit bill.

For senior citizens in America, this is an absolutely key vote and one which everyone should watch. I listened to the comments of my friend and distinguished colleague from Florida. Let me suggest to him that no President in his right mind would veto this bill. This bill is timely. Because in the wake of the President's veto of prior debt limit legislation, the administration took some extraordinary and disturbing steps to circumvent the legal debt limit.

As our chairman noted, on November 15, Treasury tapped into \$61.5 billion from the civil service retirement trust fund and the G Fund in the Thrift Savings Program. This raises chilling questions about where Treasury will look next to create further borrowing authority.

Let us be clear on this. The President does not want to erect fire walls around these trust funds because he needs the assets in these accounts to get around the debt ceiling and resist serious budget negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2621 provides essential protections for Social Security and other trust funds now being raided by the Treasury to avoid the statutory debt limit. It restores public confidence in these retirement systems. This bill is both necessary and responsible. It reasserts Congress's constitutional right to determine the debt, it protects senior citizens' trust funds and benefits, and it closes the loophole that this administration has used to siphon retirement assets in its possession.

This is not about cash management, Mr. Speaker. It is about the integrity of Social Security and the Federal retirement system and keeping faith with those who depend on them.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in one sense I hesitate to speak on this because this is such a ludicrous proposition. I do not know why you are pursuing it. At a time when we should be talking responsibly, negotiating responsibly on a bipartisan basis, you are playing games.

Why are you doing it? So far you have not fooled anybody. Not a soul. You started this in Ways and Means.

The Social Security trust funds are not being raided. You know that. It is

just a falsehood. In your sentence you cleverly say raiding Social Security and other trust funds, or raiding other trust funds and Social Security. Social Security has not been touched.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, the GAO said in a letter of December 12 our review of Treasury records show that between November 1, 1995, and December 8, 1995, Treasury followed its normal investment and redemption policies throughout transactions affecting the Social Security trust funds.

So why are our colleagues doing this? If the Treasury had not used its approach of a few weeks ago, then Social Security recipients would have been affected, and everybody else. Our colleagues were saved from responsibility for default by the action of the Treasury Department, and now they are trying to shift blame to it.

This bill is what risks immediate default and financial chaos, so look. Maybe our colleagues are all going to vote kind of like robots for this. Maybe, like robots, they are going to come and vote for this, but I have to think that it is someplace in their mind, or other place, that they know this is an unwise move.

As my colleagues know, it is time to stop this kind of antic. Hopefully we are on the eve of some serious negotiations. Everybody has announced they are going to start tomorrow in a more serious vein, and here, 24 hours before that, our colleagues bring up this charade. They know it is wrong, they know it is not going to go anywhere. They are trying to gain a few political points at the last minute.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are losing faith in their political antics. They have been losing credibility because of devices and tactics like this.

It is time for serious bipartisan negotiations in the budget and the end of tactics like this.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Michigan that one of the previous administrations back in 1985 did indeed borrow from the Social Security trust fund and was most severely criticized by the Democrat Party for having done so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] for yielding me the time, and, Mr. Speaker, this is serious business, and, as the gentleman from Florida said, this is the second time that we have attempted to protect the trust fund. The first time was back on August 1, 1986, and I would like to read an excerpt of a Senator's speech when we were trying to accomplish the same thing then that we are trying to do with this leg-

islation. By the way, that Senator was AL GORE, and here is what he said about legislation almost identical to this legislation:

Like the Social Security trust fund, the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund is a dedicated—dedicated let me stress—trust fund, and, as such, its assets may only be used to provide benefits to civil service retirees. The fund stands as a strong symbol of assurance that Federal employees' retirement benefits will be paid when they are due. While employees may not fully understand the arcane interactions of Federal financing, they do recognize when money they have contributed toward the financing of their retirement has been used in ways other than those intended or promised. It was right for them to take offense last year when the civil service fund was first tapped to keep the Nation solvent during the 1986 debt ceiling crises.

Is this silly? Was it silly when it again happened this year when Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin reached into the civil service retirement fund and took out Treasury securities bearing interest of almost \$40 billion and substituted them for an IOU? Was it silly when he took the entire proceeds, \$21.5 billion of the G fund, and did not reinvest them? I do not think so. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Senator GORE's statement 10 years ago remains the best, and let me close with a further quote by Senator GORE. Ten years later this statement remains the best explanation of why we need this bill, and I quote:

To insure the trust fund assets are used only for the purpose of the trust fund, not for general government obligations.

As Senator GORE stated, it was right for Federal employees to take offense when the civil service retirement fund is used for political purposes. It is time for us to protect the trust fund and restore congressional control over the Federal debt.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed in the past by the Parliamentarian that it was forbidden under rules of the House to quote directly from a Member of the other body, or to refer to a Member of the other body, or to quote on this floor from speeches or pronouncements made by a Member of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I did not bring it up during the gentleman's recitation because I think he did it in good faith, but that was what I was instructed by the Parliamentarian, and I would like to know if that is, in fact, the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Members are permitted to quote former Members of the other body.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. So, further parliamentary inquiry:

Then one may not quote anyone who is currently in office either by name or in terms of what they may have said or done?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I certainly would be glad to, but I am making an inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. BACHUS. As I said, then former Senator AL GORE. I did not refer to the fact that he is now the Vice President of the United States, although I do not think that would be inappropriate, but I think that the Speaker and other Members of this body understand that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I have a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. PELOSI. Is the Vice President not the President of the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Quoting the Vice President, who is the President of the Senate, in his capacity as a former Member of the Senate is not necessarily out of order.

Ms. PELOSI. So let us get this straight.

A Member of this body; because we are all going to have to abide by this rule, so I want to make sure I understand it; we can quote a Member of the Senate as long as he is not a Member of the Senate any longer. Being President of the Senate, one is not a Member of the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will clarify for the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] the situation as to quotations of current Members of the Senate by reading clause 1 of rule XIV which permits:

... quotations from Senate proceedings on a measure then under debate in the House and which are relevant to the making of legislative history establishing the meaning of that measure but may not include characterizations of Senate action or inaction, other references to individual Members of the Senate, or other quotations from Senate proceedings.

So that is in pertinent part.

Ms. PELOSI. So the Chair's clarification addresses the substance of remarks. I thought the clarification that the Chair gave previously addressed who made the remarks, and that was a former Member of the Senate. The debt ceiling issue is a matter of discussion in the Senate of the United States. The Vice President is an ex officio Member. Not to be argumentative about it, but I think it should be clear how Members proceed in this debate because it is an issue that is discussed in the Senate, the Vice President is an ex officio Member of the Senate, so even though the gentleman was quoting from when he used to be a Member from Tennessee, on an issue then, that issue is recurring now.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield with this proviso, the Chair un-

derstand why I am asking the question. I have been forbidden to quote a Member of the other body with respect to legislation that is pending before us.

Mr. BACHUS. Let me draw the distinction, and I am not arguing over my colleague's ability to do that or not.

I quoted a former Member. At that time, I said former Senator AL GORE. I quoted from his speech on August 1, 1986. I pointed out that it was an amendment which accomplishes the same thing that this legislation would do, and, if I can read my—

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I understand the motivation and am reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentlemen will suspend, the Chair would just advise Members that quotations of former Members of the Senate now serving as Vice President in their capacity as Senators are in order as long as they are not disparaging of that former Member of the other body.

The Chair has responded to the inquiry of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] and the inquiry of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and believes the matter is concluded.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, now that we have gotten that important decision made, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE].

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2621 and to ask both parties to get together and start acting responsibly. Let us move on in the best interests of our constituents and move this process to the next level.

Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to express my opposition to H.R. 2621, and to state my disbelief that Congress is still locked in a political budget battle, and has taken measures to politicize the issue of extending the debt limit. Today, by attacking the integrity of Secretary Rubin, and voting on H.R. 2621, it seems that the majority wishes to hold the President hostage to its budget goals.

I say that the majority seeks to hold the administration hostage, in that the clear effort today is to force the country to default on its obligations—for the first time in history. Let me remind my colleagues and the American public that if this bill were enacted, the Treasury would be prevented from raising funds, to meet daily U.S. obligations. Moreover, according to OMB, if the bill becomes law, we will default within days, if not hours.

In a charade of protectionism, where the majority claims to protect the beneficiaries of various trust funds, the majority today will precipitate default and orchestrate its own chorus of financial crisis.

By handcuffing the Secretary, and reducing the number of tools lawfully at his disposal, the Republican charade will be exposed as follows: Millions of citizens entitled to various payments would not receive what they are owed. This would include: Medicare and Med-

icaid recipients; food stamp recipients; people entitled to Social Security; military and civilian employees; and Government suppliers of goods and services.

I am sure that we will hear vigorous debate on both sides this morning, and we will explore the Secretary's efforts to keep Congress informed of his actions to avoid default. But in closing, and as a Member who voted for the coalition budget, I urge my Democratic colleagues to fully accept the fact we will adopt a balanced budget with reduced spending in programs that we cherish. Conversely, I urge my Republican colleagues to ease up on the radical and extreme tactics that only cause the administration to become more rigid in its position.

We are acting irresponsibly, and blackmailing our own constituents.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill for a number of reasons; one, because it is superfluous. If, in fact, we do not know already, we should know that under current law the Social Security trust fund is protected, it is an entitlement, and when we had this debate once before on November 15, the President came out and made a very definitive statement that he would not and would not at all take funds from the trust fund in this situation.

But another reason I am against this, Mr. Speaker, is this is dangerous-type activity. It is one thing if we are going to disagree about how long to take to balance the budget, 7 or 8 years, or we are going to say something should be a block grant or it should be an entitlement, but we should not be fooling around with the debt ceiling. It is irresponsible. The country has never defaulted and should, in fact, never default, and what Mr. Rubin has done under law and what he is being asked now not to do is something that one of our former Treasurers, a good Treasurer who had great financial expertise as well as understanding of the body politic, Mr. Baker who asked for this legislation so, in fact, that there was an impasse over the debt ceiling, he would have legislation to not go into default, and this is exactly what Mr. Rubin did a few weeks ago. Now, if we have this legislation pass and Mr. Rubin had to pay the \$61 billion that has been drawn down from these trust funds, it would, in fact, automatically put us in default, and this is something we should not be taking in this fashion on this floor today.

As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] said, this bill will probably not become law. There are saner minds in the Senate, and they will not act upon this. But what I worry about is that there is more and more people in this body on this side of the House that are willing, responsible people, to put forth this kind of legislation thinking that somebody else will save them,

that it will not go to the Senate, the President will veto it. We should not be having the world financial markets look at us and see us having a bill of this type on the floor, fooling around literally with default. Default is unacceptable, it should not happen, this bill should not pass, and we should go back to the business of government. People want Government to do their business. This is not what we should be doing.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who chairs the Task Force on the Debt Limit.

□ 1215

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty to come to this microphone, if the gentlewoman from Connecticut would dialog with me. I am taking the liberty to come to this side of the aisle, because I would hope after the current, if you call it, fiasco is done with, and we come to a time period after we have settled this dispute and hopefully come to a conclusion on balancing the budget, how much control do we want to retain, regain for Congress? How much control over the authority given in title I of the Constitution, that says we have control over spending and borrowing, do we want to have a majority in Congress be able to control?

To react to a statement that the gentlewoman from Connecticut made, there is nothing in law that protects the Social Security trust fund from the same kind of disinvestment that was enacted on the civil service retirement trust fund on November 15. There are no changes in law between when disinvestment occurred in 1986, when a different administration disinvested the Social Security trust fund in 1986 and used that as flexibility to play with the debt ceiling, than occurs today. So we have a commitment by the Secretary that he does not intend to go into the Social Security trust fund for disinvestment. I will take him at his word, but eventually we must control the ability to not only control spending but to control how large this debt is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, the debt of this country was increased \$61 billion in one afternoon, if you compare that \$61 billion to the fact that it took this country the first 160 years of its existence to mount this kind of a \$60 billion debt, and then we expanded the debt load of this country another \$60 billion.

There is no default that is going to occur under this bill. There are provisions in the rule that specifically relate that what actions have taken place so far will not be under the subject of this law.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. SMITH], I have read his "Dear Colleagues" and they are very well thought out. A, we should have if you want, new legislation, and not be doing this in this way at this time. Also, as the gentleman knows and has said in your "Dear Colleagues", the Secretary of the Treasury is not authorized and therefore cannot do this. The gentleman knows that.

The other thing, your last statement, what you said up to the last point was true, but what is not true is this legislation does in fact, if carried out, making the Treasury pay back the \$61 billion, would result in \$61 billion above the debt limit and would result in default.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the gentlewoman would yield, she should just read the rule, please.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a certain degree of sadness that I rise and associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], who spoke. There are two ways, frankly, that the Government can be shut down, which seems to be the objective, frankly, of the Republican leadership in this House. One, of course, is not to pass appropriation bills or a continuing resolution in lieu of appropriation bills. That was done some days ago, and we shut down for the longest time in history, for 4 days. It cost the American taxpayer between \$650 million and \$700 million.

The other way of shutting down the Government, of course, is not to extend the debt limit. Every American ought to understand that the reason that we need to extend the debt limit is because we have already voted in previous Congresses, and indeed in this Congress, to spend money, more than we had coming in. Therefore, it is necessary to be responsible to borrow that money, but by law there is a limit. We periodically raise that limit. It really is, in my opinion, a non-issue, because the issue, really, is on spending. That is the debate we are having on the budget, the reconciliation bill.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, on the specific assertion of some who rise and say we want to protect Federal employees on the disinvestment of the retirement funds, I do not pretend to be the only or the necessarily best advocate of Federal employees, but I frankly do not think there is anybody on this floor on either side of the aisle that cares more about Federal employees or fights for their interests more than I do. They are not at risk. The law protects them.

I have a letter, a notice from Alice Rivlin in response to my request, and she says, "Congress' failure to send the President acceptable legislation to

raise the Federal debt limit, which is one way to shut down the Government, has forced Treasury Secretary Rubin to take extraordinary steps to avoid government default." I do not think anybody in this Congress intends default. She goes on to say, "This action will in no way affect the benefits to which current and future retirees are entitled. The law requires currently that the Treasury Department automatically reimburse the trust funds for the full amount disinvested plus interest."

Let us stop playing games. The American public does not appreciate it. We are all going to protect Social Security. This administration is committed to that. Social Security is not at risk. We all know that. Let us be responsible. Let us lift the debt limit. Let us pass a CR and get on with the business of America.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, until the cows go home, that is how long the President and Secretary Rubin can run this place under our present situation, where they could use the term "disinvest" to borrow from these trust funds, not only Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, Federal employees' thrift savings account, and others. So we do not want to do that. That is why we are passing this legislation.

Another expert knowledgeable with this system, Louis Crandall of Wrightson & Company has said, "The creative accounting to which the President and Secretary Rubin could resort could get them through for a couple of years."

That is why this legislation is being put before us today. We need to address this problem directly with a balanced budget, my colleagues have mentioned that, rather than hiding further debt by borrowing from the seniors and other U.S. citizens who have paid their hard-earned dollars into these trust funds.

We were not sent here to come up with creative accounting techniques, we were sent here to make the decisions that are best for the American people. A question I might pose for the people on that side of the aisle, as well as my side of the aisle: When Secretary Rubin disinvests, does that not add to the debt ceiling, which in a sense violates the law that we have for the debt ceiling? I think that is a question we should ask and have that side of the aisle explain to us if he disinvests, using the pension funds from the Federal employees, is he not in a sense putting up as collateral their pension funds and thereby borrowing against it, increasing the debt ceiling, even though Congress has not legislated to do that? I pose that question rhetorically.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bill. Then we will not have to listen to this side when we have a Republican President complain, and then this side will not have to complain when we have a Democrat President.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this Chamber about 15 years. I have rarely seen a bill that is more bush league. I think what this bill shows is that the other side is just not ready for prime time. The bottom line is a simple one. If you simply wanted to protect Social Security, you would limit the bill to Social Security. You do not. We all know that the Social Security trust fund will not be touched. We have had assurances to that effect, and no law specifically allows it to be touched.

What we are doing here is trying to play chicken in a very childish, school yard-like way. They say, "let us tie Secretary Rubin's hands. Let us make default a little more likely. Then maybe, maybe, maybe this side will blink." You have been through it once before. We are not blinking, not to a bully-like tactic like this.

I have found it just utterly amazing how irresponsible and how hypocritical this proposal is in light of the fact that the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], used to warn last week in solemn tones that the stock markets will crash if we do not pass this budget; but on the other hand, he allows to the floor a proposal like this which makes default more likely. What kind of shenanigans are they? One week, we must not default, default is a danger. This week, pass legislation that makes default more likely.

I think we are not getting straight answers. We are getting games. We are getting silliness. I would say that the attempts by my friend, the gentleman from Florida, to blame Secretary Rubin, blaming Secretary Rubin is like putting the hostage on trial for the crimes of the kidnappers. This whole thing is a puerile, childish attitude. It is sort of a group of people banging their fists on the table and saying, "Do it my way or I am going to threaten you." We will not be threatened. Let us get on with the business of this country and solve the budget resolution.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is fraught with problems that we would only recognize if it were to be enacted. I trust it will never be enacted.

Let me explain some of the specific problems. There are two sections. One does seem moot because the White House and the Congress both agree we ought not to be using Social Security trust funds. It really is not an issue, except that if we do go into default, I

do not see how we can pay benefits to Social Security retirees or to Federal Government retirees.

That goes to the fact that there is no way to give preferential status to Government debt instruments to be able to determine whether some relate to the Social Security trust fund, some relate to the Federal Government, Federal retirees trust fund, and some are general Government debt obligations. There is no system to do that, so to obey the law we would have to reject all Federal debt instruments as they become due.

The other section, the section that deals with the Federal retirement trust funds, is the biggest problem. I think it is important to bear in mind the context of this. This is legislation that was requested by the Reagan administration. It was signed into law by President Reagan because it was a prudent financial management instrument to ensure that we do not create chaos in the domestic and international financial markets. It is a way to manage the debt at a time of political crisis.

We have a time of political crisis, even though the other side has in fact voted twice now to increase the debt ceiling. That is not at issue, that we need to increase the debt ceiling. The problem is that they want it attached to a 7-year balanced budget and other changes in other laws that are really not directly related to the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to pass this, we would immediately go into default. This \$54 billion in Treasury bills that mature today, we would not be able to make good on those bills if this were law today. There is \$58 billion on December 21 and \$36 billion on the 28th of December. We cannot pass this. It would be the most irresponsible thing we could do to the people of this country, particularly those that own Treasury bills, Treasury notes, and Treasury bonds.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For the previous speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], I would point to the section of the bill starting on page 2 entitled "Protection of Benefits and Expenditures for Administrative Expenses," where it specifically provides that these expenditures will be taken care of and can be paid for: The Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, the Government Securities Investment Fund, the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, the Unemployment Trust Fund, each of the railroad retirement funds and accounts, the Department of Defense Education Benefit Fund, the Post-Vietnam Era Veterans Education Fund, and the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund.

□ 1230

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would, for the previous speaker from Virginia,

[Mr. MORAN] point out the section of the bill starting on page 2.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Fort Lauderdale, FL [Mr. SHAW], for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress shall have the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. Those 16 words are article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution. So often around here we debate the interpretation of different provisions within the Constitution. Nothing could be clearer than that.

The congressionally established debt ceiling is at \$4.9 trillion. Approximately a quarter of it is held in the form of nonmarketable government securities in Federal trust funds. The debt in these trust funds has always been counted under the statutory debt limit.

Now, Congress has given the Secretary of the Treasury authority to temporarily turn nonmarketable securities and the two Civil Service retirement funds into Federal IOU's during a short-term—and I underscore short-term—debt limit impasse. The borrowing authority formerly occupied by those securities can then be used to sell marketable securities.

Now, Secretary Rubin used this authority in mid-November to effectively raise the Federal debt limit by, as we all know, \$61 billion. Now, the Secretary of the Treasury does not, does not have unlimited authority to tap trust funds. Past Treasury Secretaries have consistently held that this type of investment can be done only to the extent necessary to pay the benefits owed by those trust funds during the period when there is a debt limit impasse.

Secretary Rubin has already pushed the envelope by declaring an impasse of 1 year to generate \$61 billion. That will provide borrowing authority through mid-February. The administration must come to a debt limit agreement with the Congress by then.

To go beyond mid-February, Mr. Speaker, the administration would have to actively divest trust funds beyond the level needed to pay benefits. There is no precedent, absolutely no precedent, for active divestment, and it is almost certainly illegal.

This action would essentially repeal the debt limit law, opening up \$1.1 trillion of new borrowing without congressional authority, clearly violating article I, section 8. Should the administration be willing to take this type of legally questionable action, we in the Congress have the responsibility to respond.

This is a very balanced, fair measure that we have; I hope we can proceed with it. While the Treasury Secretary should have the flexibility needed to avoid a Federal default, pay interest to

Federal bondholders, and pay benefits to retirees during a short-term debt ceiling impasse, he does not have the authority to nullify the power of Congress to control the borrowing of money and set the Federal debt limit.

While we hope that this is not the intent of the administration, if it is, Congress will respond accordingly, and that is why we are here.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 20 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to come over and speak on this side of the aisle, because this is the side of the aisle, the party, the so-called party of sound money, the so-called party of the gold standard, of tight credit; the so-called party of Wall Street; and yet the legislation that this party has brought to the floor is totally irresponsible and totally out of line with where this party has been. It displays either willful political gamesmanship or willful ignorance on the part of its proponents. This bill will cause a default, a default that the markets will never forget.

Yesterday we had the general counsel of the Federal National Mortgage Association testifying on this issue, and the question was asked, if you had a default on a mortgage, would you buy that mortgage? The answer, no, because they would remember that default. If we default on Treasuries, people will stop buying Treasuries and interest rates will go up, and everybody will pay for it.

The Secretary of the Treasury testified yesterday, if this bill goes into effect and the debt ceiling is not raised, he will not be able to raise the funds to pay Social Security benefits. So the fact is that if we pass this bill, we will go into default and Social Security will not be protected; it will go into default too, as will Medicare, as will the Federal pensions, as will the military pensions. All of that will be in default; people will not get their checks for systems that they paid into.

This bill is inconsistent with the actions taken by a previous Republican Secretary of the Treasury, Jim Baker, and again, his general counsel testified to that fact yesterday. However, today, we are trying to evade the real issue at hand. Because my colleagues do not have the votes to pass their budget, they are going to try and throw the country into default.

The Speaker said not long ago that it would be OK if we went for a while in default. There would not be an impact, and that is just simply not the case. It would be a detrimental effect to homeowners, to mortgage owners.

Mr. Speaker, I am new to this House like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is new to this House. When we

first came here, one of the most important issues we had to deal with was the potential default of the Government of Mexico on Mexican treasury bonds. There are a number of Members in this House on both sides of the aisle who felt that the Mexican Government had put themselves in that position and we should not have anything to do with it.

Well, here we are today and we are about to do the same thing to the United States, and that is wrong. Shame on the party of Wall Street. Shame on the party of sound money.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it would behoove us to hopefully one of these days have more camaraderie in trying to reach solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would examine whatever research he might have undertaken to quote the Speaker as saying a default is OK for any period of time. That is not true.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the American people should know how bad our national indebtedness situation has grown. To satisfy the insatiable appetite for expanding our \$5 trillion debt, this administration is now robbing Federal retirement trust funds. Oh, yes, we promise to pay back grandma and grandpa, but is it not sad in fact that we have sunk to a new low, stealing from our senior citizens' rainy day account?

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Civil Service, let me tell you the irresponsible mess the new majority inherited. Thirty-five of our Federal pension funds have \$1 trillion; it amounts to trillions of dollars in unfunded liabilities. In the private sector you would be arrested for running pension funds in this fashion.

The Federal Employees' Retirement trust fund that I oversee, this is just one of them, has an unfunded liability of \$540 billion. Another \$350 billion has already been raided from the current account. Now, Secretary Rubin tells us, he can cook the books and feed the debt until the end of January.

Today we must act responsibly. Today we must act to protect our dwindling retirement funds, and today we must begin to get our Nation's finances and these retirement accounts in order.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL], with great pleasure.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let us call this what it really is. This is an effort to precipitate a crisis in this institution. This is an effort to coerce the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury into doing something that is purely and simply bad public policy.

What do Bill Simon, William Miller, Paul Volkmer and Alan Greenspan all have in common? They have suggested that this is bad public policy. They are unified on that principle. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], however, is correct on one thing: What about some camaraderie in this House of Representatives?

I recall when Nick Brady was the Secretary of the Treasury and the S&L crisis was around us. This kind of legislation was not proposed by an overwhelmingly Democratic majority in this institution. We did not attempt to tie the hands of the Secretary. We worked together in a bipartisan manner to shape a reasonable solution to the S&L issue.

What is the answer today? Let us extort from the Secretary of the Treasury what we have not been able to do with numbers in this institution. This is fundamentally flawed public policy.

Mr. Speaker, let me move on to one other quick issue which is the steady erosion of congressional authority that this represents to manage the budget. That is the same group that believes we ought to do it through the line-item veto; we ought to turn that power over to the Executive. However, now, in this instance, we do not like short-term policy, so let us, under the circumstances, attempt to tie the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, from Alexander Hamilton to Douglas Dillon, to Brady, to Bentsen and to Rubin.

This country has been well-served by the quality of people who have held that job. Secretary Rubin is on the right track in attempting to honor our obligations. That is the way that this country should be run, and we should not be moving down this road to poor public policy to solve a short-term political problem.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is about public responsibility. This is about Congress' responsibility to manage our debt. This card, my voting card that I insert in the machine as other Members do, runs up the national debt each time we do it. It borrows from our children, it borrows from our trust funds in order to make this government work, and we have done it year-in and year-out, excessively.

Our job as elected Members of Congress serving in this House is to bring fiscal sanity to this Nation, fiscal sanity to the operations of this Government, much like every homeowner does, much like every businessperson does. Balancing a checkbook is something we all learn at a very early age. Maintaining adequate balances in our accounts is something we learn at a very early age. Only when you come to Congress do you forget that lesson and

suggest it is OK to insert this card and plunge this Nation deeper and deeper into debt. Mr. Speaker, \$5 trillion deep we are now.

H.R. 2621 provides a mechanism to bring us to reality, to focus on our Nation's problems, to bring fiscal restraint to this House, to protect the trust funds, and let me emphasize that word: Trust funds. In God we trust. Trust funds. What we are establishing is a mechanism to once again restore trust to the people's money.

Every Member of Congress has to realize that this card and the dollars we spend with this card are not our funds. We are entrusted to protect the funds of the American public.

So I disagree with my colleagues and I urge passage and adoption.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from Florida, Mr. GIBBONS, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the viewers who are listening and the people in the gallery that are listening are somewhat confused about what this is all about. You would believe it is about protecting Social Security trust funds if you listen to what the Republicans are saying.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what this is about. This is about putting additional leverage on the President in budget negotiations; it is about causing the default on our national debt. They claim it is not about causing default on our national debt, even though that is what this bill in fact does.

□ 1245

If you are concerned about protecting the Social Security trust fund, in the motion to recommit we will have something to speak about that. But I daresay that my Republican friends will vote against the motion to recommit because this is not about protecting the Social Security trust fund. You do not protect the Social Security trust fund or any other trust fund by putting the national debt default at risk. That is not how you protect the payments to our Social Security beneficiaries. During fiscal chaos, those who rely on the trust funds are at more risk, not less at risk. That is when we tend to do things that we later regret.

So this is about trying to put additional leverage on the President and on the Congress on dealing with the deficit, and this should not be the vehicle to do it. You do not put the debt of the Nation at risk and default, particularly when this debt limit has already been approved by the Republican leadership and the Members by previous votes of this House. You have already agreed on this debt limit. You have already spent this money. Now you have the audacity to come forward to say that we should not pay the bills that we have already

incurred under the bills you have already brought forward and the debt limit you have already approved.

Let us act responsibly, let us defeat this bill. That is the best way we can protect the trust funds of this Nation.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Committee on Ways and Means' legislation to protect the integrity of the trust funds and the budget process.

I think it is very unfortunate that the administration's handling of the debt limit issue seems to be based more on partisan politics than on anything else. As two JEC reports released last month pointed out, in the period leading to the veto, the administration sought to create the false impression that a veto of the debt limit would cause a default. That is very unfortunate.

The first JEC report I released pointed out that the President had already had a deferral process and rescission powers under the Impoundment Act already in law. As reported by the Associated Press, on the other hand, while the administration was hyping an alleged cash flow crisis, it was sending several hundred Federal workers to Disney World for a series of lavish conferences. These were issues that could have been dealt with in many other ways.

The second JEC paper I released last month points out the whole default scare was a ruse concocted by the administration for partisan political purposes. The whole controversy was a carefully designed PR event.

One of the more disturbing aspects of this episode was the fact that the public warnings of default made by a variety of administration officials were based on false information. The administration knew there would be no default and that a variety of means were available to avoid it.

Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by saying that the whole episode only reinforces public doubts about the integrity of Government officials.

Mr. Speaker, the two JEC reports an article that I have made reference to are as follows:

[From the Joint Economic Committee Staff Report, Nov. 7, 1995]

THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S DEBT LIMIT CHARADE

In recent weeks Clinton Administration officials have offered a list of the disasters that would supposedly occur under the Republicans strategy on the debt limit. Treasury Secretary Rubin, White House chief of staff Panetta, and President Clinton himself have tried to portray the Republican position as irresponsible and "extreme," as if a rapidly growing national debt about to exceed \$4.9 trillion were responsible and moderate. Panetta has claimed the Republican

position would "let the country go to hell and basically default." However, a review of the record suggests that the increasingly strident Administration rhetoric is a distraction from real budget and debt management issues.

The fundamental issue is that the Administration opposes the Congressional policy to seriously curtail federal spending and debt growth, and would accept such a policy only under great pressure. According to CBO, the official budget submission of President Clinton did not greatly differ from the current services baseline, which would have permitted budget deficits to climb to \$349 billion by 2002, with \$2 trillion added to the national debt. Only after the Congressional budget process produced resolutions trimming over \$1 trillion of federal spending and debt growth, did the President finally respond.

Guided by a new political consultant, President Clinton made a belated statement outlining a sketchy plan purporting to balance the budget over 10 years, but would in fact leave \$200 billion deficits. This plan is difficult to view as a serious proposal, but appears to be an effort to deflect attention away from the official budget submission.

The Administration has been equally ineffective in addressing the approaching debt limit. This paper demonstrates that despite the Administration's purported concerns about the gravity of the Treasury's cash flow situation, available steps to delay reaching the debt limit and ease any interim problems have not been taken.

ADMINISTRATION FAILURE TO USE DEFERRAL AND RESCISSION TO COUNTER CASH CRUNCH

Under the Impoundment Control Act, as amended, Presidential deferrals are permitted "to provide for contingencies" or "to achieve savings made possible by or through changes in requirements or greater efficiency of operations," for administrative as opposed to policy reasons. Dealing with this severe cash flow problem would appear to be one of the "contingencies" covered under these provisions. Deferral could be used for several distinct purposes: conservation of resources to delay reaching the debt limit; advance preparation of a plan to conserve cash becoming effective upon reaching the debt limit; and instrument of cash management for use after the debt limit was reached.

The Impoundment Control Act also provides for rescission, a procedure under which appropriated spending can be restrained by the President pending Congressional action. Under a Presidential rescission request, the President can freeze additional discretionary spending for 45 days without Congressional action; after this period expires Congress must approve the rescission or the funds are released. While the requirement for Congressional approval is somewhat restrictive in the longer run, rescission would be a way of conserving funds for at least 45 days. As in the case of deferral, rescission can be viewed as a tool to delay or manage cash flow problems resulting from reaching the debt limit.

Instead, the Administration has raised the specter of a financial crisis and blamed it on Congress, even though such an event would be triggered by a Presidential veto. The Administration's actions to date confirm its opposition to a policy of fiscal restraint, and it has failed to take the actions needed to manage possible consequences of a budget disagreement by deferring nonessential federal spending.

The Administration description of the consequences of reaching the debt limit is also distorted. The Administration has attempted

to present the \$4.9 trillion debt limit as a brick wall which the Federal Government will run into all at once, resulting in catastrophic consequences that must be averted at all costs. However, these Administration arguments could be taken more seriously in the context of a real effort to manage the debt situation. This cannot be done with press releases, but with concrete actions taken to address the cash flow position of the Treasury.

The real nature of the situation can be gauged by the extent to which the Administration has acted or planned to conserve cash by deferring or rescinding nonessential federal spending—but there has been no meaningful action to do so. A serious effort to defer some program spending until later in the fiscal year, or to rescind this spending, would at least cushion any cash flow problem, and if timed appropriately, might avoid it.

Clearly, the Administration's failure to conserve cash in the face of a major budget disagreement between two branches of government would not be an effective way to reduce cash flow problems. By failing to act the Clinton Administration seems to have deliberately attempted to maximize any problems that could result from a cash flow squeeze.

A sufficient portion of discretionary federal spending could be deferred or rescinded until later in fiscal 1996 to delay and alleviate contingencies arising from the impending debt limit. The later the Administration acts to defer or rescind spending, the more difficult it will be to manage the situation in the event of an impasse. However, it is obvious from the complete lack of action to date that the Administration is not as interested in managing the finances of the government as in using them for partisan political advantage. It is true that the size of the deferrals or rescissions would be large and administratively inconvenient, but it is equally true that these measures could mean that the debt limit would not be reached as soon, and that any remaining cash flow problems would be less serious than they would otherwise be.

The lack of any action or plans to slow federal spending to defer and alleviate a situation the Administration has sought to portray as a crisis raises questions about the credibility of the Administration's statements on the subject. Even if a late deferral or rescission could not entirely resolve a cash flow shortfall, it would at the very least make it less severe, and facilitate its successful resolution by other means. In addition, temporary disinvestment of one of the non-social security trust funds would provide yet another means of covering current obligations without dire consequences. The notion that reaching the debt limit means there is no alternative to immediate legal default is simply false, and can be viewed as an attempt to spread confusion and fear in support of the Administration's bargaining position in favor of higher deficit spending.

A review of the cash flow position of the Treasury on a monthly basis shows that November is typically a large deficit month. However, December is often nearly in balance, while January is actually a surplus month. Thus strong and decisive actions by President Clinton to defer or rescind spending could probably supply the needed funds to maintain essential federal programs for some time, and would make the situation much more manageable after the debt limit were reached. A Presidential deferral for administrative contingencies does not require Congressional action.

In summary, while deferral or recession can be viewed as a means to delay and minimize the possible effects of reaching the debt limit, it is also appropriate to view deferral and rescission as potential means of addressing cash flow issues after the debt limit is actually reached. Another option would be adoption of legislation authorizing the Administration to set priorities for managing the cash flow of the Treasury, as in H.R. 2098.

DEBT LIMIT CLASH WOULD BE CAUSED BY PRESIDENTIAL VETO

Administration officials have engaged in a series of noisy public relations events designed to create the impression that a veto of the debt limit would be the fault of Congress, and that the economic effects of this veto would be catastrophic. The Administration has sought to portray its role as little more than an innocent bystander. It is true, of course, that continued deficit spending has created a situation in which the \$4.9 trillion statutory debt limit is about to be reached. However, it is not true that a Presidential veto would be the fault of Congress. At issue is a disagreement in policy which may result in a Presidential veto; the responsibility for a veto and its consequences must be borne by the executive branch.

The Administration has made clear its preference for higher deficit spending and debt accumulation, along with a larger increase in the debt limit. This underlines the fact that what is at issue is a fundamental change in policy away from deficit spending and rapid increases in the national debt.

CONCLUSION

While loudly invoking the coming disaster, the Clinton Administration has undertaken no known steps to use the means completely under its own control to alleviate the situation. Instead of deferring or rescinding funds to conserve cash in the face of what it portrays as a crisis, the spending spigots have remained wide open for many weeks. If the situation is as dire as portrayed by the Administration, why has it completely failed to act? Moreover, if it later mismanages the debt situation in such a way as to create real problems, the major share of resulting problems will be the Administration's failure to address the cash flow crunch when it could have done so. After months of complaints, the Administration cannot pretend to be surprised if a fiscal impasse does indeed occur.

CHRISTOPHER FRENZE,

Chief Economist to the Vice Chairman.

[From the Joint Economic Committee
Policy Analysis, Nov. 1995]

THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S DEBT LIMIT CHARADE—PART II

After weeks of histrionic Administration warnings about how failure to raise the debt limit would bring default and catastrophic economic consequences, President Clinton chose to veto the temporary debt limit increase. Failure to raise the debt limit would not trigger default because the Administration had already identified the available means of managing the situation, despite its repeated public warnings to the contrary. The Clinton Administration position was thus revealed as a political attempt to mislead Congress and the public based on financial assumptions it knew to be false.

As veteran political correspondent Donald Lambro observed five days before the debt limit was reached, a House JEC staff report had already pointed out that the "White House warnings of a default are a 'charade.' It concluded the president has plenty of authority to defer or slow down spending, or

use cash assets such as pension fund reserves to meet debt payments." This report, the Clinton Administration's Debt Limit Charade, went on to point out that the Administration had fostered the situation by failing to defer or rescind unnecessary discretionary spending to alleviate the situation. The report also emphasized that the Administration's default ruse was a distraction from the central issue: Republican insistence on a balanced budget, as opposed to the Clinton Administration's preference for higher deficit spending and debt accumulation.

Early in November it became evident that the White House's public posture was stiffening as it prepared in advance for the President's veto of the debt limit increase. This even more aggressive attempt to heighten the crisis atmosphere was not a preparation for default, as it may have appeared to some at the time, but reflected the determination of Administration officials to maximize partisan political advantage from the fallout and confusion of the coming veto.

The events of the last few days have made it clear that the Clinton Administration had prepared in advance to veto the debt limit and Continuing Resolution (CR) as the first media event of the 1996 election campaign. As one Clinton Administration official stated on the front page of the New York Times, "That's his re-election campaign," an aide said. "He's prepared to fight all winter on that line." This statement exposes the Clinton Administration strategy to foster and sharpen the confrontation over the veto of the debt limit and CR legislation to kick-off the President's re-election effort, and keep its opponents off balance. Initially the Administration had the upper hand because only it knew the exact timing and content of actions to be taken to evade the debt limit—after distracting public opinion for months with disinformation about default. Once the focus returned to the central issue of deficit spending, the Administration's position started to erode.

SECRETARY RUBIN'S RAID ON RETIREMENT FUNDS TRIGGERS ARMEY/SAXTON REQUEST

On November 15, 1995, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin announced his plan to disinvest the "G" fund of the federal employee thrift plan, and the civil service retirement plan, in order to create room under the debt ceiling for issuance of new debt. This circumvention of the debt limit essentially evades a constraint rooted in Article I of the Constitution which states: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To borrow Money on the credit of the United States." The Secretary's actions permitted the issuance of over \$60 billion of additional debt, enough to finance monthly federal deficits through January. Since January is ordinarily a month in which the cash flow position of the treasury is in surplus, it may be February, a large deficit month, before any additional action would be necessary. In any event, while the propriety and even legality of this disinvestment activity is doubtful, the amount of available funds are sufficient to finance monthly deficits for an extended period of time.

In response, on November 17, House Majority Leader Dick Arme and JEC Vice-Chairman Jim Saxton sent Secretary Rubin a letter requesting information regarding when Treasury staff first examined the financing options presented by the retirement funds. Unfortunately, the inflammatory public statements about default by Secretary Rubin, White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, and other Clinton Administration figures had created the impression that there

was a deliberate attempt to disrupt the financial markets to undermine Administration opponents. The documents requested of Rubin may help clarify whether there was a contradiction between what Clinton officials were publicly saying to Congress and the public, and what the Administration was privately planning to do.

The Administration documents received under this request suggest that plans for the disinvestment of the retirement funds have been underway for some time, and were not a last minute decision. In other words, the accessibility of the retirement funds had already been identified and shared with "appropriate officials" in the Executive branch well before prominent Administration officials claimed that a veto of the debt limit would lead to default. It is interesting to note that the critical document signed by Secretary Rubin triggering the disinvestment was typed without a date, which was only filled in by hand on the 15th of November.

THE CLINTON BUDGET

The entire controversy over the debt limit arises from the preference of the Clinton Administration for higher deficit spending and debt accumulation. This was made clear in the detailed budget submission made by President Clinton last February. Only after the Congress acted in producing balanced budget plans did Clinton attempt to cover himself by releasing a sketchy outline of what he called a 10 year balanced budget plan, but what in fact would have left \$200 billion deficits. A review of the official budget submission clearly shows how unimportant high deficit spending is to the Clinton Administration.

The levels of deficit spending would hardly be affected under the official February Clinton budget submission. The Clinton budget recommended deficits growing to a level of \$318 billion by 2002, with \$2 trillion added to the national debt over the same period. The official February budget submission is a useful guide to what the Clinton Administration would regard as an appropriate level of deficit spending in the absence of a public relations problem created by Congressional actions to balance the budget. The upward trajectory of deficit spending under President Clinton's recommendation reflects the low priority this Administration has assigned to fiscal responsibility.

CONCLUSION

A review of the events leading up to the recent budget confrontation shows that the Clinton Administration carefully attempted to heighten the atmosphere of a default crisis, while privately laying a plan to evade the debt limit. The confrontation was a charade intended to provide a convenient platform for the President's re-election campaign. Public statements made after the fact by Administration officials only confirm this dismal conclusion.

CHRISTOPHER FRENZE,

Chief Economist to the Vice-Chairman.

[From the Economist, Nov. 18, 1995]

THE DEBT CEILING HUMBLD PROPHET

Doomsday is a grave event. One does not simply reschedule it, therefore, without a good explanation. On November 15th—the supposed day of reckoning for America's debt—Robert Rubin, America's treasury secretary, laboured mightily to provide one. He was being sincere all along, you see, when he talked of a possible calamitous default on the federal government's debts; when he implored Republicans in Congress to raise the

\$4.9 trillion debt ceiling by that date, or else. It was only by a minor miracle, Mr. Rubin explained, that his Treasury Department had been able, temporarily, to avert disaster. And if Congress did not relent, the dread day would still come, probably sometime in early January.

Financial markets reacted to the revised timing just as they had to the original one. They ignored it. Most bond traders know what Mr. Rubin and his Republican tormentors have known all along: that the Treasury is sitting on a pile of trust-fund assets that could enable it, if necessary, to hold out right through to the 1996 elections.

The federal government administers about 160 trust funds, with well over \$1 trillion in assets, including the funds for Social Security and Medicare. Most of these are, strictly, off limits. The two exceptions are a pair of retirement funds for federal employees. In normal times, these two funds (like all the others) hold their assets in the form of special government bonds which, though they cannot be sold to the public, count officially as federal debt. By replacing these bonds with unofficial IOUs, the Treasury Department can magically free some room beneath the debt ceiling, allowing it to borrow more money from bond markets.

On November 15th, Mr. Rubin did exactly that. First, he drained all \$21.5 billion from the so-called G-Fund, a voluntary pension plan for federal employees. He then authorized the Treasury to tap the Civil Service Retirement (CSR) fund, for a further \$39.8 billion. These two actions freed up enough cash to make a \$25 billion interest payment on the government's debts, and to cover its other debt operations for the rest of the year. After that, Mr. Rubin claims, a genuine cash crunch will occur. But since the CSR fund is still sitting on another \$300 billion in assets, this seems an empty threat.

Even if Congress continues to play games with the debt ceiling, a default will occur only if someone successfully challenged Mr. Rubin's authority over the retirement funds. This is unlikely. For a start, few parties have an interest in doing battle. Republicans would take the blame if they succeeded in triggering a default. And federal employees would be unaffected by the Treasury's shenanigans: by law, all their assets must be replaced, with interest, once the cash crunch has passed.

In any event, a legal challenge would be on shaky ground. In 1986, after a similar cash panic, Congress explicitly granted authority over the two funds to the treasury secretary to help him pay off debts. And although Mr. Rubin would have to issue a series of bizarre technical rulings to continue tapping the CSR fund, there does not appear to be any legal obstacle to his doing so.

So Americans need not worry that their government will default, or that it will be prevented from borrowing more. They do, however, face a fate that may be almost as horrible: someday, the mountain of debt might actually have to be repaid.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, those of our colleagues who are observing and those in the gallery must think they are in a fantasy world, and I really do think that we should not have been taking this time to deal with what obviously is expected by our Republican friends over here not to be passed, not to ever see the light of leg-

islative day, and yet they got up and said, "We are here to protect Social Security. This is a key vote. Everyone should watch. We should not borrow from our children."

I have here a copy of the Republican budget. I can tell you exactly what is going to happen. When the crocodile tears were shed over here about the \$5.2 trillion public debt, let me tell you what the Republican budget proposes for the year 2002, 7 years from now, \$6.8 trillion in public debt. I will tell you what the debt increase is going to be. It is going to be \$300 billion this year, and it is going to be another \$185 billion in 2002.

So where do you get off today, trying to stand up here and talk about what you are taking from your children and protecting the Social Security fund? The Republican budget calls for looting the Social Security trust fund of \$636 billion plus interest over the next 7 years in the illusion that they are balancing the budget.

You intend to take from the Social Security revenues in order to pay for your budget over the next 7 years. To come to this floor today and say you are trying to protect it where the debt limit is concerned is the height of illusion.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I really am glad that this is not a serious vote that we are about to take. My colleagues ought to be clear on that. Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats, I guess, expect this bill to go anywhere.

It was on the suspension calendar on November 14 or November 15. They did not expect it to go anywhere then. The reason for that is that everybody knows that this is an absolutely utterly irresponsible piece of legislation.

The Secretary of Treasury yesterday appeared before a hearing, and I asked him pointblank, Mr. Secretary, what would have happened if this bill had passed on the suspension calendar on November 14 when it was originally voted on? Would the U.S. Government be in default today?

And he told me in no uncertain terms, told all the Republicans and the Democrats, if this bill had passed on November 14 when we first voted on it, the U.S. Government would be in default today and if it passes and becomes law today, the U.S. Government will be in default tomorrow.

So this is not about Social Security, it is not about budget, it is not about the President, it is not about our children. This is about the responsibility of our Nation for a debt.

We talk about personal responsibility. This is public responsibility we are talking about. We are talking about

our children, we want to set an example for them to pay their debts. That is what we want to set an example for. And this bill simply sets a terrible, terrible example for our children.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me the time first of all. It shows what a gentleman he is, because he knows I am going to vote against his position. But I also told him that I was going to tell the truth about this proposal.

The truth of the matter is, and I just got off the phone with the Congressional Budget Office, that the Republican budget for 1996 will borrow over \$100 billion from the trust funds to disguise the true nature of the debt for the Republican budget for next year, which has recently been revised but as recently as just a couple of weeks ago was \$296 billion.

That is money we do not have. It is money that has to be borrowed. If we were not borrowing enough already, I will tell you how bad it is. In the 2 minutes that the gentleman has granted me to address this body, our Nation will spend \$1 million on interest on the existing national debt. So that \$296 billion is added on top of that.

So the so-called Balanced Budget Act, much ballyhooed in the ad in USA Today, is all a ruse. I am going to hit the Republican Party with a demand letter for the \$1 million they promised to the first person who could disprove they had a balanced budget, because the Congressional Budget Office has just told us that the annual operating deficit first is over \$180 billion of regular funds, and then they are going to disguise another \$100 billion by borrowing from the trust fund.

The bill before us today is good policy. The problem is they have no intention of ever putting it into effect. That is a shame. It does not bode well for this body. It does not bode well for the people of the United States. But I hope that the people of the United States will insist that this is the type of behavior that should not continue and that stealing from the trust fund, which is what is going on, has to cease.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about the debt limit. Of course, just to set the record straight, this is the permanent debt limit, the permanent debt limit that we raise every 2 or 3 years and have been for almost my whole lifetime.

They talk about default on the national debt and they worry about default. Those are phony scare tactics and everybody knows that. As the Secretary of the Treasury was saying

those things, he was planning to loot the retirement funds which he is now doing every day, looting them because he knew that that would not happen.

I just want Members to think for a minute. What do the people in our districts think about this debt limit issue? How would they vote if they could vote here today? They still believe that there is some sanity left inside the beltway. They are not thrilled about the constant raising of the permanent debt limit and I do not think they would vote for any further increases.

I think we have to take a sound, careful look, think deeply on this issue and only when certain that we are on the track of a balanced budget, then we can carefully raise this debt limit, and if it is not for the last time, this Nation will probably not survive. If we can do it this time and only with a balanced budget in prospect, because this cannot go on forever.

This is the whole purpose of this tremendous effort to balance the budget. It is absolutely essential, and we will do it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 55 seconds.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we have just wasted an hour around here. It has been kind of joyous on my part because if we had not been wasting time on this, we might have been doing something bad around here.

This is the most irresponsible piece of legislation I have ever seen. This is not like a couple of weeks ago when we closed down the Grand Canyon and the Washington Monument, laid off the nonessential people, whoever they may be.

This just closes the whole place down, irrespective, the troops in Bosnia, the people that are guarding the Federal prisons, the FBI, the IRS. A lot of people would like to close them down. The whole place. You cannot honor any checks. No airplanes could fly. That is responsibility.

This has got to be the stupidest thing I have ever seen in all my years here on this congressional floor. There is no mileage in closing this government down. It is like taking a bunch of broken bottles and trying to juggle them. You are going to get cut every time you do it.

If you do not like what the Secretary of the Treasury is doing, the courts are still open. Go sue him. But do not come here to the floor. He is not doing anything wrong. If he is doing anything wrong, why do we need to change the law? You have got plenty of remedies. Ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE]. He can tell you.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, we have had a long debate, a period of 1 hour. We have had speaker after speaker from the Democrat side to come down to the floor and say what my friend from Florida just said about we would not be able to pay the troops in Bosnia.

We are not talking about closing down the taxing authority of this country. We are not talking about stopping the other revenue flows that are already in place coming into this country. We are simply talking about one simple truth that I think we as Members of this body are duty bound to protect. That is, the constitutional right which is reserved to this body and the Senate for expenditure of funds and for borrowing money.

□ 1300

What we are trying to do here is to close a loophole, a loophole that has not been the exclusive domain of the Democrat administration. Previous Republican administrations have sought out and used this loophole, but this loophole circumvents the rights of this Congress. I am not going to sit by idly and watch us default on our debt. That is not what this argument is about. This argument is about can the administration, do they have a loophole, and believe me. Constitutional scholars will debate this question, but this clears it up. They will not have the authority to circumvent the Constitution which very clearly provides that borrowing money and spending money is a prerogative of this Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all the Members to stand up for the rights of the Congress as set forth in the Constitution, close this loophole, vote "yes" on this most important bill.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I must rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2621. I firmly believe that existing law already protects the trust funds covered by this legislation. In addition, there is clear evidence that this legislation would trigger a default on the U.S. Government's current debt obligations. Any suggestion that this type of action should be used in our ongoing budget negotiations is clearly ludicrous and grossly irresponsible.

In all my experience in Congress, I have no doubt that this body has never considered a more important piece of legislation than balancing our budget. However, I am deeply concerned about what I consider reckless talk, which may portend even more reckless action, on the debt ceiling.

On November 15, the New York Times reported that European Central Bankers are increasingly alarmed by the prospect of a U.S. default. According to the Times "IBCA Ltd. of London, the leading European Credit-Rating agency, placed the United States on its rating watch listing for possible downgrading from its current AAA status." This action follows on the heels of a decision by Standard and Poors to issue a highly unusual warning to our Government that the faith of investors, and I quote,

"has to some degree, been diminished" by the threats of imminent default.

In a recent letter to Speaker GINGRICH, I reminded him that, as a student of the history of this great country, we have not defaulted on its financial obligations in 219 years in a manner which we seem to be heading toward. I submit that the full faith and credit of the United States must not be jeopardized. Default could set off a chain of economic events, at home and abroad, that would undermine the safety and soundness of the world's financial markets. It would be irresponsible and catastrophic for this Government to permit this.

Therefore, as Republicans dedicated to fiscal responsibility and protecting the economic future of our grandchildren, we must take the responsible action to increase the debt ceiling and not use the threat of default as a lever to force negotiations. What are we, a third world country?

This having been said, I do have some reservations about dipping into the civil service retirement and disability fund, Government Securities investment fund as well as the Federal Employees Retirement System, despite Treasury's assertions that, and I quote, "the beneficiaries of—these funds—will suffer no adverse consequences whatsoever from these actions. There are appropriate questions to be asked today as well as one regarding the Social Security trust fund.

Although there is precedent to take these actions, especially during the Reagan administration, it is sad that Treasury is being forced to invoke such extraordinary remedies to honor the existing obligations of the U.S. Government. And I will tell you that these views are being voiced loud and clear by several economic experts that I truly respect and who have testified before the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, which I chair, particularly former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker, current Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan and Robert Hormats, the former Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in the Reagan administration and current vice chairman of Goldman Sachs.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2621, the Trust Fund Protection Act and commend the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for his and the committee's persistence in their patrolling of the financing schemes of this administration.

Let's be clear about what we are talking about. The United States ran up against the statutorily established debt limit in November—in layman's terms, we run out of money to borrow on our credit line. At the time the administration claimed that not giving this Congress more credit would result in a disastrous financial collapse in the markets.

As predicted by many of those private citizens who actually spend their day-to-day time in the business of monitoring the securities and bonds markets, the market did not respond negatively. In fact the bond market soared to record heights anticipating that the Federal Government would actually reach a balanced budget agreement for the first time in over 26 years.

By not increasing the debt limit, it was hoped by Members of both parties who strongly support balancing the budget, that

this perceived dilemma would help to get the administration to the bargaining table.

This was not a game of Russian roulette or political gamesmanship as some have claimed. In fact, this was another demonstration of how strongly the new majority in this Congress holds its principled position of balancing the budget. We are morally obligated as well as politically obligated as the holders of the purse to bring about the goal of a balanced budget.

However, those in the Clinton administration continue their waffling over their position on the balanced budget. Indeed their inconsistency in action on this point is one of the reasons we are here today.

The day after the debt limit was reached and the Clinton administration ran out of money to spend on its pet projects, the Treasury Secretary defied all political and economic logic by dipping into the social security, military retirement, and civil service trust funds for a little more spending money. I am amazed that some Members on the other side of the aisle have actually come to the floor this morning claiming that there was nothing wrong with this practice. I strongly disagree and would contend that it amounts to parents dipping into their children's college tuition savings account to go to the movies over the weekend. Yes, there may be money available but no that money is going to have to be paid back with interest and yes that is an end-run around the debt limit.

This bill before us today would stop these end-run shenanigans. It would put the management of the Nation's securities back on top of the table, out in front so that everyone can see. It would outlaw this despicable attempt at defying the will of the branch of Government—Congress—tasked by the Founding Fathers with the responsibility for controlling the Nation's purse.

H.R. 2126 would prevent the Treasury Secretary from pulling money out of the Social Security trust funds, the civil service retirement fund, the military retirement fund, the unemployment trust fund, the railroad retirement fund, the black lung disability trust fund, and the defense education and post-Vietnam-era veterans education trust fund. Each of these are targeted with tax dollars for specific purposes and should remain intact so that the Government can stand behind its obligations.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would only observe that from all the squawking and carrying on in Washington over the pains of balancing the budget some may get the impression that the Democrat party never heard all the squawking back home on main street America over the past 25 years when this Congress refused to balance the budget.

Well my friends, its time to put up or shut up and Republicans were the first one's to put up a balanced budget and the American people have put up with Democrat political, fiscal and immoral shenanigans with the people's money long enough.

Support the bill and balance the budget.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the Constitution clearly states that it is the Congress who has the power "to borrow money on the credit of the United States," not the President or the executive branch. The problem that continues to

trigger increases in the debt limit is the failure to balance the Federal budget. Balancing the budget is the first step in paying off the ever-mounting debts that have accumulated for future generations.

Passing the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 could be the best gift we ever give our children but this cannot be done without the President's help. We offered the President a balanced budget which included a raised debt ceiling but the President vetoed it.

Instead of negotiating a balanced budget plan, the President permitted the Treasury to raid two Federal trust funds—taking a total of \$61.3 billion from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund and the Federal Employees Thrift Savings Fund [G-fund]. By shifting these funds, the President bought more time to allow the Government to skirt the debt limit and avoid a default.

While no one wants a default, disinvesting retirement funds to free up room under the debt ceiling circumvents the debt limit as well as Congress' role in authorizing Federal borrowing. Moreover it allows the administration to avoid having to change its spending habits—a change which the American people have demanded.

The administration says that those funds will be repaid with interest but that interest is going to have to come from somewhere. Every dollar the administration removes from the trust funds can then be spent by issuing new debt to the public. Again, we are left with another Government bill with more interest payments at taxpayers' expense.

To better envision the significance of the debt limit and balancing the budget, I like to use the analogy of a credit card limit. When one has spent one's maximum spending/credit limit, one cannot keep on spending. Instead, one must take steps to balance his or her budget so that the output does not exceed the input. In other words they must change their spending habits.

Living within one's means is the financial reality that individual Americans confront everyday. People cannot simply keep calling the credit card company asking it to raise their credit limit. That is essentially what the administration wants this Congress to do. It wants Congress to raise its credit limit or the debt ceiling without any strategy for paying off its debt.

Balancing the budget is a step in the right direction; it diminishes the continuing need for having the debt or borrowing level raised. The Federal debt or credit card bill is now about \$5 trillion, and that does not include the interest. The fiscal year 1996 budget estimates that the U.S. Government will spend about \$256 billion in 1996, or about 16 percent of the budget, just to pay the interest on this debt.

H.R. 2621 is a bill to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security and other Federal trust funds. It ends the debt-ceiling smoke and mirrors. With the \$21 billion in the G-fund, \$365 billion in the Social Security Retirement Fund, \$143 billion in the Medicare Trust Fund, and \$483 billion in the Social Security Trust Fund, there is money for the administration to disinvest and build up more and more debt with more and more interest payments thereby sidestepping the Constitution. This bill ensures what the Constitution says

about the authority to issue debt—Congress is vested with the "Power . . . To borrow Money on the Credit of the United States."

The reason we are having this current confrontation in Washington is not simply over how the Government keeps its books, or when we reach a balanced budget. The true confrontation is changing the way Government operates. We are in the midst of a revolution as dramatic as Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and its expansion of Government into every aspect of our lives. The question is whether we will have more Governmental control over our lives, higher taxes, more borrowing, and more interest payments, or whether we will go back to what made this country great—a frugal Government and individual responsibility. I agree with the views Thomas Jefferson expressed in his letter to Elbridge Gerry nearly 200 years ago—"I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and for increasing, by every device, the public debt, on the principle of its being a public blessing."

H.R. 2621 not only protects our retirement funds from senseless and expensive manipulation, it sends the President a clear message that the American public and this Congress is serious about balancing the budget.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, if enacted, this bill would cause the immediate default of the United States.

Instead of protecting Social Security payments, it would delay January's benefit checks. January's Social Security checks could not be paid until enough tax revenues came in to pay all previous unpaid Government checks which we defaulted on in December upon enactment of this bill. For the Nation's lower income seniors and disabled, January would be a cold and frightening month.

If we have immediate default, people who seek to cash their savings bonds will be told to wait. Families that have bought savings bonds—as we have begged them to do—to save for January college tuitions would be in limbo.

Why? Because the Republicans are insisting on a budget bill that includes massive tax breaks for the very upper income.

Retroactive capital gains breaks will provide billions to the very wealthiest in our society, while we create delays and uncertainty for those dependent on retirement checks.

The wealthiest 1 percent will get an average \$90,000 in estate tax relief—while millions will be told that we can't cash their savings bonds on Social Security checks.

The top 1 percent of families, whose income averages \$651,274, will receive \$8,231 in tax breaks in the year 2002 under their tax bill—but the Republican majority will default on this winter's earned income tax credits.

Default would be a stain on this Nation's 220 year financial history. The Republican budget priorities—making the rich richer and the poor poorer—are a stain on our Nation's moral history.

Please defeat this terribly disruptive bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Pursuant to

House Resolution 293, the previous question is ordered on the bill as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Mr. GIBBONS. I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GIBBONS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2621 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONTINUATION OF REDEMPTION AND INVESTMENT POLICIES.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury—

(1) may use the social security trust funds only for purposes of paying social security benefits as he did in December 1995 when he followed the normal redemption and investment policies used to pay social security benefits by redeeming—

(A) on December 1, 1995, \$16.8 billion in securities to pay direct-deposit social security benefits, and

(B) on December 6 and 7, 1995, \$9.4 billion to pay social security benefits paid by check, and

(2) shall continue the investment policies that he has followed since the debt ceiling crisis began in November 1995 by continuing to invest social security receipts in the social security trust funds following his normal procedures.

(b) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUNDS.—As required by subsections (j), (k), and (l) of section 8348 of title 5, United States Code, and subsections (g) and (h) of section 8438 of such title, the Secretary of the Treasury may utilize the civil service retirement funds to avoid Government default in times of a forced debt ceiling crisis, and shall restore those funds fully, including interest, as required by those subsections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody realizes we got a charade going on down here today, and this motion to recommit just says what should be done and what the current law is on this, and it pays tribute to the Secretary of the Treasury for having followed faithfully the laws that the Congress has provided for him in this debt management procedure that is going through with it. The Secretary of the Treasury is a very honest, responsible, and honorable man, and he has used the law, as we have provided for him to do, in the circumstances that he found himself in.

Mr. Speaker, this is just an attempt by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr.

GINGRICH] and company, the Speaker and company, to force the President and the Congress to do something that they have not got the political authority to do: to make a bad deal.

Everybody knows that this balanced budget that we hear so much about is being balanced on the backs of the children of the United States, of the sick, of the poor, of the aged, and that is not the proper way to do it. We need to balance the budget, but we do not need to pick out the victims as our Republican friends have.

No amount of talk here, no amount of obfuscation on this floor, can disguise the fact that, while a balanced budget is desirable, the manner in which it is being balanced is just not the American way to do it. We have always been mindful of the needs of others, we have always realized that some people are not born in life as fortunate as others, and we have tried to compensate that and make sure that America is not only brave, and honest, and true, but is humane, and I regret that the Republican leadership has put this Congress in a position of trying to do something that it should not naturally do.

The President is not going to be blackmailed by this kind of shenanigans. No President in his right mind would ever sign this bill, it will probably never get out of the other body, and we have wasted another couple of hours here talking about it.

But who knows? We may have done something worse had we not been on this matter for so long.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, a motion to recommit simply legitimizes what is going on now. Let me read for my colleagues a provision, and I, as a lawyer, have never read this in the law, anything that is drafted such as this. It says:

The Treasury shall continue the investment policy that he has followed since the debt-ceiling crisis began in November of 1995 by continuing to invest Social Security receipts in the Social Security trust fund following his normal procedures.

Now can my colleagues imagine trying to unravel that 15-20 years from now, about going back and seeing what one Secretary of the Treasury was doing. It personalizes the existing Treasurer into law. I have never seen that happen before.

Then I would say particularly to my friends from Maryland and from Virginia this is something they should look at very, very cautiously. We have continued to see, and these particular

Members, as well as the Delegate from the District of Columbia, come to this floor and protect Federal employees. Federal employees should be offended by this motion to recommit because it simply says that the Federal retirement fund now becomes a piggy bank that the Treasurer can dip into as he sees fit.

Do not take my word for it. Read page 2 of the bill which says the civil service retirement fund, and it just goes a very short paragraph, and there is no way that these Members, or any of us that are concerned about Federal retirees, that we could possibly vote for this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit ought to take our colleagues' breath away. It is an incredible proposal. First of all, it attacks Social Security. While claiming to protect Social Security, it, in fact, condones the status quo which threatens Social Security.

Every day in America, Mr. Speaker, we pay Social Security, and it comes to the Treasury, not to the Social Security fund, and then the Secretary fund, and then the Secretary of the Treasury forwards it on. He could conceivably keep it overnight, and then invest it in the Social Security fund. What if he is up against the cap? Could he keep it a few days or a week? Could he keep it a month to pay beneficiaries and not invest it? Could he underinvest it? In the 1980's the Secretary of the Treasury actually disinvested funds in the Social Security account, and he can legally do so again. This motion to recommit does not address those vulnerabilities.

Mr. Speaker, we are right now relying on President Clinton saying, "I'm not going to disinvest or underinvest the Social Security fund. Trust me." Secretary Rubin says the same thing. Yesterday, before our committee he said in effect, "You can count on the President. He's given you his word. He won't mess with the Social Security fund." In other words, "You can trust the President. We won't go after Social Security."

What do all these promises tell us? It tells us that we are relying on just that: promises. "Trust me." We don't need to rely on promises. The American people don't need to rely on political promises to protect Social Security. Instead what we need is legislation which says, "No, it is a trust fund. It ought to go into the fund, and it ought to stay in the fund, and the fund should be fully invested." That's what we need. Not promises and assurances but a legal requirement and that's what this legislation gives us. On the other hand, this motion to recommit gives us no legal safeguard, only assur-

ance that the President and the secretary's current policies and promises to protect Social Security will be continued.

I cannot believe that my colleagues would present this motion to recommit as an attempt to protect Social Security, and ask that this legislation be recommitted to protect Social Security. What is even more astonishing is what they have actually put in writing in this motion to recommit. They actually have written in words in this motion to recommit that they are going to allow the Secretary of Treasury to continue his current policies. Policies which have led him to disinvest more than \$39 billion of the Civil Service Retirement Fund. Policies which have allowed him not to reinvest the entire \$21.5 billion voluntary pension fund. Policies which Wall Street Journal yesterday reported will allow him—and he actually proposes to—delay the payment of \$14.5 billion in interest due the Civil Service Retirement Fund. Policies have allowed and will allow the Secretary of Treasury to substitute IOU's for interest-bearing treasury securities. That is incredible. Not only that, this motion to recommit actually puts the stamp of approval on all these activities. It says that the Secretary of Treasury can continue to use Civil Service Retirement funds to pay the obligations of government. It is right here in the motion to recommit. The motion actually has the courage to say that.

By inference, this motion to recommit says something else. While claiming to protect Social Security, not doing so, it also says in effect, that with the other trust funds. We are going at them full-speed. We are going to let the Secretary of Treasury "have at them" with no protection whatsoever for the other trust funds. We are going to let him continue to take money out of the Civil Service trust funds and substitute IOU's.

No protection for the other trust funds. Have at them, as for the Wall Street Journal article saying he is not going to pay interest due to the Civil Service Retirement fund at year-end, this motion to recommit says, "Fine. That's okay. We are going to continue to let you keep not paying interest." I've heard reports that the Treasury has looked at the Postal fund as a source of addressing the debt ceiling. This motion to recommit says, "Have at the Postal fund." How about the Bank Insurance fund? Are they looking at that fund? Little old ladies CD's down at the bank. They think they are federally insured. They trust there is a federal insurance backed up by a trust fund that will make any losses good. What do we say about the Bank Insurance fund if Treasury decides to go after it? This motion to recommit says, "Go to it. Have at it."

Mr. Speaker, this legislation says a trust fund is just that. The people that

deposit their money in the fund trust you not to take it out. They make payments to that fund and they trust you to put it in. That's the "trust." Second, it is a fund, not an IOU. A trust fund. This motion to recommit says this about the trust fund, "No trust and no funds." And for all this underinvestment, raids, IOU's, accounting entries and gimmicks, keep on keeping on. This motion to recommit puts a big seal of approval on all this chicanery. Vote against this motion to recommit and for the underlying legislation. Vote for trust funds which have both trust and funds.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would say to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle let us not delegate our authority given to us by the Constitution to this administration or to future administrations. Vote no on the motion to recommit and yes on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 229, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 861]

YEAS—190

Abercrombie	Clay	Doyle
Ackerman	Clayton	Durbin
Andrews	Clement	Edwards
Baesler	Clyburn	Engel
Baldacci	Coleman	Eshoo
Barcia	Collins (IL)	Evans
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Farr
Becerra	Condit	Fattah
Bellenson	Conyers	Fazio
Bentsen	Costello	Fields (LA)
Berman	Coyne	Filner
Bevill	Cramer	Flake
Bishop	Danner	Foglietta
Bontor	de la Garza	Ford
Borski	DeFazio	Frank (MA)
Brewster	DeLauro	Frost
Browder	Dellums	Furse
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Gedjenson
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Gephardt
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Geren
Bryant (TX)	Dixon	Gibbons
Cardin	Doggett	Gonzalez
Chapman	Dooley	Gordon

Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kenneley
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui

McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush

Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sistisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce

Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shaughnessy
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin

Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Whitman
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent

Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinaro
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers

Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shaughnessy
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Boucher
Emerson
Hansen
Harman
McInnis

McKinney
Mfume
Owens
Ros-Lehtinen
Spence

Tucker
Waldholtz
Wilson

□ 1329

Messrs. MANZULLO, CHRISTENSEN, and ROEMER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. KLECZKA, VENTO, HALL of Texas, and LAFALCE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 103, answered "present" 77, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 862]

AYES—235

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billbray
Billirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremins
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis

Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke

Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinaro
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billbray
Billirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn

Bunning
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dorner
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bellenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clement
Costello
Cramer
Danner
DeLauro
Dicks
Deutsch
Dingell
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Eshoo
Ford
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt

Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hefner
Hoyer
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
LaFalce
Levin
Lincoln
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Minge
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal

Obey
Oliver
Orton
Pallone
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Reed
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Sabo
Sawyer
Schumer
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wyden

Bishop
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Clay

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—77

Abercrombie
Becerra

Clayton	Hilliard	Rangel
Clyburn	Hinchee	Richardson
Coleman	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Collins (IL)	(TX)	Rush
Collins (MI)	Jacobs	Sanders
Conyers	Jefferson	Schroeder
Coyne	Johnson, E. B.	Scott
de la Garza	Kennedy (RI)	Serrano
DeFazio	Lantos	Stark
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Dixon	Lofgren	Tejeda
Engel	Martinez	Thompson
Evans	Matsul	Torres
Farr	McDermott	Towns
Fattah	Meek	Velazquez
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Ward
Filner	Miller (CA)	Waters
Flake	Mink	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Moakley	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Ortiz	Williams
Furse	Owens	Wise
Green	Pastor	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)	Wynn
Hastings (FL)	Pelosi	Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Boucher	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Emerson	Lipinski	Thomas
English	McInnis	Tucker
Fazio	McKinney	Waldholtz
Hansen	Mfume	Wilson
Harman	Oberstar	

□ 1339

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. McInnis for, with Ms. Harman against.

Mr. FARR and Mr. COYNE changed their vote from "no" to "present."

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 862, final passage of H.R. 2621, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on December 14 I was unable to vote on rollcall votes 861 and 862 because I had to attend a special Metro-Dade Commission meeting in Miami. I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 861, a motion to recommit with instructions H.R. 2621 and I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 862, final passage on H.R. 2621, a bill to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security Trust Fund.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks regarding H.R. 2621, which has just passed this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE JESSE L. JACKSON, JR., OF ILLINOIS AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from the State of Illinois, Mr. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Members of the Illinois delegation please escort the member-elect to the rostrum.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Illinois delegation, it is my honor, my very high honor and high privilege, to present to the Speaker and to the House of Representatives a newly elected Congressman from the State of Illinois. He has taken the seat that was previously held by Mr. Mel Reynolds.

The gentleman is eminently qualified to enter upon this position, Mr. Speaker. He holds a degree as a Baptist minister. He holds a degree as a practicing lawyer. He holds a degree as a Master of Business Administration. He has spoken the length and breadth of the country in public addresses. He has engaged in all kinds of political activities, which is to be expected when one realize the family which is his.

I know that the people of Chicago, the people of his district, are very proud to have him as their new Member of Congress from the city, and it is with that that I present him to you for swearing in, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Let me say to my friend from Illinois that I know the father well and look forward very much to getting to know the son. We are delighted, I think all of us, to have you here.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God?

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the Congress of the United States.

I TOO HAVE A DREAM

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and distinguished Members of the House, I am honored to be a servant of this body.

I want to thank God, who has called our family to public service and blessed me with the ability and the will to serve. It is faith in God and the strength of my family that made this

exalted position of service possible. The Rainbow Coalition gave me the opportunity to serve and grow. We must expand the Rainbow Spirit across the land. We must let a new generation arise. I want to thank and acknowledge my family—my wife Sandi, my parents, Rev. and Mrs. Jesse Jackson, my sister Santita, my brother Jonathan and his wife Marilyn, Yusef, and little Jackie, Grandma and Grandpa Brown, my grandmother Matilda Burns and Helen Jackson, who could not be present.

My ambition and my focus is clear. I want to do God's will, and I believe it to be His will that we lift the lot of suffering humanity. Where there are walls that divide, we must build bridges and bring peace to a war torn world, whether Bosnia or Nigeria.

I want to honor the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Illinois who entrusted me to represent them, to make the best case possible to improve the quality of life for all of them. For those who voted for me, and those who did not, for those who were too young to vote, and for those who've given up on the vote, because they no longer dream or believe, that change will come.

I promised the seniors of my district that I would fight to save their Medicare, and the youth of my district to save their scholarships. I promised to fight for affordable housing, to uplift the conditions of people in Altgeld Gardens, Ginger Ridge, Ford Heights, and the many communities across my district, where living conditions have not changed in two generations. They are not lazy, or welfare kings or queens, they want to work, but they need the opportunity to work.

Last, I want to be a public servant who is mostly known as a freedom fighter of character in the best tradition of Jesus The Christ, Martin Luther King, Jr., Nelson Mandela and my dad, Jesse Jackson, Sr. Our character is measured by how we treat the least of these. I will fight with all of my might for a public policy that will wipe out malnutrition and save the malnourished. A public policy of full employment, healthcare, housing, and an education safety net for all of the American people. I want to defend the defenseless. I want them to dream again and stop recycling nightmares. We must choose schools instead of jails for our future. Let the children dream. Let the seniors dream again. Let them hope. Let them believe. Revive their spirits. Let all of us hope.

I look forward to learning from you and to working with you. Together, we must make the American Dream possible for all of America's people. Thank you.

[The following portion was delivered in both English and Spanish.]

Mr. Speaker, in the time I have left, I would like to say that I share a dream, and I called it "I Too Have a Dream."

That the southside will look like the northside.

That Rainbow Beach will look like North Avenue Beach.

That the Dusable Museum will be funded like the Field Museum.

That southside and suburban children will receive funding like the northside for parks, zoos, restaurants and piers with ferris wheels.

That equal funding for education will be a reality in this generation.

That more county money will be used for preschool and afternoon school programs than incarceration programs.

It is my hope that I can look forward to working with Members of Congress, and working with each and every one of you. Together, we must make the American dream possible for all of Americans, for America's people.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

□ 1345

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS WELCOMES JESSE JACKSON, JR.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning on behalf of the entire Democratic Caucus to welcome the newest Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, JESSE JACKSON, Jr., our colleague from the Second Congressional District of Illinois. At 30 years old, Mr. JACKSON will be one of the youngest Members of the 104th Congress. But what he lacks in age, he more than makes up in commitment to justice and opportunity for the people of Illinois, Chicago, and all Americans.

As field director for the National Rainbow Coalition, he has been on the front lines to fight for economic opportunity in America's cities and basic equality and justice everywhere. When he ran for Congress this year, he pledged to dedicate himself to the kind of issues that are at the heart of the Democratic Party and America. Protecting Medicare and Medicaid, raising the minimum wage, creating jobs, and fighting to heal the divisions that too often exist among races and between genders in our country.

I am proud to serve with JESSE JACKSON, Jr., and I know that he will do remarkable things for the people of his district, bringing all of the energy, enthusiasm, and dedication to bear on the problems we face.

So I say to the gentleman from Illinois, welcome to the people's House, and we all look forward to working with you as we together do the people's business.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CON- FERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZA- TION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-407) on the resolution (H. Res. 307) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WELCOME TO JESSE JACKSON, JR.

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have known our new colleague for a very long period of time and have worked with his parents for an extremely long period of time. I have watched him grow up in a very disciplined, loving household, one that has been in the forefront of all of the issues. I have particularly watched him grow up in an environment where his very loving family has been one that has been led by a freedom fighter, his father, the Rev. Jesse Jackson, and who has been under the very loving care of his mother, Mrs. Jacqueline Jackson.

Clearly here is a young man who grew up sort of in the eye of a storm of liberation and a storm of good will that was trying to be brought for our country, and yet here is a young man who is an example of what can happen to young people.

Here is a young man who has never had a problem with drugs, a young man who has never had a problem with the law, a young man who has developed into a fine human being, one who has a great education, one who has been a person who wanted to learn and to grow. He epitomizes what America can do and what those of us who are concerned about the well-being of our young people can hope to expect.

Let me say this. It has already been discussed that he has a number of degrees, a Bachelor's degree from North Carolina A&T University. He has a Master's from the Chicago Theological Seminary. He has a law degree from the University of Illinois. Believe me, he got a mandate from the Second Congressional District of Illinois, and has won two elections in 2 weeks, and we salute him.

JACKSON USHERS IN NEW ERA OF LEADERSHIP

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand and join with my colleagues in welcoming the newest Member to this House, JESSE JACKSON, Jr. I feel as if he, too, is my child. I feel as if he is my son. I feel that way because I guess I have known him, I have watched him grow up. I have worked very closely with his father and his mother. They are my friends.

When he first indicated that he would be running for this seat, I did everything that I could to encourage him, and I would like to thank all of my colleagues in this House who joined with us in a tremendous effort to raise money and to work in the district to ensure that JESSE JACKSON, Jr., could be with us being sworn in today.

I am so proud of him, because he represents everything that we want our children to be. I am so proud of him, because oftentimes there are these negative images of young African-American men portrayed in the media. However, there are many young JESSE JACKSON, Jr.'s out there. A lot of people do not know about them. They do not understand that there are children who have come from nurturing families, with the kind of support that could lead them here to this House and to other things if but given the opportunity and the chance to do that.

And so JESSE JACKSON, Jr., stands here today as a symbol to all of those young people out there who believe that they can do it, that there can be support for them realizing their dreams.

I am proud that he is here. I look forward to the leadership that he is going to provide, not only in this House but throughout this Nation.

Let me just say this to my colleagues. JESSE JACKSON, Jr., will usher in a new generation of leadership in this country to deal with the problems that confront us all. So I want you to look at him today and look at him in a new and different way. I want you to understand what he symbolizes and what he is going to mean, not only to this House but to all of America.

I welcome you, JESSE JACKSON, Jr. I look forward to working with you, and let the message go forward to the young people out there, that they have got someone now who is going to reach out to them, bring them into these new possibilities and show America the way in which it should be going.

WELCOME TO JESSE JACKSON, JR.

(Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome to the House our newest Member and my long-time friend JESSE JACKSON, Jr. I first met JESSE during his father's 1984 presidential campaign. During that time

JESSE and I had the opportunity to register people to vote together, rally together, encourage young people to stay in school together, and we always had the dream to serve in this House, the United States House of Representatives, together.

I will never forget the many trips we made to Washington as young college students, and we would pass the House, the Capitol, the United States Capitol, and look at each other and say, one day we will serve in the House of Representatives together and shape national public policy.

I recall the great words of Benjamin Mays when he said, "The calamity of life is not failing to reach your dream. The calamity of life is having no dreams to reach for."

JESSE JACKSON, Jr., is not only a dreamer but one who works night and day to accomplish his dreams. The people of the Second Congressional District of Chicago and young people all across this Nation should be very proud to have such a great public servant like my friend and now my new colleague JESSE JACKSON, Jr.

I welcome you, my friend, and together we will keep hope alive.

A GREAT DAY

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am very, very proud today. Today is indeed a great day for myself, for the people in the city of Chicago, the people of the Second Congressional District. Today is a day that is great for all of America.

□ 1400

We must take pause today, Mr. Speaker, to understand all that has gone on in regards to JESSE JACKSON, Jr., being sworn in as a Member of Congress. I am absolutely so proud, and I am so appreciative of the work of the Jackson family.

You see, Mr. Speaker, about 25-26 years ago I had to call upon Jesse Jackson, Sr. to save my very life. I called him when I was on the run, when police officers were out to kill me. Jesse Jackson did not hesitate to come to my assistance and to come to my aid.

I have seen JESSE JACKSON, Jr., from a toddler up until an adult, and I cannot think of any more qualities that God could have invested in a single individual than what he invested in JESSE JACKSON, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, this young man, as you saw a brief indication of today, has traveled the world, has been in the company of great individuals, individuals at the top of national governments, individuals who are, indeed, movers and shakers and history mak-

ers throughout the world. But the quality, the resounding quality that keeps coming forward in terms of JESSE JACKSON, Jr., is not arrogance, is not a higher-than-thou or greater-than-thou or holier-than-thou. The common characteristic that comes through in terms of JESSE JACKSON, Jr., is humility and humbleness and willingness to work in behalf of those individuals in this society who have no one to fight and to work for them. He is, indeed, a great person already at the age of 30, a remarkable man, a history maker.

Simply because of the fact that he can walk with kings and yet and still he can also be very comfortable to walk and lead and participate and fight for the common man, Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives will not be the same because we have a humble individual, an individual who knows greatness and knows that greatness evolves as a direct byproduct of working on behalf of common people.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. I ask for this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader about the schedule for today, tomorrow, the weekend, and next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my comments by adding my congratulations to those that have gone before me to the gentleman from Illinois. It is always a great thrill to be sworn in for the first time and to have your family here for the event.

Mr. Speaker, there will be no more legislative business today. I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the upcoming schedule for the remainder of the week.

Tomorrow, we plan to take up the conference report for H.R. 1530, the Department of Defense Authorization Act. There is also the possibility that the appropriations conference report for the District of Columbia will be ready for consideration tomorrow. We should know more about that possibly later today and will, of course, keep Members advised.

As Members know, it has been 25 days since the House passed our last CR. For over 3 weeks now we have been waiting for the President to become engaged in substantive discussions and present his alternative plan to reach a balanced budget in 7 years. Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting. We are eager to examine his alternative and to commence serious negotiations with the President at the table.

Mr. Speaker, if the President decides to get serious about these balanced

budget negotiations, there may be a possibility of a short-term continuing resolution for the weekend. Obviously, we will know more about that this afternoon after negotiations with the administration today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that I will be happy to engage in further discussions tomorrow regarding details of the schedule for next week.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. I just say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, I thank him for his patience in order for us to have this colloquy. I appreciate his patience, and I would also like to yield now to my friend, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN], who I think has a concern about the weekend.

Ms. LOFGREN. If I may inquire, I am a freshman Member of this body, and so perhaps this is the way things normally go, and I am certainly not opposed to working hard. But I, as do many parents in the Congress, have a little boy who believes in Santa Claus. I am wondering when I will get to take him to visit Santa Claus, and further, when all of the wonderful things that Santa Claus is going to bring him will actually arrive.

He did point out to me the other day that we did not work last Friday and we did not work this Monday, and we did not start working until late on Tuesday, and now it is 2 o'clock and we are knocking it off for the day.

My question is: Are we going to be working on Saturday to finish the appropriations bills not yet done? If not, why are we leaving now so that myself and the other parents might actually get their children to visit Santa Claus?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, let me just thank the gentlewoman for her observations.

It is a difficult time for all of us. I am amazed at how many Members have children and grandchildren that are dancing in the Nutcracker Suite this weekend all across this Nation, and it is a matter of enormous consequence to all of these families.

My governing principle, Mr. Speaker, is to schedule work when it is ready, to move it as quickly as we can. We had had other work scheduled for today. Unfortunately, the bill that might have been under consideration at this time was withdrawn for reasons that are of the committee's concerns.

The defense appropriations bill is obviously something we must move tomorrow, and can do so. If we have no work, that is, work that must be done on Saturday or Sunday, and I am sure the gentlewoman would agree with me, that should we approach an opportunity to complete the budget on Saturday or Sunday, I am sure she, as well as all the rest of the Members, would more prefer to stay here and do that and finish out the year.

But short of that work on the weekend, especially if it appears that we

will be here working next week, it would be my intention, under whatever parliamentary arrangements are possible, for us to have no work on the floor on Saturday and Sunday, so that those Members who are not otherwise engaged, perhaps in a conference or perhaps in the budget negotiations, could indeed grab a couple of days with their families before we come back and commence work on Monday.

I wish I could be more specific and give Members a definitive answer right now. But I think I owe it to all of us to be certain that I have, in fact, explored every possibility of having that definitive work before us before I close the door on Saturday and Sunday and encourage people.

So for now, I would suggest to the gentlewoman and to all of my colleagues, if you have plans to try to go home for the weekend, that is something that is, indeed, as these things are, very important to you and your family, do not cancel those plans. As soon as I can say something definitive, I will.

Mr. BONIOR. We thank the majority leader for his understanding and his reading of what he sees possible this weekend. We appreciate his concern.

Can the gentleman from Texas give us an indication, if we leave for this weekend or tomorrow, when we will resume on Monday next?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, of course, again, if it is possible, that is to say, unless I am otherwise compelled by compelling work, I would try to enable the Members to have Saturday, Sunday, and, say, Monday until 5 free from any votes on the floor.

Obviously, we all need this time. It is precious. And I would try to make it as extended a period of time as possible and would change from Monday at 5 only if compelled by some work that I thought would justify the inconvenience to the families.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, as the leader knows, this has been a very difficult year on the schedule and its impact upon families, on both sides of the aisle. And as we enter the holidays, Mr. Leader, I would hope that we would have some indication as to how late we are going to be going into the schedule next week. It is a very difficult time to get plane reservations to fly back home to our home districts and see families and spend time with families at the holiday.

Do you have some kind of indication as to how long into the next week we will be proceeding on the budget?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, let me make the observation, we are in very difficult, very serious, and extremely important negotiations with heartfelt differences

between the Congress and the White House, and while I am confident that everybody is trying to do their very, very best, and have my own hopes that the week could be shorter instead of longer, I simply could not with any degree of reliability give any intimation to the Members other than to advise you to be prepared to stay for a long, hard work week throughout all of next week, with the hope that perhaps we could reach some agreement that would allow me to come on this floor and enjoy your appreciation with my bringing of the good news, and I would hope that would happen.

Mr. ROEMER. As the leader knows, I want a balanced budget. I have been working hard for the last 11 months to achieve one, and certainly if we see progress, which I hope we see more of in the ensuing days, we are willing to work hard next week to achieve that final outcome in a bipartisan manner.

But as the leader knows, we also, if he could indicate to us, if that is going to be December 24 or 23, that is helpful for us as we make plans. It is also helpful for us in many ways as we try to plan out our work schedule and our family schedules.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the point the gentleman makes.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, what I see and what we see expressed here, we have 435 people here that share a commitment to their families and a commitment to the Nation through their work here, and we are all caught in a period of dire consequences and serious stress, trying to find a way, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] said so eloquently a few years back, to get home and love our children, and I can only say that insofar as I can do anything to accommodate the Members and their families while also accommodating to their sincere desire to complete the year's work in a responsible fashion, I will make that effort, and I will try to keep the Members as advised and as current as I can possibly do with any certainty at any time.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman for that, Mr. Leader. I just have one final question.

Two days ago the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conducted a rule change concerning the book royalty issue. It is a long-overdue reform. It was unanimously approved by the committee. The chairwoman has clearly indicated that the bill would be considered before the end of this session.

We are concerned by press reports we saw in the paper this morning indicating that the leadership on your side of the aisle may be blocking the committee's unanimous recommendation, and I guess my question to you this afternoon is will the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct recommendation for immediate action be honored

by the Republican leadership? And can we see this bill within the next week?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for your inquiry.

As the gentleman knows, a bill has been drafted and has been submitted, assigned to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules has the bill under consideration, and I cannot tell you with any degree of certainty what will be the dispatch of that bill by the committee, but I am confident that the Committee on Rules will act on this bill in full regard to its own fine traditions as a committee and the kind of consideration that such legislation takes, and I have to tell you I have had only a very, very brief discussion with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and a discussion in which he has assured me that the bill would get all the serious consideration in the due course of time that is appropriate within the traditions of this fine committee.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So I guess the other question is, though, when will this be acted on? Because the hope had been, by this unanimous decision of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to move on this, that it would be done before we went home. And since we have all of this extra time and the budget has not been solved, is there anything blocking this from coming up right now?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I will just say to the gentlewoman, the bill is in the committee of jurisdiction. The committee of jurisdiction has the jurisdiction. It is not at all unusual, I dare say, every individual Member who drops a bill in the hopper does so with the sincere hope that it will be acted on immediately. That rarely is the case, and there are procedures known best to the committee, and I do not think it is appropriate for me as a Member or as the majority leader to second-guess how a committee will exercise its jurisdiction.

I think we have committees, and each committee has its own manner of operating, and I do not think that it would be appropriate for me to speculate on the manner in which this committee nor any other committee would dispense with a bill.

□ 1415

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina).

Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WEI JINGSHENG'S SENTENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the People's Republic of China imposed a harsh new prison sentence on its most prominent human rights campaigner, Wei Jingsheng. Today the New York Times in translation has presented us with the reasons that the People's Republic of China has meted out this draconian sentence against its leading human rights activist. The charge, according to the People's Republic of China, was overthrowing the government, overthrowing the government, and what did this man who is nominated by many in this body for the Nobel Peace Prize do to cause the People's Republic of China to charge him, and convict him, and sentence him for overthrowing the government? Let me read from the Chinese Government statement about the conviction, quote:

The court's investigation showed that Wei, in attempting to overthrow the government, developed a plan of action which included establishing an organization to raise funds to support democratic movement activities.

Well, that is true enough. Wei Jingsheng has long been an advocate for democracy in the People's Republic of China. He was a leader in the democracy wall movement which took its name from the wall near the city where democratic activists hung their pro-freedom manifestos. He served over 14 years in prison labor camps in China where, according to reliable reports, he was beaten and tortured. Now having been out of prison for only a few months, Mr. Speaker, he was charged and convicted again for promoting democracy.

Let me read further from the government's statement:

He is responsible for purchasing newspapers, setting up a company in charge of organizing cultural activities.

All of these things got him a prison sentence, keep in mind, colleagues: Organizing nongovernmental painting exhibitions, performances, and publications.

Wei Jingsheng worked actively to implement the above plans, quoted the Chinese Government. He bought 12½ percent of the shares of an urban credit cooperative in Beijing to start setting up a democracy movement bank, and he wrote and set an introduction to projects for assistance to people in charge of an overseas organization and asked for hundreds of thousands of U.S. dollars to fund his activities. He also registered a company in Hong Kong and used the name of the company to prepare art exhibitions in Beijing so as to recruit people in organizations that would be sympathetic to him. Wei Jingsheng also secretly connected some people both in China and abroad

to study struggle strategies, conspiring to unite the illegal organizations in China, by which they mean the illegal pro-democracy organizations in China, and act when the right moment comes. He also used illegal means—now I am again quoting from the People's Republic of China official statement of yesterday:

*** and published a series of articles overseas to slander and attack the Chinese Government, the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and the Socialist system, and to advocate the independence of Tibet, something that another Nobel laureate, another Nobel Peace Prize winner, is guilty of. He and the enemy forces overseas, among which we may number ourselves in this body, echo each other and try to create publicity. Certainly that is worthy of a prison sentence, to overthrow the people's democratic dictatorship, sabotage the Socialist system, and separate the country.

Wei Jingsheng will be in jail for another 14 years, and the response from the Clinton administration has been deafening. One of our Democratic colleagues said yesterday, "I think the administration policy is a dismal failure in every respect, and I think the sentence is a slap in the face." The New York Times notes today that the Clinton administration, while criticizing China, stopped conspicuously short of threatening specific retaliatory action.

Mr. Speaker, even our Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights said only, "We urge the Chinese authorities to show clemency." Clemency, colleagues, is due someone who is guilty. Wei Jingsheng is innocent, he is an innocent man wrongly charged, and this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, should band together in his support.

TREATING OUR FELLOW MEMBERS WITH RESPECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk very briefly about something that is concerning me very deeply, especially in light of some of the debate or lack of debate that took place in this Chamber last night on the Bosnian question.

President Bush referred to a growing mood on Capitol Hill as a climate of ugliness, and President Thomas Jefferson talked about, when he wrote the manual that we all read as new Members of Congress and try to refresh our memories about the rules of civility and comity in this body; we all read Thomas Jefferson's words, and he stated, and I quote:

It is very material that order, decency and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as the debate spirals downward at times and people resort to the temptation of

name-calling, and finger-pointing, and fisticuffs rather than camaraderie, and civility, and community, that we not only hurt bipartisanship in this body now and in the future, but I think we tear at the fabric of what Americans deeply respect about this institution and what they want us to do today, and that is to work together to solve some of our problems in a bipartisan way on the budget, on making Congress work more efficiently and effectively, of downsizing Government, particularly committees and subcommittees here in this body, and that we can do it in a civil manner, being civil to one another.

My very first vote, Mr. Speaker, 4½ years ago as a new Member of Congress was on the Persian Gulf, and I was inducted into this body with such a deep sense of awe and respect not because George Washington's picture is in this body, not because In God We Trust is above the flag here in this Chamber, but because Members treat each other with respect, and although we had disagreement on the timing of going to war, everybody respected the differences in opinion, and everybody was a patriot.

Last night's debate did not include that kind of respect, and I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, on a quote from Speaker Joe Cannon who once said:

It is true we engage in fierce combat, we are often intense partisans, sometimes we are unfair, not infrequently unjust, brutal at times, and yet I venture to say, taken as a whole the House is sound at heart. Nowhere else will you find such a ready appreciation of merit and character. In few gatherings in equal size is there so little jealousy and envy.

I think the first part of that statement is very true, Mr. Speaker. We do have fierce partisanship at times, but we should always have the nature and character of civility which is reflected in our rules come to the foremost, be held at the highest respect and esteem for all Members, and that we continue to work in a bipartisan way for what is best for the American people.

□ 1415

FUNDING AMERICA'S DEFENSE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]. I think he was right on the ball. I do not necessarily agree with the strategy or the tactics used by the House, and I probably would have supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] if it had—I did not fight to get that unanimous consent removed.

As I stated in my opening remarks last night, I thought all the Members across the board had good intentions in this thing. I would support that. I would also tell my friend that quite often when we sit on this side of the aisle, we feel that there is a lot of misinformation on Medicare, that there are no cuts and different things, and a different way to get to education, and it is difficult to come to those terms sometimes when you are getting slammed down on the ground all the time. I would work, and I know the gentleman does, and I know how he works, and I know that he himself would do that. The problem sometimes is with leadership. I would work with the gentleman.

Let me go to the issue that I want to talk about.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say, as classmates and people who serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, you and I do work in a bipartisan way on many occasions, and I have a great amount of respect for you. When we had the Persian Gulf debate, and as a former war hero, you have added a great deal to the debate we have had on military matters.

I just have a deep, deep regret and a heavy heart when we have the kind of lack of civility that took place in the body last night on a unanimous-consent motion, on a resolution supporting not the mission—with which I disagree—in Bosnia, but the confidence in our troops and the support for our troops, which I wholly agree with. I would hope that we could have agreed to that unanimous consent last night.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to talk about a little today, and I do not have time to do it fully, and it is not on a partisan issue, is that many of us voted last night on our consciences, and feeling that we were doing the best thing for our troops overseas. My concern, as I stated, is not the votes last night, Mr. Speaker. My concern is what comes in the future, that we hear people say they want to support the troops, they want to make sure that they do not come back in body bags; that they come back.

There are legitimate issues on how much we should spend for defense and how much not. But remember when the President ran in his campaign, he said a \$50 billion defense cut would put us into a hollow force, and then in his first tax bill would put us at a \$177 billion defense deficit, would decrease defense.

Because of some of the different environments we go to in the world, with Haiti and Somalia, the different areas, and I am not going to go through the negative of those, but it has put us even further below what the require-

ments of defense are. GAO has said we are \$200 billion below the Bottom-Up review. The Bottom-Up Review was, remember, drafted by then-Secretary Les Aspin and the President to see what our needs would be to be able to fight two conflicts, and the minimum we would need to be able to do that. When you are \$200 billion below that, then it tells you that you need to put some more dollars into national security for this country.

Some people on the debate tomorrow will say that there is more in this defense authorization bill than the President asked for. This is true. But as I take a look, let me give you a couple of examples.

The F-15 Strike Eagle, the Air Force has not bought a single airplane in 3 years because of the budget. They are using the F-15 Strike Eagles in Bosnia today, out of Italy and other places. They are also using the F-16. The Navy is using the F-18 CD, which is the latest model. The service life on those airplanes is coming due and there is no replacement for them.

In this budget that is coming up tomorrow, what we do is replace some of the life cycle in the aircraft that we have been using prior to that in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We take a look at something my friend has fought for, impact aid that we took out of the budget, and to be able to provide for that. He and I agreed we do not have as much as we would like in that.

I also look at Captain O'Grady. Captain O'Grady, when he was shot down over that portion of the world, told me personally, he said, "DUKE, I did not have the training, the ACM time that we need," the air combat maneuvering.

I would ask my colleagues to take a look at what the needs are in defense. We need to support our kids. Support the bill tomorrow, and do what is right.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute my name for that of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] during special orders.

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

There was no objection.

THE HURRY-UP-AND-WAIT SCHEDULE OF CONGRESS, AND THE HANDLING OF ETHICS COMMITTEE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, those who saw the scheduling colloquy a few minutes ago absorbed another very pec-

uliar development here in the House. You see, at 2 in the afternoon, at 3 o'clock perhaps, a little bit in the middle of the workday for most American families, the House quit for the day. We are now at a point in our debate where we can debate some of the issues, but the official proceedings, here in the middle of the workday the House concluded its proceedings.

This is at a time when we near a Government shutdown, two of the conference reports on appropriations bills have not even been presented to this House, and according to the scheduling colloquy, it appears that one of them, one of the two, is a possibility for tomorrow, on the shutdown day, and the other one we got no indication of whatsoever.

The even more peculiar thing about this hurry-up-and-wait schedule that exists here in the Congress was the portion of the scheduling colloquy that related to the subject of ethics. It was only about a week ago that not just any bill but a measure concerning a rule on book royalties was referred not by just a Democrat, or not just by a Republican, but by the unanimous vote of an equally divided committee, half Republicans and half Democrats, the House Ethics Committee asked for a unanimous rule, or asked for a rule unanimously, I might say, to be in effect by the end of this year concerning book royalties. It was sent over to the Committee on Rules.

Members will recall that they took this action in a letter dated December 6, upbraiding and reprimanding the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] in regard to books and in regard to repeated ethical violations here in the House. After finding three clear violations of the rules of conduct of the House, they said in addition, with regard to the book "To Renew America," the one published through Mr. Murdoch's company, they said that

Concerning the publication of your book "To Renew America," while the amount involved greatly exceeds the financial bounds of any book contract contemplated at the time the current rules were drafted, the committee strongly questions the appropriateness of what could be described as an attempt by you to capitalize on your office with reference to this book.

They go on to say that, at a minimum, what the Speaker has done creates the impression, and this is their words, this bipartisan committee, " * * * of exploiting one's office for personal gain." They say the conduct was basically at such a level that to be sure no other Member of this House ever does this again, we need a rule on the books, the same kind of rule that would have been on the books had there been any real commitment to true ethical reform in this House on the first day back on January 4, 1995, because that is when it could have been adopted and when it should have been adopted.

But even after waiting almost a year, they say unanimously on a bipartisan basis, "Such a perception" regarding this book, and again I quote them, "is especially troubling when it pertains to the office of the Speaker of the House, a constitutional office regarding the highest standards of ethical conduct, and so the committee has drafted an amendment to the House rules to treat income from book royalties as part of outside earned income subject to the annual limit of House rule 47. The committee will propose this resolution to take effect January 1, 1996."

Mr. Speaker, when asked about that today, the majority leader said, "I will not prejudge the committee process. Anybody can go file a bill. Maybe the Committee on Rules will get to it and maybe it will not." He knows full well from reading the morning papers that the chairman of the Committee on Rules has said, and I quote, that he is "unalterably opposed to even the concept that you would want to limit book royalties"; that is to say, unalterably opposed to doing what a unanimous Ethics Committee recommended because of the scandal associated with the Speaker's book contract with Rupert Murdoch. So apparently we are going to approach this week, we are going to approach next week, we are going to approach the end of 1995, and have no real ethics reform.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, this is not the result of the action of one chair of one committee. The Speaker could bring this rule change to the floor right now. It need not wait until the sun sets, if it ever does here in Washington today. No, indeed. We could be moving forward on the issue of ethics, but in this House, whether it is lobby reform or gift ban or campaign finance reform, the slogan seems to be "Just say no or just say Newt." They seem to mean the same thing.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2661, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FISCAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight have until midnight tonight, Thursday, December 14, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 2661.

It is my understanding that this request has been cleared with the minority leader's office.

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

There was no objection.

THE MATERIAL GIRL OF THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION: SECRETARY OF ENERGY O'LEARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I am understanding that the House has ceased its activities here. However, the rest of Congress is working in their offices, answering constituent relations and working on active legislation. If the gentleman cares to take the afternoon off, it is fine with me, but the rest of the House is working.

That is not what I want to talk about. I want to talk about the Clinton administration's material girl. Secretary O'Leary has leased, at taxpayers' expense, for overseas travel the same luxury jet that Madonna uses. Now Clinton's material girl has been overseas 16 times in the last 3 years. She has been out of the country 50 percent more days than Secretary of State Warren Christopher. Secretary of State Warren Christopher's responsibilities include foreign policy and foreign relations. When he gets off an airplane overseas, when you see his face and him stepping off an airplane, he is doing his job. But the material girl, the Secretary of the Department of Energy, is responsible for civilian nuclear waste, Department of Defense stockpile and safety, Department of Defense nuclear waste, the national energy labs, all inside the United States, power marketing administrations, strategic oil reserves, all of which are within the United States of America, but the material girl's overseas trips are also expensive. They are as high as \$720,000 each. Several of these trips have expenses that are unaccounted for, some as high as \$150,000. One of these trips, the same luxury jet that Madonna uses, Secretary O'Leary took 51 staffers and 68 guests. It cost the taxpayers \$560,000. There is only about \$70,000 that is currently unaccounted for.

That is why the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and myself have requested the Government Accounting Office to do an audit, so we hope it will be done early next year. I think it is time that we stop this misuse of taxpayers' money and account for the expenses that we cannot account for at this point.

Mr. Speaker, this excessiveness, this mismanagement, this extravagance, is just the tip of the iceberg. It started off with GAO report that highlighted problems about management at the Department of Energy. They lacked focus, they had an admission a minute.

Then there was Vice President GORE's National Performance Review, who said within the Department of Energy the environmental management group was 40 percent inefficient and it was going to cost taxpayers \$70 billion over the next 30 years if something is not done. Then we found out there were 529 public relations employees at the Department of Energy, one personal media consultant for the Secretary of Energy herself; and then there was the

private investigative firm, which she paid \$56,500 to find out who the unfavorable were in the press and in Congress. I was No. 4 on the list. Then there was her personal friend that she hired at \$95,166 year plus \$12,000 living expenses for the Department conflict resolution officer.

We have a lot of redundancy in Government, and we need to eliminate that out of the Department of Energy too. Two-thirds of the budget comes through the Department of Defense. There is duplication of effort within the labs. There is the nationalized oil fields at Elk Hills, CA. We have private companies that extract oil from the Earth. There are the Power Marketing Administrations that also are duplicative of the private sector.

That is why I am leading the task force to eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet-level agency, to remove the waste, consolidate the duplication, transfer to the private sector that which they do best, and eliminate the parts of Government that are unnecessary. Each time the material girl, Secretary O'Leary's mismanagement comes to the press, this effort gains support. It highlights the fact that something must be done.

This process of verifying has uncovered something else, though, that is probably worse than anything you have heard so far. That is that the material girl has transferred from the Department of the Interior \$500,000 to the Government of India to prepare the Taj Mahal for her arrival. Five hundred thousand dollars. What is so upsetting to me about this is that I can only think of the deficit we are running this year. I can only think of the budget we are dealing with. To spend \$500,000 to prepare the Taj Mahal for her arrival is taking away from our children's future. It is borrowed money that they are going to have to pay back. It is wrong. It is time to stop this wasteful spending.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet-level agency. The only way we can do that is to continue with this effort and this legislation. It is needed to balance the budget and it will stop the unnecessary spending.

□ 1445

SOCIAL POLICIES SHOULD REFLECT LATEST BIOMEDICAL KNOWLEDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of H.R. 2748, a bill to prevent the potentially devastating consequences of discrimination based on genetic information. I ask my colleagues to join us in

support of this critical legislation. Currently 26 of our colleagues have cosponsored the legislation.

As Chair of the Women's Health Task Force of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I closely followed reports earlier this year that increased funding for breast cancer research had resulted in the discovery of the BRCA1 gene-link to breast cancer. While the obvious benefits of the discovery include potential lifesaving early detection and intervention, the inherent dangers of access to genetic information are just becoming evident.

There is increasing concern that individuals will be denied access to health care and that employers might screen employees to eliminate those who could cause a rise in group premiums. The following actual cases document the cause for concern:

A 24-year-old healthy and insured woman is asked to sign a lifetime waiver exempting her from breast cancer coverage because of familial tendencies.

An insured, previously healthy man suffered a heart attack. After DNA-based testing revealed a hereditary form of high cholesterol, his insurance company refused to pay the hospital bills or cover future treatment for cardiovascular disease.

As our knowledge and understanding of the biomedical genesis of human health and disease increases, our social policies and ethical responsibilities need to be adjusted accordingly.

H.R. 2748, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Act of 1995 contains four major provisions. It prohibits insurance providers from: First, denying or canceling health insurance coverage; or, second, varying the premiums, terms, and conditions of health insurance coverage on the basis of genetic information; third, requesting or requiring an individual to disclose genetic information; and fourth, disclosing genetic information without the prior written consent of the individual.

The bill is uniquely focused, comprehensive, timely, and includes effective enforcement mechanisms. It is focused on the issues of insurance discrimination and privacy as they relate to genetic information. It comprehensively covers all types of insurance providers including self-funded and ERISA plans. It is timely in that it tackles insurance discrimination and privacy issues related to genetic information before they become epidemic. It provides both State and Federal measures to ensure effective enforcement.

Grave concern about these issues and enthusiastic support for the bill has come from the American Cancer Society, the National Breast Cancer Coalition, and the Council for Responsible Genetics. The National Action Plan on Breast Cancer, the NIH-DOE Working Group on Ethical, Legal and Social Im-

plications of Human Genome Research and the National Advisory Council for Human Genome Research have joined together to address the issue of genetic discrimination and health insurance. Their work has resulted in development of four policy recommendations. Those recommendations provide the foundation for Federal legislation to prevent discrimination on the basis of genetic information. This bill encompasses those recommendations.

This bill, which addresses the profound questions about who will have access to genetic information and how this information will be used by others, is critically important to the health and well-being of this Nation's women, men, and children and our future generations.

NO FUNDS FOR THE TREASURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House debated H.R. 2621, a bill which would, in my opinion, force a default of the U.S. Treasury on U.S. debt and forestall payment, not only of principal and interest on U.S. debt for the first time in our history, but also forestall payments on Social Security, Federal and military pensions. In fact, this bill was advertised as one which would protect Social Security and Federal and military pensions, but in fact, the end result would be causing a default and leaving the Treasury with no funds whatsoever to pay those payments to the beneficiaries who have paid into those systems.

During the debate, I referred to a speech which Speaker NEWT GINGRICH made before the Public Securities Association on September 21, 1995, just earlier this year. In this speech is where the Speaker plainly and clearly advocated defaulting on U.S. debt in order to force the President and the Nation to accept his budget and no other budget.

My assertion was called into question by my colleague and friend from Michigan, and therefore, I submit for the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to include the following article from the New York Times as printed on September 22, 1995 entitled "Gingrich Threatens U.S. Default if Clinton Won't Bend on Budget."

Mr. Speaker, let me quote a couple of excerpts from this article. The article starts out:

House Speaker Newt Gingrich threatened today to send the United States into default on its debt for the first time in the Nation's history to force the Clinton administration to balance the budget on Republican terms.

The article goes on to say:

Clearly, part of Mr. Gingrich's autumn end-game strategy is to force the White House to accept much of this agenda, many

parts of which President Clinton has vowed to veto, by holding an increase in the Federal debt limit hostage. Without an increase in the Federal debt, the government will be unable to meet many of the payments due in November for Social Security, military pay, and interest on the Federal Government's \$4.9 trillion debt.

Such confrontational techniques have been used in the past, but it has been highly unusual for a high government official or high government leader to suggest, as Mr. Gingrich did today, that default on government payments was not beyond the pale.

Let me quote directly from the Speaker. As we would say, the Speaker speaks. "I don't care what the price is," he said in his speech. "I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days, not this time."

What that means, Mr. Speaker, is if we had a default and we had no bonds and we were not able to roll over the debt, that would mean that the Government would run out of money, and what that would mean is when Social Security checks need to be sent out, the Government would not have any money and the Government would not be able to take the Treasury securities, which Social Security invested in, and reinvest those into the market to raise capital. So in effect we would be high and dry; and unfortunately, the millions and millions of Americans who have paid into Social Security and count on that money to come every month would be high and dry, too.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, it is appalling, I believe, for this House to play with a time bomb such as the U.S. creditworthiness. We have a triple-A rating, and yet we have this revolutionary new Congress which believes it would be revolutionary to hold the country hostage and throw the Nation into default, to do away with our triple-A rating, to raise interest rates for all Americans, and to withhold the Social Security checks, the Medicare checks, the military checks, the pension checks to Americans who deserve those because they paid into them.

Let me remind my fellow colleagues of the House of the last revolutionary movement which decided to not stand up and pay its debts. It was the Bolshevik movement after the Russian Revolution in 1917, which refused to honor the Czar's bonds because, they said, "We have a new leadership here and we are not going to honor those." Even today, people throughout the world hold those bonds and they are worthless. Even today, the Soviet Union, having broken the bonds of communism, has trouble entering the markets because of what happened back in 1917.

We do not want that to happen to the United States we do not want to see what happens to the United States, what we debated earlier this year with respect to Mexico. We are the greatest nation on the face of the Earth. We are the leader of the free world. We are the strongest economy in the world.

The U.S. Treasury bond is the gold standard for the world. All other interest rates are tied off of it, and yet the Speaker threatens a default and threatens to destroy the creditworthiness of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD, that was the Speaker's position, and I hope he will renounce it.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1995]

GINGRICH THREATENS U.S. DEFAULT IF CLINTON WON'T BEND ON BUDGET

(By David E. Sanger)

WASHINGTON.—House Speaker Newt Gingrich threatened today to send the United States into default on its debt for the first time in the nation's history, to force the Clinton Administration to balance the budget on Republican terms.

His comments, a more extreme version of the hardball stance frequently used in past budget showdowns, raised the specter that the looming standoff may begin to rattle financial markets around the world. Mr. Gingrich's remarks came in the middle of a day in which the dollar plunged as much as 5 percent against major currencies before recovering slightly, sending interest rates up sharply. [Page D13.] The Speaker's statement appeared to be one of several factors that added to the markets' unsettled condition.

More broadly, Mr. Gingrich's speech to the Public Securities Association, which represents traders in Government debt, underscored the growing agitation and sense of imminent collision in official Washington as both Democrats and Republicans move toward a confrontation that could shut the Government down this fall.

Throughout the capital, there was a sense that the current had quickened and the rumble of a great waterfall could be heard close ahead. Angry disputes broke out on wildly varying issues. Republicans threatened to block sending American ground troops to enforce the Bosnia peace plan, agreed to vast reductions in the protection for endangered species and Federal lands, and pushed ahead with plans for radical changes in Medicare and Medicaid. Democrats fumed and vowed to do what they could to slow the legislation's breakneck pace.

Clearly part of Mr. Gingrich's autumn endgame strategy is to force the White House to accept much of this agenda—many parts of which President Clinton has vowed to veto—by holding an increase in Federal debt limit hostage. Without an increase in the limit, the Government will be unable to meet many of the payments due in November for Social Security, military pay and interest on the Federal Government's \$4.9 trillion in debt.

Such confrontational techniques have been used in the past. But it was highly unusual for a high Government leader to suggest, as Mr. Gingrich did today, that default on Government payments was not beyond the pale. "I don't care what the price is," he said in his speech. "I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days—not this time."

Without concessions from the White House across the board, he said, there will not be any increase in the debt ceiling. "And we'll see how long they will last," he added.

Administration officials were still trying tonight to figure out how seriously to take Mr. Gingrich's comments. A few months ago, the Speaker was forced to back away from his off-the-cuff suggestions that the United

States should recognize Taiwan as an independent country, a step that would lead to a breach with China.

But Congress has little direct influence over foreign policy. By contrast, its control of the Government's purse strings gave added force to Mr. Gingrich's remarks. Indeed, the Speaker's comments drew a quick and harshly worded response from Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin. "The President won't be blackmailed by the use of the debt limit as a negotiating lever," he said in a telephone interview from Miami, where he was giving a speech tonight.

"It would be unprecedented and unwise for anyone in a position of authority to dismiss the consequences of default on the debt of the United States of America for the first time in our history," he added. "Even the appearance of a risk of default can have adverse consequences, and a default itself would increase the cost of debt for the United States Government for many, many years to come. A sovereign country's creditworthiness is a precious asset not to be sacrificed under any circumstances."

Mr. Rubin said he did not expect the United States to default on any debt payment, a step that he has repeatedly called "unthinkable." But even a serious threat of a disruption in payments can move the markets, and may send borrowing costs soaring for the United States.

The Treasury Department estimates that every increase of one percentage point in interest rates would swell the budget deficit by \$4.9 billion this year. Republicans, however, argued that interest rates should decline if the ultimate outcome of the dispute between the parties is a big cut in spending.

Aside from all the Sturm und Drange in Washington, the debt limit debate has not yet had much effect, traders said. "The markets have not yet focused on it," said David M. Jones, vice chairman of Aubrey G. Lanston & Company, which trades Government bonds. "One of the risks is that foreign investors will not understand what is happening here. And if they get nervous, they will just flee until it all sorts out."

The issue will take on added urgency in the first five days of November, when the Government must pay \$50 billion in Social Security benefits, Medicare and pay for active-duty members of the military. On Nov. 15, about \$25 billion of interest payments are due.

As Treasury officials concede, a number of financial tricks are available to keep the Government afloat even if the ceiling on debt is not raised. There are temporary debt limits, emergency "cash management sales" to keep money flowing in the coffers as short-term loans, and borrowing against other Government reserves. But all of the steps come with a cost, and none can go on for too long. Though the overall Government debt is \$4.9 trillion, the Treasury sells about \$2 trillion of debt securities every year because so much of the Government's borrowings are "rolled over" into new bonds.

The debt limit exists as an institution in Washington because the Constitution mandates that only Congress can authorize borrowings. Before World War I every bond issued by the United States required separate Congressional approval. Today, the raising of the debt ceiling essentially permits the Treasury Secretary to make the day-to-day decisions required to meet the Government's obligations.

40 YEARS OF TAX AND SPEND IS EXTREME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we have been called many names, the majority has. We have been called revolutionaries, just a few minutes ago even Bolsheviks maybe, but the main term has been extreme, extreme and mean-spirited, the "E" word.

Mr. Clinton has used it, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has used it, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has used it. It seems like there is a concerted effort to use the "extreme" word to describe the new majority.

Mr. Speaker, the new majority was elected by a majority of the people in this country. I do not consider them extreme; I think they saw something wrong with 40 years of one-party rule in this House. I think they saw something extreme about the spending over 40 years, and something extreme about the rising taxation that this one-party rule for 40 years had placed upon the American people.

What is extreme? What is extreme and mean-spirited about wanting a reasonable balanced budget within 7 years? What is extreme about wanting to reform welfare and end welfare as we know it? What is extreme about a plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy? What is extreme about wanting to reform Medicaid and allow the Governors, just like Governor Bill Clinton wanted, to see a change in Medicaid to save it and to make it more easily administered through the States. What is extreme about wanting to give tax cuts to families when the average family today is paying 40 percent of their income, and some approaching 50 percent, in local, State and Federal taxes? What is extreme about that?

Mr. Speaker, what is extreme about spending \$2.5 trillion over the next 7 years, more than what we are spending now? How much more does the President want to spend?

What is extreme is a President that has said over and over again he wants a balanced budget, but he never can bring himself to do it. What is extreme is 40 years of tax-and-spend that has brought this Nation almost to bankruptcy with a \$5 trillion debt. What is extreme is putting our children's future in jeopardy.

I have a 13-year-old daughter that, if we continue spending and spending and spending without ever balancing the budget, in the year 2012 every tax dollar will be consumed by entitlements and interest on the debt. What kind of future will she have? What kind of future will she have when she approaches my age in the year 2030? The deficit for 1 year will be over \$4 trillion, just for 1 year.

□ 1500

We are talking about the future of this Nation. What is extreme about wanting to save the economic viability of this Nation?

It seems that our liberal friends, led by Mr. Clinton, are more concerned about next year than the years after.

Extreme, mean-spirited. I have parents that are both 78 years old. I want to preserve the future of Medicare for them. I am a mainstream American. I came from mainstream America. I was elected by mainstream Americans that saw something critically wrong coming out of this Federal Government.

There are a lot of 78-year-olds just like my parents back in the Second District of Kentucky that want to have Medicare in their future. But because of an extreme point of view from the other side they are willing to see it go bankrupt before they are willing to save it for the future.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. Speaker, this week has been proclaimed by President Clinton as "International Human Rights Week" to commemorate the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The United States is a world leader in advancing the cause of human rights and is a signatory to two international treaties that guarantee these human rights, the U.N. Charter, and the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. Both of these treaties have been ratified by the U.S. Senate, and are therefore binding.

I call our Nation's attention to Article I of the U.N. Charter and Article I of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—in both treaties, the right to self-determination of peoples is affirmed.

Self-determination for non-self governing peoples is the foundation from which other human rights are exercised. Guam is a non self-governing territory, and its status as a non self-governing territory whose people are entitled to exercise self-determination is specifically stated in the U.N. Charter. And we should note that Guam was placed on the United Nation's list of the non self-governing territories by the United States over 47 years ago.

Within this context, it should be of great concern to this Congress and to the President that the desires of the people of Guam to exercise their rights and to improve their political status have not been met with the same fervor and the same level of attention that the United States gives to other peoples' problems.

Every year it is always someone else or some other nation who needs to repair its record on human rights and self-determination. But what about Guam? What about our desires for political rights and for our exercise of self-determination by our indigenous people?

As President Clinton stated in his proclamation, "Peoples throughout the world look to the United States for leadership on human rights." Yes, Mr. President, that is correct, and to this I would add that people in the non self-governing colonies of the United States look to you for leadership on human rights. We look to you to respond to Guam's desire to create a new commonwealth within the American political family. And we look to you to respond to our desire to exercise self-determination in deciding our political status.

We ask that the United States fulfill the commitments it made to the people of Guam and to the community of nations when it signed and ratified the U.N. Charter and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to be responsive to the inherent political commonsense of this Nation to extend full democracy everywhere.

So far, the Federal Government's reaction has been sincere pledges to respond to Guam. And, for a while there, the Clinton administration looked like it had the commitment to respond in a serious way to Guam's efforts. But now we are stuck in neutral because of what surely would look like a comedy of errors, albeit unintentional, on the part of the administration. We have now gone through three status negotiators in 1995 alone. We have been unable to negotiate because there is now no one to negotiate with.

Can you imagine this happening with the Bosnian peace talks? Why would United Nation and international commitments now be meaningless when applied to a United States colony?

I call on the administration today to heed its own words, to live up to the international commitments and international standards of human rights that it has agreed to in the U.N. Charter.

We normally think of human rights violations as the violent denial of basic freedoms in many parts of the world. There is the denial of free expression and the incarceration of dissident voices. This is the violent abuse of human rights.

But there are other forms. In much the same way that the neglect of children is also a form of child abuse as is violent behavior, ignoring the political desires of a people for whom you have a responsibility qualifies as an abuse of human rights. The people of Guam have spoken through local referenda and they deserve serious and sustained attention to their political aspirations. To ignore these political aspirations is an abuse of human rights by neglect.

The Congress and the President as the representatives of the American people have consistently delivered the message throughout the world that good government can only begin when there is true consent of the governed. This is the core American creed. In the American territory of Guam, the vast majority of laws, the very political structure that the people live under are determined not by the people, but by a Congress in which they have no voting representation and by a President they have not elected.

Government through the consent of the governed is the most basic of all political rights and should remain the cornerstone of the structure of human rights. We should challenge ourselves to make sure that human rights are defended not just under the American flag when our troops are deployed in foreign lands, but that these human rights are also defended under the American flag when it flies over the non self-governing U.S. territories.

CELEBRATING COMMUNITY: THE OPENING OF THE NEW MARTIN LUTHER KING CENTER IN FREEPORT, IL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. Speaker, as we debate reaching the balanced budget by the year 2002 and what role the Federal Government should play in restoring hope to our children's future, one of the misguided arguments that some of my colleagues continue to banter in Congress and in the media is that the American people cannot trust anyone but the Federal Government to provide assistance and/or programs in the areas of need.

By what arrogance can this argument be made? To suggest that left to their own devices, the American people cannot provide for their families and neighbors? The notion that local communities and local governments cannot be trusted? Please. This country was built through the goodness of people helping people. From the earliest days of the original colonies, the people of this Nation have thrived off the common goodness of its neighbors, its communities.

If we are to believe that there is nothing trustworthy outside of the Federal behemoth bureaucracy, whom are we accusing of being untrustworthy? Which Governor? Which State legislature? Which county? Which city or school district? Which community can we not trust?

I believe men and women, parents, elected officials, churches and other community leaders are best able to achieve the longest lasting and most effective changes we need in our society. Day by day, neighborhood by

neighborhood, child by child, family by family, America gets stronger.

President Coolidge once said: "No person was ever honored for what he received. Honor has been the reward for what he gave."

Let me tell you about what one community has done. On November 18 of this year, the city of Freeport in the 16th District of Illinois celebrated the achievements of hard effort and leadership when it opened the new Martin Luther King Jr. Community Campus, and this is a picture of that beautiful campus. This beautiful \$3 million facility was built and paid for without any tax dollars or Federal grants. The facility was built with the commitment and dedication of the local community.

It started with a vision by the late Rev. Robert Huff to create a community center where area children and families could get whatever assistance they needed. Unfortunately, he passed away before he could witness the reality of his vision.

This beautiful new facility was made possible by the hard efforts and dedication of people like Jack Meyers, who led the fundraising campaign, and Ray Alvarez of Honeywell's Microswitch, who was instrumental in rallying community support for this construction.

The new MLK Campus in Freeport has not been erected only of mortar and bricks. It stands firmly on the convictions and hopes and dreams of the people dedicated to making Freeport a city committed to the future of their community, a future that is unified behind helping their neighbors locally.

The community campus has already provided many tangible results. It helped Wendy Mader realize her dream of becoming a licensed day care provider; Tameka Carter, who is reaching her dream of becoming a lawyer. And the Martin Luther King Campus helped Sharon Serna work through the single parent program to get off public aid, get an education, and become a registered nurse. Her dream was made possible by the local people who make the MLK Community Campus not only the envy but a model of what other communities in this country are accomplishing.

Again, the facility was built without one Federal dollar, built by the dedication and hard effort of the people of a small city in rural Illinois. Have any of their programs used Federal dollars? Yes, but the programs are designed and tailored by the local people for the local people.

Currently, Congress is working on major changes on how social services in this country are funded. The idea is that after 30 years of spending 40 cents out of every dollar on a huge Federal bureaucracy, we can be more efficient with our programs if we get the money back to the local people in the best manner possible.

If centers like the King Campus choose to apply for tax dollars, they

should be able to get the most out of every tax dollar, not just 60 cents but 90 or 95 cents. That kind of efficiency cannot be accomplished through a huge Federal bureaucracy.

The campus is the perfect example of local control and local success.

I salute the efforts of everyone at the MLK Campus. I salute the people who have found a second chance or the special assistance they need through the center. And I want to salute the people of Freeport, who in their own way have proven that we do not need the Federal Government dictating policy to provide for their community.

What we need is the commitment and dedication of the people of the community who are willing to face a challenge and willing to meet the needs of the people they love so dearly and the people they serve so well.

KEEPING THE DISTRICT IN BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is day one of the countdown to shutdown. I have been on the floor virtually every day since the last shutdown. But I speak not of the shutdown of the Federal Government. There was an unintended consequence. The city I represent was also shut down.

A shutdown of a complicated big city is nothing short of a catastrophe. If there is a continuing resolution, it will be marginally better, but imagine putting handcuffs and a straitjacket on a city at the same time and then saying, "Run your city well on a weekend CR or a weeklong CR, and keep from over-obligating, and make sure you spend enough money."

I am here this afternoon to express my gratitude to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and to the DC Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, these two committees unanimously passed a bill to allow the District of Columbia to spend its own revenue instead of being shut down. I express my gratitude to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the committee, and to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], the chairman of the subcommittee. I will put an op-ed piece by Mr. DAVIS on this very subject into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The op-ed piece is headlined, "Why Shut Down the District?" The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] marshals all the arguments for not doing so.

Why was there such bipartisanship on this bill? In the first place, it was a matter of sheer principle. The Members knew and saw that shutting down the District was not their intent. They did

not mean to catch a whole city in this fight. Then of course the Members saw up close what happens when you shut down a city and the trash is not collected, and the city cannot go about its daily business, and the citizens suffer. It is not a pretty picture.

It is our money and only our own money that H.R. 2661 speaks to. The Federal payment would be left here at the discretion of the Congress.

What is happening in the District of Columbia as I speak? The district is preparing to shut down. What a terrible diversion for a city on the brink of insolvency, when this Congress has told it to do otherwise, to prepare for reform of its financial and management operations.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] was just on the floor saying that there could be a weekend or a weeklong CR. There could be two such CRs. Nobody can expect the District to run well in that way, even if it were healthy, as of course we know it is not.

Speaker GINGRICH encouraged us to continue with the bills. He has been very helpful to the District in the past. I am asking him to bring the bill to the floor today, so that before midnight on Friday this body can guarantee that the city, where this body sits, will in fact be open for business.

□ 1515

Only a few hours stand between us and closedown of a city we do not mean to close down. At midnight on Friday, the District of Columbia goes dark and hundreds of thousands of innocent bystanders will see their city go dark, while the Congress remains in session uninjured by any shutdown. No Member of this body desires that. No Member of this body would want to defend that.

Please, help me to keep my city open. Help me to help my city recover. The city wants to do what the Congress has mandated it to do: get its house in order. This Congress has put a Control Board on the city, and now the Control Board has testified that the last thing the city needs is to be shut down and have to pay its employees for not coming to work—as would have to be the case since they would be forced onto administrative leave. That is not the way to run even a small town.

I am here to say to my colleagues, we cannot run the Capital of the United States this way, and we cannot allow the word to go across the wires and around the world that some Federal agencies went back to work (and I congratulate you that some appropriations have now passed; it looks like ours will not, indeed, pass), but that the Congress of the United States allowed the Capital of the United States to close down catching 600,000 innocent people in the wake of our own special storm.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and

the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] have done. I appreciate that the Speaker has encouraged us to keep this bill going forward. Now, a little more than 24 hours stand between us and keeping the city of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC, open. Please, help us to do just that.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 14, 1995]

WHY SHUT DOWN THE DISTRICT?

(By Thomas M. Davis III)

Shutting down the federal government because Congress and the president fail to agree on a budget resolution is an act that has many unintended victims and numerous unintended consequences. The damper these failures put on recruiting and maintaining the best and the brightest for our federal work force will be with us for some time. On another level, the backsliding it inflicts on our efforts to change the District of Columbia government are profound.

The D.C. government is not just another federal agency. It is a front-line government providing vital health, safety and personal services to 570,000 residents and 300,000 metropolitan commuters. When federal agencies shut down, citizens in any city in the country can still get a driver's license and register their automobiles. When federal agencies shut down, the states can continue to process AFDC and Social Security applications. But when the District government shuts down, people needing services, whether medical care at a clinic or trash collection from their homes, are not served.

Congress should act immediately to ensure that the District of Columbia can spend its own locally generated tax dollars during such a shutdown. We can do this before this week's expiration of the current continuing resolution Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton has introduced legislation, H.R. 2661, to allow the District to spend its own revenues even if its budget has not been approved by Congress (the budget will still be subject to approval by the control board). I am a cosponsor of H.R. 2661, which yesterday was approved by the House subcommittee that oversees the District and is scheduled for full committee action today. It is imperative that Congress pass it for two important reasons.

First, without passage of H.R. 2661, the District government is subject to being shut down again, as it was Nov. 14-19. That's because the District's own appropriation has not been enacted, and there may be no continuing resolution to keep the government open.

The unique status of the District—the city cannot spend one penny of its budget, either local or federal revenues, without an appropriations bill being passed by Congress and signed by the president—has never before seemed important. In past federal shutdowns, the District appropriation had been enacted so that the city government could continue operations, or else the District has been put under a continuing resolution along with federal agencies that were without approved appropriations.

But this time there was no District appropriation and no continuing resolution. This places on the District of Columbia a unique burden. Every other city or state in the country can continue to operate its own programs, and may even take up the slack of missing federal funds from its own revenues when the federal government is shut down. But the District is stymied.

This situation is inexcusable even in normal times, but in the current financial crisis

it has become extreme. The District lost more than \$7 million in productivity during the recent shutdown, according to the control board, and it failed to collect up to \$70 million in revenue that it was owed. Meanwhile, contractors around the metropolitan area are going bankrupt every day, and the IRS files liens for unpaid tax withholding because the District of Columbia doesn't have the cash to pay its bills. Allowing the District to fall even farther behind in its revenue collection is tantamount to negligence on the part of Congress.

In addition to lost productivity and lost or delayed revenues, the very officials who have so much work ahead to rebuild and reform the city were forced to spend their time deciding what services and employees were "essential" in a government that is already notoriously dysfunctional. Instead of working on privatizing city services, City Administrator Michael Rogers had to write furlough notices. Instead of reviewing contracts and improving cash management, Chief Financial Officer Anthony Williams had to figure out new ways not to pay bills. Instead of pushing ahead publicly with the council on urgently needed reforms, Mayor Barry could only wonder what new disaster he would have to deal with next. And the control board, which is trying to push the District forward, could only make certain that the District complied with the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act and shut down everything that was not an imminent threat to health or safety. This is no way to run a city in the grips of a financial crisis.

Congress and the president could keep the federal and District governments open either by reaching a budget agreement or by enacting another continuing resolution. I am hopeful that one of these two events will occur before there's another shutdown. No one can possibly expect to escape the public outcry that would come from sending hundreds of thousands of workers home 10 days before Christmas.

But there is an even more compelling reason to enact H.R. 2661 immediately. While operating under a temporary continuing resolution, the D.C. government has no legal authority to obligate funds beyond the expiration of that resolution. Since continuing resolutions are emergency, stopgap measures, this forces the District government to operate on an emergency basis, signing contracts and planning spending schedules from week to week. This ad hoc operational mode is not only bad for contractors and other service providers; it runs exactly counter to what is most needed in the District government: stability and the ability to make long-range decisions.

Unless H.R. 2661 is enacted and the District is allowed to obligate its own revenues, even without an appropriation bill, the District will continue to limp from crisis to crisis, lacking the ability to take concrete, long-term actions or to make the decisions that would be in everyone's best interest.

Congressional oversight and ultimate control would not be threatened, because the District's federal payment is not included in H.R. 2661. This legislation would not free the District from federal oversight and would not give the city budget autonomy. It would simply allow the District to escape from the threat of shutdown and the gross inefficiencies of operating on a week-to-week basis, and to at least be able to crawl along on its own revenues during a budget impasse.

I am pleased that Speaker Gingrich, President Clinton and the control board support this legislation. Congress should act now to

pass it, and thus prevent further paid furloughs and a shutdown of city operations.

CHANGING THE CULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under the Speaker's announced positively of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank several of my colleagues for joining me in the House Chamber. As we discuss the pending events, we listen with great interest and, indeed, great agreement with our colleague, the delegate from the District of Columbia, and we realize also that the people have sent us here to Washington to change a culture, to change a pervasive practice which has permeated this Chamber and, indeed, our national governance for half a century.

In fairness, we should note that the Members of both parties have been involved in this, and it is this endless notion of tax-and-spend and tax-and-spend and tax yet higher and spend yet more. It is worth noting that one of our founders, Benjamin Franklin, said that there were only two certainties in this life: death and taxes. I dare say, if Mr. Franklin were with us in this Chamber as we prepare to confront this next century, he might amend his statement to say that higher taxes could lead to the death of the American Nation if we do not change what has gone on before.

The facts are these: In 1948, the average American family of four surrendered 3 percent of its income in taxes to the Federal Government. By 1994, that same average family of four surrendered almost one-quarter of its income, 24 percent, in taxes to the Federal Government.

It has been noted by Members of both parties that change is hard. Change is difficult. But as the newcomers to this Congress who join me this afternoon along with one of our distinguished Members of the sophomore class will bear out, change is necessary if we are to make a difference, if we are to prepare this last best hope of mankind to adequately confront the next century.

The people of the Sixth District of Arizona said it pretty simply in November of 1994. Indeed, I think it was said across the country. The realization is this: The people of America work hard for the money they earn, and there is nothing selfish and there is nothing ignoble about Americans hanging on to more of their hard-earned money so that they may decide how best to save, spend, and invest for their families, so that they may make critical choices so vital to their children's future and so that they as seniors can hold on to more of their money again to make choices that are best for them.

As I look around the Chamber, it is a formidable lineup. One of the gentlemen seated here, who we will hear from

shortly, indeed, an NFL Hall of Famer, one of the gentlemen to my left, uncharacteristically, a resident of California, indeed, I call him an honorary Arizonan, for his mother was born in the Sixth District of Arizona, near the Inspiration Mine, I know he will have words of inspiration for us; our friend from Nebraska, one of three newcomers on the House Committee on Ways and Means. It is worth noting the last Republican freshman to hold one of those spots was in 1966, a gentleman who went on to become President of these United States, one George Bush; our good friend from Indiana is here, who has worked so hard on trying to get a handle on regulations; our good friend from Kentucky from the sophomore class, who speaks so eloquently and is really a redshirt freshman, if you will, for he came by way of a special election.

Mr. Speaker, now it is my honor to turn to the one-time Princeton line-backer, who is proud of his Tigers in their accomplishments this year on the gridiron, who went on to law school at Wake Forest, and he helped to tutor those teams and improve the record of those Demon Deacons, my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRlich].

Mr. EHRlich. As usual, I am at a loss for words when the gentleman from Arizona introduces us. It is such a great opportunity to be with my colleagues from all over the country today to talk about, as the gentleman said, change, change that is long overdue in this society, change, and I believe the gentleman's words were necessary and hard.

I would point out to the gentleman, and we have a piece of evidence with us today, I would point out to the gentleman that change is hard in our society in the 1990's because some groups in our society do not like change. They do not want change. They will say anything to ensure change does not occur.

As the gentleman sees, I have brought the actual transcript with me of a little ad that is running around the country. The AFL-CIO, a big labor group, and I should make this point, not all elements of big labor but some big labor leaders and, of course, some big labor leaders love big government and, as a result, do not love this new majority nor this freshman class, but some members of big labor are running this ad.

I would like to direct a few questions to the gentleman from Arizona and my hallmate, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], my very good friend and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], "Mr. Deregulation," my very, very good friend on our Subcommittee on Government Reform. What I would like to do, with the gentleman's indulgence, is take a look for the next 10 or 15 minutes; let us take a look at the verbiage used by big labor

to fight not an agenda for America's working families but to fight this new majority who have the real interest of America's working families at heart, the real people who work for a living, who sent every one of us here. Every one of this group was sent here by people who work and who resent these sort of commercials.

The gentleman from Arizona, the commercial begins, "On November 20, our Congressman," fill in the blank, "voted with NEWT GINGRICH and against working families." What vote? The balanced budget, the balanced budget for America's working families.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, how on Earth can that statement even be made? For why would a balanced budget work against America's families? Are we not putting money back in the pockets of working families by balancing the budget on a 30-year mortgage? Are we not realizing real cash that stays in the wallets and pockets of working families? By lowering interest rates with a balanced budget, are we not really helping to fulfill the American dream?

I am just curious that the gentleman from Maryland understands the rationale for this statement and if it is grounded within any type of intellectual fact.

Mr. EHRlich. Of course not. If the gentleman will yield further, let us look at what follows the introduction. I know the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from California are chomping at the bit here, but it is essential that the American people understand big labor loves big government. They do not want a balanced budget. They do not want the agenda that every member of this freshman class ran on in support of the American family, in support of people who work for a living, who resent the increasing intrusion of big government into their lives every day.

Second line, "He voted to cut Medicare." Third line, "Education and college loans." Fourth line, my favorite, "Class warfare." Class warfare from big labor. "All to give huge tax breaks to big corporations," and our favorite, "the rich."

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman from Maryland. I appreciate your diligence ferreting out the truth on these ads. It is about time we had a standard of truth in advertising that would apply to some of the claims that are made.

Is it not true, though, that the average worker will benefit from our balanced budget because of lower interest rates, where, if they have to borrow \$15,000 to buy a new car, they will be able to save \$900 over the loan? Now that is \$900 that is more of his take-home money that he can pay. And is it

not true, in my district, for example, the median income is \$25,000; a lot of people work in factories. We have got several GM plants. We have got factories all over the District. That \$25,000 though, \$9,000 goes to pay for taxes for city, State, and Federal taxes. And is it not true that a key part of our budget plan says, "For a family of four we are going to take \$1,000 of that \$9,000 in taxes and let you keep it? You do not have to deduct it out of your paycheck every week and send it to Washington to pay for the bureaucrats; it is yours to take home, to buy food for your kids, to save for college, to make payments on that car we talked about."

So is it not true that every aspect of this budget is actually going to be good for the working men and women that the AFL-CIO say they represent?

Mr. EHRlich. I know the gentleman from California, and he has been accused of supporting from California, and he has been accused of supporting the rich as well, and I know that for a fact. But if I can answer the gentleman's question, of course, it is for the working people. But it is very dangerous medicine for big labor, for some elements of big labor, and they do not want the American people to know the facts.

Mr. RADANOVICH. My first comment on this is that, you know, if this was the advertising program of a private corporation, they would be in court right now pending lawsuits against them for truth-in-advertising. I know you did not vote to cut Medicare, because I voted the same as you, and I did not vote to cut Medicare. There is not a person in this Chamber here who voted to cut Medicare. We voted to increase spending on Medicare by 50 percent over a 7-year period from the current \$4,800 per beneficiary to at least \$6,700 per beneficiary over 7 years.

□ 1530

Now, I do not know what kind of an idiot these people think the American people are, but that is not a cut. The American people are smarter than that.

I would also like to comment on the fact that this Congress has not been working for working families, because we spend more than we take in. I would like to challenge any one of you to try to make sense about how we can be for working families while we cannot even balance our own budget, while we are deliberately spending more money than we are taking in. That is not good for families.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield, that is exactly the point, for this Congress should do no less than working families do every week or every month around the kitchen table, trying to come to grips with their own family budget, to make adjustments, to fight in part the battle of taxation that is too high, so that they know how

best to allocate their resources governed by this simple fact: They do not spend more than they take in or they are faced with one of the worse 4-letter words ever to come up, D-E-B-T, debt.

To quantify it, I do not believe this ad tells the truth. If you are going to say the rich, indeed with the family tax credit that my colleague from Indiana points out, it is a very expensive definition of rich, if we are to trust the ad of big labor, for it affects over 80 percent of American families across the economic strata. And that is the impact of the ad.

While we are in the neighborhood, and I know my friend from Indiana has a point, but just one other thing to say to respond to my colleague from California's musings about this particular advertisement and others like it: I have challenged my former colleagues in broadcasting, and indeed I did this at one of the local stations in Phoenix going to what in effect was a meeting of their editorial board, I said, friends, the reality checks, the truth watches that you do during the election season, why not continue now? Why not check the veracity of these ads?

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would call on broadcasters who are licensed in the public interest, local news divisions, network news divisions, do your own reality checks, do your own truth watches on these repugnant, patently false advertisements, for this is an ongoing campaign.

Mr. MCINTOSH. The question I get from people when I go home is my are they being dishonest? Why is this ad not telling the truth? Why does not the President tell the truth about what is going on? I have been trying to puzzle through that, because I do not understand why they would so patently lie to the American people time and time again.

This chart I think explains one of the reasons that is going on. It shows how in our budget process we have been continuing to negotiate over how much we are going to spend each year. The top line shows the freshmen started out with \$11.2 trillion. The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. MARK NEUMANN, who joined us here in the Chamber, developed a budget that would be balanced in 5 years and only spend \$11.2 trillion over that 7-year period. But we did not pass that in the House. Instead we passed a \$11.78 trillion 7-year balanced budget, and then negotiated with the Senate, where some of the President's allies inched it up to \$11.9 trillion. Then when we passed the act again this fall it went up a little bit further and further to this point, where we are at \$12.004 trillion. What the President wants to do is add another \$400 billion to that and take it up even further.

The bottom part of the chart shows what they have done with the taxes. In the Contract With America we started

out with \$358 billion of tax cuts for the American family. Then in compromising with the Senate, we came to \$245 billion in tax cuts. Now the President wants to shrink that down to about \$70 billion of tax cuts. You can see the parallel. As they cut back on tax relief and get more money for the Government, they can spend more over and over again.

So the question is, do we want to spend more for the bureaucrats' budget here in Washington, or do we want more for the family budget, for people who are living in America trying to make ends meet?

What we have said in the freshmen class in particular and in the Republican Congress is enough is enough. We think \$12 trillion is plenty of money to spend on the Government programs, and we need to start focusing on giving families some tax relief so that they can have an easier time of balancing their budgets and have more money available.

Let me make one other point. That would be reason why I think they are being dishonest. They want to spend more money and are afraid if they tell the truth people will focus on what the effect is for the family budget.

The second reason is, and I wanted to ask the question whether in his research on this issue of welfare for lobbyists, whether this advertisement was paid for by any groups who received taxpayer money?

Mr. EHRLICH. You mean grant reform? The dirty little secret this class has exposed? We have been joined by three of our wonderful colleagues in the freshmen class. You mean \$39 billion in taxpayer money?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Is it possible these groups want to make sure that some of this spending ends up going into their coffers? So they are going to lobby and send ads to make sure that they continue to live on the trough of all this Government spending?

Mr. EHRLICH. As the gentleman knows, we have exposed, I think, "we" being the class in the new majority, have exposed a lot of very relevant information that the people of America need to know about, some nonprofits, some for-profits, some groups in this country, who continually take the taxpayers' money, not to spend it to help people, but to lobby Congress for more money.

The gentleman has been a leader in this respect, and I congratulate him.

Before our new colleagues begin, I would like to respond for one minute to the gentleman from California. I know the gentleman from Arizona has something to say about this, too.

The gentleman from California asked are people this stupid? Are people this naive, to believe this sort of ad? I have good news for the gentleman. The answer is no. Calls coming into my office from union members eight to one say

"EHRLICH, stay the course. Balance the budget. Protect me. Do what we sent you to Washington to do." And there is a great distinction that big labor would not have us talk about, the gentleman from Arizona and California, and that is this: If the labor membership followed labor leadership, the seven of us would not be on this floor today. We would not be on this floor, because the membership understands where their bread is buttered, and that is with a balanced budget, and that is with a less intrusive Federal Government.

Mr. MCINTOSH. If the gentleman would yield for one quick second, before we switch from that point, let me reinforce your message. When I go home, I go through factory tours a lot, virtually every other weekend or so, and I walk up and down the line and ask people working for a living, "any message for Washington? Anything you wanted me to take back with me when I go back there?" Time and time again I hear from them, "Yeah, cut our taxes. We are having a difficult time making ends meet. If you guys take less of my paycheck, I can work for a living and have a better life."

That is the message from the rank and file. It is not getting up to their leadership. But, fortunately, the rank and file guys and women who are working for a living know the difference, and I think they are going to continue to support our effort to balance that budget.

Mr. RADANOVICH. So too in my district. When we faced the recent Government shutdown, I represent fortunately an area that has three national parks, Yosemite, Kings and Sequoia National Parks. Putting Federal employees out of work and giving them time off, they get paid. They worry a little bit, but they get retroactive pay. But in my district the people that suffered were those who depend on the tourist economies in these small communities, the one I was born and raised in, Mariposa, other communities, Oakhurst and Sonora, those areas, those businesses suffered. I had people that suffered a 50-percent loss in revenues during that period of time.

Still, the amount of response that I got during that time was at nine to one, "stay the course." And what they called to say was that they are not buying this, because, thank God for Rush Limbaugh and C-SPAN, these people, the everyday American can spot somebody who is not telling the truth. They are much more educated than before. This may have worked over the last 40 years, but it is not working today.

So I have got faith in people. When I walk down and talk to transportation, parcel post deliverers, and their on-line employees, basically their message to me was, "George, don't bother coming home if you lose this budget battle." They say "Hang in there." They know exactly what is going on.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming the time, I thank my friend from California for making that point. I thank my friend from Maryland for making a very key distinction between those who are bosses of big labor and those who labor for a living. The miners in the Sixth District of Arizona, who want to hand on to more of their paychecks, who understand the overburdensome taxation their families face, and who came out in record numbers in 1994 to say that we want a change.

So I salute the gentleman from Maryland for again exposing this. I challenge the mass media to follow suit with their own reality checks, their own truth watches.

I know perhaps if there is a footnote the gentleman would like to add, I just looked to the well and I know that your exploits on the gridiron among the members of this class are exceeded only by our good friend who returned to his native Oklahoma to run for this body, but before that distinguished himself in the National Football League, and indeed entered that Hall of Fame, the best hands in the freshman class and one of the brightest minds, I would yield now to our good friend from Oklahoma, Mr. LARGENT.

Mr. LARGENT. I wanted to thank my loquacious colleague from Arizona for yielding to me. Really I begin my time here by making a confession, and that is I have one of the poorest senses of direction in existence. In fact, I have gotten to the point where I do not even trust my own sense of direction. I have on my key chain a compass that I carry around with me in Washington, DC, and I found it has come in handy as we wander through the Halls of Congress.

The reason I bring that up is that I found I have learned not to trust my own sense of direction. In fact, I get particularly turned around when I go shopping in the mall with my wife, and we go shopping for 2 or 3 hours, and go in and out of the stores. By the time we are done shopping, I cannot find the car. So what I have learned to do is as I come out of the mall and I am trying to determine which way the car is, if I think it is to the right, I always go to the left, and 99 percent of the time I am right.

What I have also learned in my short time in Congress is that if everybody in Washington, DC is saying to go left, if I go right, I am probably doing the right thing. And that really brings me to the point of why I have come here this evening, and many of my colleagues are joining me here this evening, and that is to talk about the tax relief that is offered in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

Because I want to tell you, and I also confess that even some of our Republican colleagues have fallen into this trap, that Washington, DC is saying "Go left, out into left field, on the \$245

billion tax cut, because the American people are saying don't give tax cuts; balance the budget."

But I want to make a very, very important point to the American people tonight, one that they need to understand, that there is nobody in Washington, DC that is saying "Don't do the tax cuts in order that we can balance the budget sooner." People need to know that. People do not want the tax cuts because they want to spend the money here in Washington, DC. It is not that they want to take \$245 billion away from the taxpayers in order that we can eliminate the deficit sooner than 2002.

It is they want to take the \$245 billion of taxpayer money away from them so they can spend it on programs X, Y, and Z. That is why they do not want to give you back your taxpayer money, and I think, frankly, that the Republicans have done a very poor job of defending the tax cuts and explaining why they are so important.

The first reason, there are two reasons in my mind, the point I would like to make before I yield to other gentlemen to talk about the specifications of the tax package. The most important reason that we need to have \$245 billion in our tax relief for the American taxpayer is just that. The Federal Government does not have a single dollar, except the dollars that they collect from American taxpayers. We do not have any money, except for the money that we take from the American taxpayers. So the first and most important reason that we need tax relief in this country today is in order that the taxpayers can keep more of their hard-earned money.

You see, there are some of us in Congress that believe that taxpayers and families can spend their money more wisely, more efficiently, more effectively for their families than we can in Washington, DC. And I know that my colleagues that are gathered here this afternoon believe that.

But, second, and this is equally important to understand, the reason that the tax cuts are necessary is that it is a critical, an important, an unbelievable mechanism to decrease the size of Government. You see, if we take that \$245 billion, as I said earlier, we are not going to apply it to the deficit. We are not going to cut spending. We are going to spend more.

□ 1545

And so the tax relief package that is contained within the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 does just that, it not only gives the taxpayers back their own money, but, at the same time, the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 reduces the size and cost of the Federal Government, at the same time still getting us to a path to a balanced budget in the year 2002.

Now, I would like to yield back to my colleague from Arizona and ask if he

would yield to our other colleagues here that are prepared to talk about the tax relief specifics.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for restoring our sense of direction with his very illustrious examples, and I look to the other side of the aisle, where in this special order we are joined by our colleagues, but I think symbolically of the fact that we want to reach out to the other side of the aisle; that we hope to work together to confront this next century, and I would simply yield to my good friend from Nebraska, the gentleman who sits on the Committee on Ways and Means, where tax policy is formulated, our good friend Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

Mr. EHRLICH. Would the gentleman from Nebraska bear with me for 20 seconds?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. I would gladly yield.

Mr. EHRLICH. I am happy of two things: First, I have the time to speak today; and, second, I never had to catch this guy.

Before the gentleman from Nebraska, our colleague, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, begins, I would make one point that I think is very relevant. We would love to do every day what symbolically we are doing here today; reaching out. However, the one precondition all of us, and I think I speak for everyone in this majority feels that that precondition is every debate, every reasonable debate must be on facts.

When demagoguery and class warfare and generational warfare run the airwaves and run this floor, it is very difficult to reach out.

I yield back and thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think Robert J. Samuelson said it best in the Washington Post in a commentary of a few weeks ago when he said, when one side continuously distorts the facts and refuses to debate the policy, then the purpose is not to debate, it is to destroy.

Mr. Speaker, here to help destroy and shatter some of the myths that have been propagated, again it is our good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think our friend from Tulsa has put his finger on the problem, and that is this Government, Washington DC, has had an appetite for spending. All they want to do is spend, spend, spend. The more money going into the coffers, the more they can spend.

This is not about whether it is \$245 billion or used to be \$360 billion in tax relief. What we are talking about now is the administration wanting to compromise and to increase the consumption of the Federal Government.

One of the areas in the Ways and Means that we worked so hard on, and

I campaigned on for over 2 years, was capital gains tax relief, the centerpiece, I believe, of getting this economy moving, keeping it a robust economy, and returning people's money back to where it belongs, in their own pockets and not in the Federal Government's. Not in the bureaucracy.

In Nebraska alone, over 200,000 Nebraskans will see relief from a capital gains tax cut. As a matter of fact, the overall tax package in Nebraska will see 580,000 Nebraskans benefit from a capital gains, a child care tax credit, or some provision in our tax package. That is putting money back in their pocket, taking it out of wasteful programs that have overspent and have gone into \$5 trillion in debt over the last 40 years.

What we are doing is talking about putting the trust in the people, whether it is in Arizona or Oklahoma or Nebraska or South Carolina, and the thought and the belief that they can spend their own money better than Federal bureaucrats can in Washington, DC. I am a strong supporter and a believer in the fact that I know how to spend my buck better than some bureaucrat down at Treasury.

That is why I believe that the tax package has been compromised too much already, and I think that to move off that \$245 billion tax figure would be a big mistake and would be a win for the bureaucracy, a win for unusual politics. I think that this freshman class stands up and will make our voices loud.

Mr. LARGENT. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Yes, I would.

Mr. LARGENT. I talked to the gentleman earlier, and he mentioned, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, that he had a figure for what the total tax cut package was in relationship to the entire budget over the next 7 years. Does the gentleman recall that figure?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Less than 2 percent. We are talking about less than 2 percent of returning the people's money back to them. Over the next 7 years, all the budgets added up, 2 percent is what the tax package is. Is it asking too much of this Federal bureaucracy, of this Federal Government, to return 2 percent of the money back to the people? I think not.

I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Anybody who is trying to bring this to a conclusion and is listening, they need to understand this. If we want to take money from the family budget and spend it in Washington, DC, to get a deal, count me out. If we want to adjust senior citizens' payments to get more money to spend in Washington, count me out. If we want to take \$135 billion of so-called new money and

spend it on Washington, DC, count me out.

I think we are going to find a lot more people saying exactly what I have said.

What does \$12 trillion mean? If anyone is doubting that there is room for a tax cut and a need for a tax cut, let me tell my colleagues what the Federal Government takes from us—\$12 trillion is spent in Washington. If we spent \$1 million a day it would take us 2,700 years to spend \$1 trillion.

We have a \$5 trillion debt. To retire \$1 trillion of the national debt would be equivalent to \$3,814 from every man, woman, and child in America. My colleagues and I all know that every American does not pay taxes. The ones that are paying, are paying a ton of it.

I firmly believe that the Washington, DC, budget has got plenty of room to be reduced. The family budget is on a shoestring, and if we are going to let people spend money on a family, let the family people do it and get us out of the business.

I want to make one last point. If we divide the population of the United States into the budget of the United States over a 7-year period, the Federal Government will spend \$162,764 on a family of 4. To me, that is enough.

I yield back my time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from South Carolina for the points he makes and reclaiming my time. I just think it is important to understand one historical perspective to really stand in relief.

It is worth noting that in 1992 candidate Clinton talked about tax relief for the middle class; and then, upon taking the oath of office, President Clinton gave us the largest tax increase in American history. And there has followed, from that broken promise, a string of broken promises, not only with taxation but with balancing this budget.

And with that in mind, I would yield to our good friend from Wisconsin, who has done yeoman's work, gotten in there, rolled up his sleeves, taken out a sharpened pencil and taken a true look at what is at stake for the American family and the American Nation with the budget. I yield time now to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this time, and I go back to what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] said. He is exactly right here. The question is how much money we are spending. And I would like someone, just someone out there to call my office and say, we think the Federal Government should spend more money. That never happens. Nobody calls my office and says we are not spending enough money; spend more money. That never happens.

Here is what has gone on with the budgets we have now and why we can-

not reach agreement here. We have CBO-scored numbers, an apples-to-apples comparison of what is being spent and where the deficits are going.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield for a second, would the gentleman please tell us what the acronym stands for and why it is so important?

Mr. NEUMANN. It is the Congressional Budget Office. And what is very significant in this is that we now are using the same numbers to compare our plans to balance the budget.

What I have on this chart with me is what the deficits are in each of the years from now through the year 2002, showing that in the Republican plan, the plan that has been laid on the President's desk and has now been vetoed, we go through the deficits. They go through a decline until we reach a \$3 billion surplus in the year 2002.

Let me make this perfectly clear. With CBO scoring, we do reach a balanced budget in the year 2002, as each and every person standing in this room today promised their constituents, and as we, as a Congress, have promised the American people we would do. It has been done.

The President's budget, last week, and I have to tell my colleagues, I was a little different than some of my colleagues even in this room. I said, let us wait and see. Let us take a good hard look at the President's budget and let us see what this budget says and see if we cannot reach a conclusion looking at the President's budget.

We have it now. We have a fair comparison between the President's budget and what was presented to him. They are scored with the Congressional Budget Office. The same set of numbers are evaluated in both plans.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if my friend from Wisconsin would yield for a quick question. Does that top number, with the plus 3, even include the tax cuts?

Mr. NEUMANN. Yes, it does. It does include the tax cuts.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. So we balance the budget in the year 2002, including the \$245 billion in tax cuts. The President's number is a lower amount in tax cuts and does not balance the budget; is that correct?

Mr. NEUMANN. That is exactly right. And here we can really clearly define what the problems are as we work toward balancing the budget. As we can see, in year 7 of the President's plan, we have a \$115 billion deficit.

I want to make this perfectly clear to everyone in this room. As far as I am concerned, this is not about the President or Democrats and Republicans fighting with each other. This is about the future of our country. This is about our children's future that we are talking about here. We have to get this number, right here, where it says \$115 billion of deficit, that has to be zero or we have not balanced the budget.

It has to be a black number. It has to be a number that is a positive number or zero, or we, in fact, have not done what we promised for the American people, and that is balance the budget.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUMANN. Be happy to yield.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. NEUMANN, would you care to reiterate the results of the last shutdown, and what was the agreement made by the administration, and how they would submit their next budget?

Mr. NEUMANN. Sure. In the shutdown in November, we reached a conclusion that extended the Government operations for a period of time. We all promised, Republicans and Democrats, that we would bring a plan to the table that was balanced under a 7-year plan with CBO scoring.

This plan is not balanced on a 7-year plan with CBO scoring, and it does not keep the promise that was made as recently as November, that we would have a plan from both sides of the aisle that was balanced in 7 years using CBO scoring.

Mr. LARGENT. Would the gentleman yield? That was not a promise. That was a contractual agreement; is that not correct?

Mr. NEUMANN. That is exactly right. It was a written contractual agreement between the Republican leadership, between all of us when we voted on it, and the President of the United States. That is exactly right.

So that the bottom line is these numbers are cut and dried, folks. This is not a Republican-Democrat debate at this point. This is a mathematical statement of facts that I am bringing to my colleagues. We do not have a balanced budget under the President's plan. It is \$115 billion short in the last year.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUMANN. Sure.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I want to point out, then, because the gentleman's example here perfectly illustrates the frustration that we are experiencing in Washington when we make a pledge to the American people, many of us who are here for the first time, that we are going to go back and balance the budget, and then we run into a game of charades basically, in order to drum up phony numbers so that we can live up to our obligations made with regard to balancing the budget in 7 years.

So, unfortunately, I think through this process, if there is any good that can come out of it, would be commitments made and kept, but also honest numbers. Because that is really what is driving, I think, the American people nuts and driving this whole controversy right now.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I think there is another important thing that shows up here. If we were to put into

law the Republican plan, exactly as it was presented to the President, that does get to a balance in 7 years, we would still add \$635 billion to the national debt over the next 7 years. So under the Republican plan, we would be adding \$635 billion to the debt and we have not solved all the problems yet.

But under the President's plan we would be adding over \$1 trillion, an extra \$365 billion to the Federal debt. And, folks, that is our children we are talking about. They will have to pay that money back.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would the gentleman yield? This has been a fascinating conversation. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] mentioned something a while ago; that the game in Washington is not to take the \$245 billion in tax cuts and to balance the budget with the money, the game is to spend it.

From what the gentleman has been able to tell me, and what the gentleman from Nebraska, JOHN CHRISTENSEN, has said, I think we have some pretty good evidence that is true.

□ 1600

Is it not fair to say that the President's tax cut plan is at \$78 billion, I believe?

Mr. NEUMANN. That is correct.

Mr. GRAHAM. He cut taxes at \$78 billion, and he is \$115 billion out of balance. That is pretty good evidence that the money that he took away from our tax cut went to spend more money on the Federal Government.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Failed welfare programs and failed social programs.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that is a very telling point.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Going through some of the areas, I just want to ask if the gentleman's understanding is the same as mine. Have we increased or decreased spending in education, job training, and student loans?

Mr. NEUMANN. We have clearly increased spending.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. How about Medicare?

Mr. NEUMANN. Medicare spending is going from \$4,800 in the system to \$7,100 per person in the system over the next 7 years.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Veterans?

Mr. NEUMANN. Veterans' benefits are increased \$400 million, and the HUD VA appropriations bill is the only one of them that is increased.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. How about welfare spending?

Mr. NEUMANN. Welfare spending is going up significantly, from about \$90 billion to \$140 billion this year to the year 2002.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. I know in Nebraska a lot of people have asked me why are we spending so much.

Mr. NEUMANN. That is the question I keep coming back to. When I show these numbers to my folks back home

and I say, "Even under the Republican plan we are adding \$635 billion to the debt over the next 7 years," does the gentleman know what they say to me? "Why are you doing that? Why are you doing that? Get this job done faster."

That is why earlier this year we did present a plan that balanced the budget in 5 years and then did something we do not usually talk about here. It paid off the debt in a 30-year period of time, and we did not use any Social Security trust fund money to do that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did the gentleman view the media report a couple of days ago that had Mrs. Clinton testifying before Congress about Medicare saying that if we control the growth of Medicare, if we reduce it from 11 percent to 6 to 7 percent, we can balance the budget and protect Medicare and keep it from going broke? Did the gentleman see that report?

Mr. NEUMANN. I sure have.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not true that our spending on Medicare is at 7.2 percent?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. That is correct.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are spending more on Medicare than her testimony. Is the gentleman aware of a speech that the President made to an AARP group in 1993—excuse me, 1995, where he indicated, might have been 1993; I do not want to get my facts wrong—where he indicated that Medicare and Medicaid are driving the country broke. It is growing at 3 times the level of the private sector. If we could reduce it to twice the level of inflation, we could take care of every senior citizen and balance that budget, and that is not too much to ask. Is the gentleman aware that he made that statement?

Mr. NEUMANN. Yes, and I have heard so many times in our town hall meetings, people in Wisconsin are saying, "Why are you increasing it at twice the rate of inflation?"

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not a fact that we are increasing it twice the rate of inflation?

Mr. NEUMANN. Yes, it is.

Mr. GRAHAM. What he said to do; what Mrs. Clinton said to do. We are doing what they asked or told somebody to do 2 years ago, and we are getting killed for it by them.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], was this the President's first try at balancing the budget? Which budget number is this as far as the \$115 billion figure?

Mr. NEUMANN. This is budget No. 3. But in all fairness, I will point out that this is, in fact, the closest we have been to a legitimate budget proposal. This is the closest that he has been in three tries to balance the budget.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. The first budget wound up in the Senate with a 99-to-nothing vote.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was 96.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have to wrap up my part of this. Can I conclude very briefly here? This Nation of

ours, this great country our ours, is in trouble. We are \$5 trillion in debt. We are sinking fast. We have got deficits every year through the year 2002.

Every time this Nation has been in trouble in the past, do my colleagues know what has happened? The American people have joined together and solved the problems. Not Democrats, not Republicans; Americans.

It is time for us, the Members of this Congress and the President of the United States, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans first, to get the job done that American people sent us here to do and to get the job done that we promised we would do on their behalf when we came here.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin very much for bringing this information. I want to say briefly that our priorities in this process in defending, to a degree, the increase in the debt even under our plan, is that we are committed right now with priorities of a 7-year balanced budget; the second being CBO scoring, which we are still working on; the third being the quick elimination of the deficit and the debt.

Unfortunately, under our plan, while we are working at eliminating the deficit, we are unfortunately still adding to the debt. But after that deficit is gone, then the debt gets worked down.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, and I thank our good friend from Wisconsin who once again demonstrates why he has been the workhorse of the budget process and is deserving every accolade that this new Congress can provide.

I am holding here a certain financial document. It is a check. I heard my friend from Nebraska and my good friend from South Carolina lament the fact that the President of the United States was making allegations about Medicare that is part of the cacophony, the mantra of the medicare campaign of the discredited American liberals who cannot seem to face facts. So, how ironic it would be if this President, who has worked very hard with his own special interests to raise scads of money for what will be a very difficult reelection campaign, again, Mr. Speaker, the challenge goes out to everyone, including the President of the United States, if they can show us a cut in Medicare spending that goes from \$4,800 this year now to \$7,100 per beneficiary in the year 2002, if there is some way to do that, then the Republican National Committee, Haley Barbour, the national chairman, is prepared to pay up with \$1 million.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Would the gentleman yield on that point? Your seniors in Arizona will not be herded into just one program, will they? They will have an opportunity for a number of choices.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And freedom of choice is one of the fascinating things

about Medicare-Plus. And just as the benefits per beneficiary increase, so do the opportunities and options for seniors under Medicare-Plus.

Speaking of opportunities and options, as I reclaim the time, let me also turn to our good friend from Kansas who has a couple of housekeeping items which we need to allow him to take care of, but also may have some observations. Let me yield time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Arizona yielding to me. This \$1 million check, I think, is a clear statement to the American people, to anybody anywhere in the world, that if there is a real cut in Medicare, show us. We will pay them \$1 million.

The point of it is, and it is just to make a point, there are no cuts in Medicare. I appreciate my colleagues explaining that to this body, so that this body can understand, as I think most of them do, but in some cases act like they do not, what the situation really is.

I particularly appreciate the earlier dialog that I have been watching as well, saying to this body and educating this body, look, we are in a dire situation. We have got to do that and we have got to do that compassionately and we are doing it compassionately.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2644

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2644.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back to my good colleague, who is educating this body about the perils that we are really in and what we can do to help this and make the future for our children better.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Kansas and I would invite him to join us here in this historic Chamber to discuss issues of historic import as we are transforming this government, not by reinventing it, but by remembering what works; remembering that document from which all of this flows, that remarkable document called the Constitution, and remembering this fundamental premise: That when people are allowed to keep more of what they earn, the fruits of their honest labor, and save, spend, and invest it according to the dictates of their conscience and their priority, there is nothing selfish about that.

I am sure what prompted my friend to come to the floor was the evaluation of our colleague from Nebraska, who has spent countless hours on the Ways

and Means Committee drafting tax reform and reduction policy, who informed us earlier that less than 2 percent of this vast array of money we are talking about, less than 2 percent in the grand scheme of things is used for tax cuts.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think it is a tremendous point and that that needs to be driven home to this body even more. Right now, the Federal Government, and this is a massive amount, it is hard to understand, takes 22 percent of the U.S. economy. It is the Federal Government. This huge piece, 22 percent.

Now, the gentleman from Arizona I am sure probably knows this figure, but in 1950 does the gentleman know what percent of the U.S. Government was of the Federal economy?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I know the gentleman from Kansas will inform us all.

Mr. BROWNBACK. It was about 4 percent. Can the gentleman imagine what the liberation would be of this Nation, of the people here, if the Federal Government, instead of 22 percent, was just 4 percent? Or, what if we got from 22 percent to 15 percent? There would be a blossoming across America of growth, of productivity, of jobs, of opportunities, of people going forward themselves and saying, "My goodness, why were we carrying such a heavy load?"

The next number of years, what has to take place in this country is we have to shrink the public sector, because the private sector is tired of carrying it and cannot carry it any further. That is what we are trying to do. It is not Draconian; it is very compassionate to help people.

This could be one of the greatest Christmas gifts that we could give the American people, my children, and our future grandchildren, and the children of the gentleman from Arizona, to get this down so that they can be liberated and free.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, because he makes an incredibly valid point that really should be the foundation of our labors in the days to come. As the controversy continues to surround this new direction in which we are heading, returning to those values which made us great, it is worth noting that in the spirit of the season, the greatest gift we can give to our children, we can give to our grandparents, we can give to our parents, and we can give to generations yet unborn, is a stable environment in which this constitutional Republic can flourish, and individual initiative can be rewarded.

So, that is the challenge and that is the great gift and the great opportunity that we trust our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us in giving the American people this season of the year.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield just a moment, because the gentleman from Arizona has been deeply involved in, and started, what has been called the Constitutional Caucus. I would ask the gentleman if the Founding Fathers were alive today, does the gentleman think they would find that we have a constitutional government existing and operating in Washington?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming the time, I thank the gentleman for the question. I think they would find a government that has become a hybrid, and I do not mean that in a good sense. I know the gentleman has great background in agriculture. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say a mutant, constitutionally mutated from this document here, which is our cornerstone, read and reshaped and stretched oftentimes beyond recognition from its original intent to fit the explosive growth of an evermore centralized bureaucracy, a bureaucracy that spends even more.

So, we have stretched it out. It is our mission, and that is why I am so glad to have our colleague from Kansas to join in restoring constitutional government, recognizing the legislative branch has every bit the role of self-examination and introspection that the judicial branch is afforded through the notion of judicial review, that the executive branch uses, that we together, with those other two branches, can restore constitutional government. That is exactly the challenge to use this timeless document as we confront the next century.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I think it also ties into this overall issue of the budget debate. If we would get back to what the Founding Fathers had envisioned of a limited Federal Government and saying this is a limited government of limited powers, the Federal Government would not be 22 percent of the economy. It would not be the burden that it is today. We would not have as much centralization; we would have much more decentralization and things out amongst the people where they could control them closer to home and closer to them.

That was the original design, and I think we have gotten away from that to our peril. The gentleman has a particularly good effort going on, that before any bill is introduced, before it is taken up on the floor, that the constitutional basis for that bill would be discussed.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming the time, and the purposes to which we must reaffirm ourselves, to which we must devote our attentions, for just as we take an oath, as we took an oath in this Chamber collectively, just as the newest Member, the gentleman from Illinois did today, taking an oath to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States, it is more than lip service.

Mr. Speaker, good people may disagree and we champion those disagreements and we want to have open, honest debate on different priorities, but I think the gentleman from Kansas really hit the nail on the head when he discussed the Jeffersonian ideal, the ideal of the one whom our friends on the other side of the aisle claim as their ideological benefactor, one of their Founders.

□ 1615

When Jefferson called for limited and effective government, that is the distinction, not that Government should be reduced beyond recognition so that the people are not empowered, that Government has a rightful role in society, but it is a limited and effective Federal Government which makes the difference and to which the gentleman from Kansas has devoted his energies, indeed as part of this new majority. I thank him for all the efforts he has made in so many different ways to realize that dream for our children, for our parents, for our grandparents, and, indeed, for the American Nation.

Again, it is worth noting and we again issue the challenge. To those who disagree with us, Mr. Speaker, to those who offer the endless mantra of disinformation about so-called Draconian cuts with reference to the Medicare Plus Program, again, Mr. Speaker, we ask them, show us the mathematical operation that takes an increase from \$4,800 of spending per Medicare beneficiary this year and over 6 years time increases it to \$7,100 per beneficiary, show us where that is a cut, and \$1 million will be paid to them.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would note this. I cited Benjamin Franklin earlier. Will Rogers offered an update in the mid-20th century before his untimely death: "The only thing certain is death and taxes, but death does not get worse every time Congress meets."

THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I would like to again call attention to the fact that as of 3 o'clock this afternoon, the Nation's Federal debt, official debt, is \$4,988,313,115,981.39. Very interesting, this is again an additional decrease of \$126 million, actually almost \$127 million.

As a new Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I did not come here with all of the answers, and very frankly I am not sure I even understood all of the problems. But one of the problems that I want to bring to my colleagues' attention today is that a member of the Committee on the

Budget asked me earlier in the week whether this number was accurate. Under his recollection, the national debt limit was actually \$4.9 trillion. As we can see, the number before us today is \$4.988 trillion plus \$300 million, or literally \$4 trillion, \$988 billion, \$88 billion more than the official national debt.

Frankly, that caused me to go back to my office staff and question whether we had appropriately researched the number. Well, lo and behold, we have researched the number, and this is the correct number because, in addition to the \$4.9 trillion of Federal debt, we have authorized another \$88 billion of debt that does not count against the limit.

As if that were not enough, earlier in the week, Mr. Speaker, I addressed this Chamber on the basis of a New York Times article from Wednesday, December 6, 1995, wherein it indicated that the administration, since November 15 of this year, has actually borrowed another \$61.3 billion on top of the \$88 billion that does not count as part of the national debt. In addition to the \$4.9 trillion that is the national debt, the administration borrowed that \$61 billion from the Federal Civil Service retirement accounts and that apparently that was permissible under law. I hope that in the earlier vote in the afternoon that we are able to pass a measure that will preclude that.

The point I want to make today is that, the more I as a new Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, learn about the nature and the extent of the problems with Federal spending, the more alarmed I become. Literally, just in the last 3 days I have found \$88 billion of debt that we were not counting against the national debt. That is on top again of another \$60 billion that has been borrowed out of Civil Service retirement accounts. That is over \$150 billion. We were not even counting it. We are not even counting it. This is over and above the congressionally authorized limit of \$4.9 billion.

I have to mention this afternoon that another bit of information came to my attention. That is that the new budget, Mr. Speaker, that has been submitted by the administration is actually not going to balance within 7 years. This is a serious issue because we came to a solemn agreement about 3 weeks ago wherein the administration and the Congress agreed that we were going to balance the budget in 7 years and use Congressional Budget Office numbers. Again, there was an issue of debate over whether we should use CBO numbers or OMB numbers.

To be perfectly honest, I do not care whose numbers we use, but we owe it to the children of this country and to the public to use the most conservative numbers. If we are going to meet the goal of balancing the budget in 7 years, I think we should take the most cautious course to get there.

The issue in Washington, in this body, Mr. Speaker, is not whether we are going to balance the Federal budget, because we are going to balance the Federal budget. The question is how. That is where partisan debate is appropriate, where Republicans can present their version of how to balance the Federal budget; Democrats can present their view of how to balance the Federal budget. And together, like all of the households in my district, including Republican households, Democratic households, Independent households, all of whom have to take responsibility for balancing their budgets, and they may do it differently. That is what is wonderful about America, is that we do have a lot of differences between us, but we need here in this body, as Republicans and Democrats, to come together to balance the Federal budget.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that over the next 24 hours as we approach tomorrow's deadline that we will once and for all be able to work together, Republicans and Democrats in this body, with a Democratic President who will keep his word and submit a budget that will balance in 7 years.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by following up on what the previous speaker said about tomorrow. As many of us know, tomorrow is the day when the continuing resolution expires. This was the agreement that both Democrats and Republicans, both Congress and the President, agreed a few weeks ago that they would extend operations, Government operations, and not shut down the Government while we continued to try to work toward a budget agreement.

It is unfortunate that tomorrow is about to arrive and we still have not worked out that budget agreement. But I think the most important thing is that the Government not shut down again and that tomorrow, even if a budget agreement is not going to be reached, which I do not think is likely at this point, that we pass another continuing resolution so that the Government continue to operate.

I was very upset this morning when I read that, although President Clinton had offered a continuing resolution to continue the operations of the Government for at least another week or possibly beyond, and although the Republican leadership in the Senate had agreed to a similar continuation, that Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership in this House had not. I would hate to see, once again, that after tomorrow the Government shuts down.

I would urge the Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership in this House, along with what the Senate has decided and what President Clinton has decided, which is that we should put our differences aside and not use the Government shutdown as leverage toward trying to pressure one group or the other into its own ideology. My view is that the Government should continue to operate while the President and the Congress, while the Democrats and the Republicans try to find common ground on the budget.

Let me also add that as the previous speaker said, there really is no disagreement anymore that we should achieve a balanced budget or even on the timetable of approximately 7 years. But there are still major disagreements over the priorities. I would suggest that part of that agreement a few weeks ago on the continuing resolution to keep the Government open specifically said that the priorities would include Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, and education and that these programs, particularly Medicare and Medicaid, would continue to be viable and cover the people who are now eligible for them in a manner which ensures quality health care for Medicare and Medicaid recipients.

The President put forth a 7-year balanced budget within the last week or so that made sure that Medicare and Medicaid, the environment and education were properly provided for and guaranteed that those programs would continue to cover everyone and that quality health care would be ensured for seniors and low-income individuals under the two Federal health care programs. But the Republican leadership has not come back with a similar proposal. So far they have not put forward any compromise plan that would not only achieve a balanced budget in 7 years but also put sufficient funds in the Medicare and Medicaid programs and provide a guarantee that those people who are now eligible for Medicare and Medicaid would continue to be provided for.

I want to stress today in the time that I have allotted to me the problems that would occur, particularly with regard to the Medicaid Program, if the budget that was passed by the Republicans in this House and in the Senate and the one that was vetoed by the President were to take effect. We now know that this budget is not going to take effect because the President has vetoed it. When he vetoed it in his message he specifically said that Medicaid was a major reason for the veto and that the major problem he had with the Republican Medicaid proposal under this budget was that it failed to guarantee health care coverage for those people who are now covered by Medicaid. When we talk about Medicaid, we are talking about health insurance for low-income people in this

country. Most of those are either senior citizens or children or the disabled or, in some cases also, pregnant women.

Right now under Federal law people below a certain income who are not covered by any other health insurance are eligible for Medicaid. The Federal Government guarantees them that as an entitlement, as we say. And they are also provided with certain standard coverage. In other words, not only are they guaranteed health insurance but they are given certain things as part of an overall health care package which is similar to what most Americans get, although in many cases maybe not quite the same quality or the same extensive coverage. It is a pretty good health care package.

The problem that the President has with the Republican budget and the problem that I and most of the Democrats have is that this Medicaid Program under the Republican proposal would basically be turned over to the States. The money would be block granted. It would be up to the States to decide who would be eligible and what they would be eligible for. So for the first time in probably 30 years since Medicaid was enacted here in this House, for the first time you would no longer have an entitlement or a guarantee that the people who now receive Medicaid could continue to have the coverage.

If we block grant the money and the amount of money which is allocated is significantly less, which it is under the Republican proposal, it is a cut of about \$163 billion. Then we are not only not guaranteeing coverage for a lot of the people who now have Medicaid coverage, but we are also making sure that because less money is going to the States in real terms, that the States will have to cut back on who is eligible or perhaps cut back on the kind of benefits that are provided to those who they plan to cover under Medicaid.

This is a major problem. It is a major problem because what it ultimately would lead to is that the ranks of the uninsured in this country would grow. Right now we estimate that there are about 35 to 40 million Americans who have no health insurance, many of them working. If we are now going to increase the ranks of those people and add 5 or 10 million more people to the ranks of the uninsured, that puts a tremendous burden on our health care system that either people do not get care or someone else has to pay for it.

□ 1630

You pay for it yourself either because your Blue Cross or your health insurance rates will go up to cover these other people's care or they do not get any care at all.

One of the problems that—these are just some of the general problems, I

should say, that exist with the Republican Medicaid proposal, but I wanted to get into a few more specific ones, some of which have been cited by the President, that have an impact not only on low-income Americans, but also on many other Americans. One of the things that needs to be pointed out is that right now the majority of the people who receive nursing home care in this country have that nursing home coverage paid for by Medicaid. In fact we estimate that 68 percent of all nursing home residents rely on Medicaid to pay bills that average \$38,000 a year.

Now just as there is no guarantee that children, or disabled people, or people who are in the community would be covered by Medicaid under the Republican proposal, there is a guarantee that nursing home coverage would be provided or that the people who now receive Medicaid to cover their nursing home bills will continue to have the Federal Government pay for their nursing home care. In fact, based on the level of cuts that is provided under this Republican budget, we estimate that about 330,000 people could be denied nursing home coverage at the end of the 7-year period that the budget covers, in other words, the year 2002. And then the question becomes who is going to pay, where are those people going to get the money if the Federal Government under Medicaid does not pay for it?

Well, one of the things that is built into this Republican proposal is basically an effort or the ability for the first time for the Government, be it the State or whatever level of government, to go after the spouses or the children of nursing home recipients, those who would be eligible for nursing home care, and to seek the spouses' assets or the children's assets in order to pay for the care that is not covered by the Federal Government. What happens is that the right of individuals essentially right now under the current law, certainly assets of the spouse or the children are simply not eligible as assets for the Government to take, but that is essentially repealed or changed significantly under this Republican budget so that what we will see is a lot of people, a lot of spouses and children, having to contribute perhaps in a major way in order to pay for their parents' or their spouse's nursing home coverage.

The other thing that is kind of insidious, I would say, in this whole proposal is that right now, under current law, Medicaid is a matching fund. Fifty percent is paid by the Federal Government, and 50 percent is paid by the State government. So, if the Federal Government puts up 50 cents, or say the Federal Government puts up a dollar, the State has to match it, and \$2 are then available, so to speak, for Medicaid recipients. But the funding formula was changed in the Republican budget so that essentially no State

would have to spend more than 40 cents to qualify for 60 cents in Federal money. What that means is that some States may decide because of a budget crunch that rather than put up the full dollar to match the Federal dollar they will only put up 40 cents and get 60 cents in Federal dollars, which means that half as much money is then available, or significantly less money is then available, for the Medicaid Program. This simply contributes again to the whole question of how much money is going to be available for Medicaid under the Republican proposal and how much the States are going to seek to cut back, either by denying eligibility to certain individuals or cutting back on the coverage that is available for the individuals who are now eligible for Medicaid.

I want to, if I could, get into some of the other problems that have been raised with regard to Medicaid in this budget, but before I do that, I think maybe the best thing, because someone always says to you, well, what is your answer; my answer is very simple. If you look at the level of Medicaid cuts and Medicare cuts in this Republican budget bill, basically what it is being used for is to finance tax breaks primarily for wealthy Americans. There are about \$243 billion in tax breaks primarily for wealthy Americans that are included in this budget. If you were to eliminate those tax breaks, money could go back into Medicaid as well as into Medicare, and we would continue to have viable programs, we would not have to block grant, we would not have to change the current guarantee of eligibility. So that is the real answer in my opinion in this whole budget deal and what needs to be done as part of the whole budget negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by the Gingrich budget, makes \$270 billion cuts in Medicare, as you have pointed out, makes about \$180 billion in cuts in Medicaid. Much of that, much of those cuts, will be money taken from senior citizens that may live on 10, or 12, or \$15,000 a year. Much of the Medicaid cuts come from people who have spent down the money that they might have and have a husband or a wife in a nursing home, and, as you point out, might lose their home that they have paid for over 35 or 40 years of marriage.

But all of this to pay for this tax break for the wealthiest people in the country, a tax break eliminating a tax on corporations that required some minimum payment dealing with some overseas tax issues that will ultimately hurt, cost American jobs, and it is, as you said, it is a tax break mostly for the richest people in the country, and then I hear our friends, some of the Gingrich freshmen, as they are termed around here, that are on the floor a

moment ago talking about how the Democrats always engage in class warfare.

Well, the fact is when you increase taxes on people making \$15,000 a year, and then you cut taxes on people making 10 times that, \$15,000 a year, that is the most insidious kind of class warfare. You take money from the working poor people that are working at Wal-Mart, or working at Kmart, or working at a minimum-wage job, and maybe her husband or wife are working in similar kinds of jobs, and their taxes are increased when they are playing by the rules. They may not even have health insurance with their full-time jobs, and they have a tax increase at the same time somebody making 2, or 3, or \$400,000 a year gets a tax break that amounts to in many cases \$20,000.

At the same time they cut Medicare, they cut Medicaid, much of which goes to not just elderly people in nursing homes, but goes to disabled kids and other people that have some sort of disability that they have very expensive medical care, and that is, as I said, the most insidious kind of class warfare where people playing by the rules and working hard have their taxes go up. They may not make much, they have their taxes go up, and people that are getting much, much more get a whole lot more tax breaks, and I do not think that is the values that this country represents, to penalize those people who are struggling, and playing by the rules, and barely making it without health care, trying to raise their kids, not be on welfare, working hard. Their taxes go up, and this whole Gingrich budget is taking money from the middle class and the poor and transferring that money to the richest people, people that do not even live in my district—I have a lot of wealthy people in my district.

They are not coming to me saying, "Hey, give us a tax break for the wealthiest of us." They are saying, "Get this budget balanced, and don't hurt Medicare and Medicaid doing it," and that is what troubles me the most about this Gingrich budget is that it is waging class warfare on the most vulnerable people and people that are working hard, and trying to pay their bills, and trying to buy a house, and trying to save a little money for their kids' college, and then giving money, taking that money from the working poor in many cases and people of the middle class and transferring that money to the richest people. It simply does not make sense.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] for coming here today and expressing what he just said, and I would just like to follow up on two points, and maybe you could, you know, respond to what I am saying.

There are many points that you made, but the two that stick in my

mind right off the bat: First of all, you are pointing out that not only are a lot of these tax breaks going to wealthy Americans; we know that the lion's share does, but that actually for many Americans who are working that are lower income, they are actually having to pay a tax increase because this Republican Gingrich budget actually repeals the earned income tax credit. So maybe we should get into that a little bit and explains how that works.

The way I understand, and you correct me, is that right now people who are below \$25,000 to \$30,000, whatever, who are working, they are able to get a tax credit which can be something like \$1,500 a year, whatever, depending on their income, and that what the Republican budget has done is to either eliminate that for some or cut back significantly so that if you are making under \$30,000 now, you may actually be paying more taxes under this budget proposal.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, that is exactly right. If you are making \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year under the Gingrich plan your taxes will go up on the average of about \$25 or \$30 a month. Similarly, if you are now a Medicare beneficiary, your premium in this Gingrich budget plan will go up about \$40 to \$50 a month.

Now to a Member of Congress, whether it is NEWT GINGRICH or any of us as Members of Congress, \$25 or \$50 a month probably does not matter much, and that is unfortunately the way, I think, that the people that voted for this bill think about it, that it is only \$25 a month or \$50 a month. It is \$25 a month for that family making \$20,000 a year; it is only \$50 a month for that senior citizen that brings in \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year. But the fact is, that is a lot of money if you are in that income bracket. Twenty-five dollars a month for some family making \$20,000 a year means new shoes for their kids in September when they go to school, it might—it means maybe once in a while taking their kids to a ball game, it means a lot to a family like that.

Fifty dollars a month for a Medicare beneficiary means medicine, or means paying for a rent increase, or means paying if it is a particularly cold winter and paying those heating bills, and that is what the Gingrich plan, the people for that plan, do not think about, is that \$25 increase, \$25-a-month tax increase for somebody making \$15,000 a year, is pretty hard on them. That \$50 premium increase, that monthly \$50 premium increase for a Medicare beneficiary, that hits them pretty hard when they are seeing the cost of prescription drugs go up and they are seeing their own heating bills go up or whatever—whatever difficulties they are facing.

That is why this is wrong in order to give that big tax break to the richest people in this country. That is wrong.

Mr. PALLONE. The other thing is that one of the major concerns that we have had in this Congress, in the previous Congress, on a bipartisan basis is the need for welfare reform, to get people off of welfare and to have them work, and if you cut back on this earned income tax credit, which basically is affecting many people who maybe just got off welfare and have been encouraged to work, they will find, if they are not making that much money, that maybe it is more beneficial for them to stay on welfare.

Also, and you were in the State legislature so you know, as I was, that oftentimes what happens is if—the State legislature have made the effort over the last 10 years to try to expand Medicaid coverage to cover working people, even though Medicaid is for low-income people, oftentimes it covers people who work. And we have expanded Medicaid coverage to people that are working who may be making a little more than people on welfare to encourage them to work because now they have Medicaid benefits. Well, if those are likely to be the first ones that are back because they are a little higher income than the people on welfare, so that if you deny them their Medicaid benefits, and you deny them their earned income tax credit, they will have less incentive to work, and we actually end up reversing what we are trying to accomplish. More people go back to welfare, and less people work, so it makes no sense.

I would like to yield—joined by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I very much appreciate that you have provided us with this time to talk about some of these issues, and since we are talking about the earned income tax credit and its effect upon people with moderate income, I wonder how many people really understand how extensive this is. There are something like 12 million people who end up losing that earned income tax credit. Remember earned income tax credit means that, if you have been working and you are paying taxes out of your paycheck, that you were eligible, if your income was very low—if even with working, one or both persons in the family working, your income was still under the \$25,000 or so level, you were eligible for some money back, and it is 12 million American families that are in that category.

Now from my State, which is a little smaller than each of yours—in fact, a little smaller than all of us standing here—from my State it is, oh, about 400,000 or so families in the State. My guess is that for the gentleman from Ohio it must be close to a million families in—well, it would not be quite that many.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. About 500,000 in Ohio.

Mr. OLVER. And that—those 12 million families lose \$30 billion total in loss of that credit that means increased taxes. Is it not ironic that in this process of giving tax reductions and selling the whole thing as if it is a great thing for middle-class Americans, that people who are of low income, but working, are going to actually see their taxes increased?

□ 1645

There will be \$30 billion of increase of taxes, and that 12 million American families is going to get translated into giving \$125 billion of tax reduction to only about 2 million families who already start with more than \$100,000 of income per year. Those families at the very upper end of the scale are going to get a huge amount of money from this process, but the \$30 billion that is taken away from families who have less than \$25,000 a year to live on, those are the people who are going to pay right through the nose for the process of giving the tax breaks to families who really do not need them, who are already doing pretty well, who have made their way very well with the American dream. There is nothing wrong with the American dream, that is a great idea. But they are not the ones who need it in these very tight times.

Mr. STUPAK. If the gentleman will yield, in northern Michigan where I am from, it is about 35,000 families who will lose that earned income tax credit. I had a young mother who had three children. She was divorced. Even though her husband was paying child support, she said what the earned income tax credit meant to her. She said, "When I would receive my earned income tax credit, it allowed me to get caught up on my bills. If I got a little behind in the last year, or if the car needed a new set of tires, I had money for a new set of tires for the car," so she could go back and forth to work, to support her family. It kept them a degree of respect and dignity and off public assistance.

So this earned income tax credit, which is being eliminated just so we can give a tax break to the wealthiest 1 percent in this country and the large corporations who no longer will have to pay the alternative minimum corporate tax, is really in this time of a Christmas season, really, if I can say the word "heartless." I mean the folks who need the help the most, to give them a little respect, a little dignity, a little pride, to help them keep off of public assistance, to help them to make it on their own, the whole philosophy here is being rejected while we are giving the corporations a tax break. I really have a great, great problem with that aspect of this Gingrich contract on America plan.

You were talking about Medicaid. Besides the earned income tax credit,

Medicaid, if I may quote from the Michigan Health and Hospital Association which says, "We fear that the Medicaid block grant program, health services for the most vulnerable populations, the elderly living in nursing homes, the poor, the children, may be jeopardized as hospitals who continue to bear a disproportionate share of the burden of caring for these individuals, face reduced payments."

What that means to me, if I can read between the lines here, not only the financial impact on these families that need the assistance, but in my district, northern Michigan, my biggest town is maybe 17,000 people. I have many, many, small hospitals. They have, as the letter says from the Michigan Hospital Association, they bear a disproportionate share of the burden for caring for these people. But under these block grant proposals, the Medicaid, the hospitals in the rural areas, which are usually my largest employers, will be faced with tremendous cuts, which means lost revenue and cuts in staff.

Here is the mother who finally got through school, thanks to the earned income tax credit and a couple of other things, who is not working, and probably has the lowest seniority; she will probably be the first one to be laid off when all these cuts go through. The rippling effect here of not only the Medicare and Medicaid cuts, and they are cuts, make no mistake about it, it is going to be devastating on small rural communities as well as our urban areas.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things the gentleman is pointing out and that the gentleman from Ohio stressed is that, if anything, our support for the Medicaid Program and our concern about the low-income people who are impacted by the Medicaid Program is not an issue of class warfare, but just the opposite.

What you are pointing out is that everyone suffers because of these Medicaid, because Medicaid cuts, and when you eliminate the Federal guarantee of Medicaid, because what happens if more people pursuant to these Republican proposals go on welfare, the cost to the government at every level grows, and you are not going to even be able to balance the budget if you start to get more and more people on the welfare roles.

Similarly, so many hospitals, not only in rural and urban areas but even in suburban areas, and most of my district is suburban, every one of the hospitals that I have is heavily Medicaid-Medicare dependent, and if they have to cut back, they lay people off, some of them close, and it impacts everyone. They cut back on services and quality of care and everyone's health care suffers.

I see the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is here, who

has done so much to raise the attention of the Congress to these issues. I yield to her.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and I want to thank all of my colleagues. It is a pleasure to join with them this afternoon, and I particularly thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for his invitation to participate and for his being here, tirelessly, just about every single evening.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the Medicaid issue from the same perspective, but maybe a slightly different one. First of all, I think sometimes people misunderstand what Medicaid is all about, and they have an impression that it truly in fact does not affect their lives, that this is a program, if you will, for poor people or people who are out there that they have nothing to do with, and it does not in some way affect their own lives. The fact of the matter is that two-thirds of the expenditures of the Medicaid program are for people who are in nursing homes.

Let me give an example of the people in Connecticut. Sixty percent to seventy percent of seniors who are in nursing homes in the State of Connecticut today have their health care paid for either partially or in whole by the Medicaid Program, so that millions of families, intergenerationally, really are dependent upon Medicaid to provide essential, essential health care.

What the Gingrich plan does is, it is a raid on Medicare, and essentially this raid is an unconscionable assault on the values of middle-class Americans.

I would like to mention a couple of things about what is intended, as well as the cutback. The Congress voted last month to turn Medicaid into a block grant program, to slash the program by \$163 billion. That is over the next 7 years. Particularly startling about the block grant approach and the one other one-third cut in the Medicaid program is the repeal of the family protections which have to do, quite honestly, with all of us, if we have senior loved ones, parents, or relatives who may potentially have to go to a nursing home. The family protections will be repealed if this bill sees the light of day, if it becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention a couple of points here. I will, by the way, say that the President vetoed the budget due to its extreme agenda as it has to do with Medicaid.

There is a report that all of us had a chance to look at, by the Consumer Union. These are the folks who put together the Consumer Reports, when you go out to look to buy a car or a computer, and you know whether you are buying something good or you are buying a lemon, or you are going to get a bum deal. You make your decision. People look at these Consumer Reports.

This is the group, the Consumer Union, that issues those reports and that issued the report on this proposal by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the budget. They talked about this potential nightmare that is going to be placed on working families with parents who need nursing home care. They have estimated that there will be 395,000 long-term care patients that are likely to lose their Medicaid payment for their care next year if this bill is approved. That is an unbelievable and staggering number of people who, one, will not have the care, but whose families, working families today in our country, are going to pick up the slack somewhere.

You are not going to see your mother, your father, a dear aunt or uncle or so forth, be out in the street. What is more, what is of equal concern, is that with the repeal of these family protections you are going to see that adult children—you can put a lien on the home of an adult child if you do not meet the State median in terms of income.

If you fall below your State median in income, and in the State of Connecticut it is \$41,000, and if you make more than \$41,000—and in many middle class homes today with two working parents you see above that number, and it may be slightly above that number—you then are now liable to pick up costs for your parent or your loved one's nursing home care. They can come in and put a lien on your house. If you are in rural America or in farm country, they can put a lien on your farm to help to pay the cost of nursing home care. This is written in the fine print in this Medicaid law, which many people do not know about.

In addition to that, there is no longer a requirement, there are no more Federal regulations on nursing home standards; every State can do what they want. No one wants to believe that States are going to be evil, bad, or that State legislatures are bad people, but the fact of the matter is that is you have a money crunch in your State and it is going to cost more to make sure of those nursing home standards, and those are the ones where they could retrain your father or your mother, they could use mind-altering drugs, that was all changed—I might add that was under Ronald Reagan—that all changed. Now they do not have to comply with any Federal nursing home standards, so it really is a monetarily devastating effect, a quality of care. It has to do with the individual who is in a nursing home and who gets that care paid for by Medicaid, but it falls on the backs of the families of folks who are in nursing homes, and that is what will happen if this law on Medicaid passes in the next several weeks here.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will continue to yield, the

gentlewoman mentioned some of these things found in the fine print. Actually, in the Committee on Commerce, on which I and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] sit, the Democrats offered 10 amendments. If you wanted to block grant, OK, fine, but there are 10 areas we want to protect.

Nursing home standards is one of them. We feel there is a need for nursing home standards across this country. Public children's hospitals. They provide money under Medicaid. Why can they not continue to have some funding? That was defeated. The cost-sharing for the poor seniors, to pick up part of their premium for part B, for Medicare, we wanted to keep that for poor seniors. That comes out of Medicaid.

Ms. DELAURO. It is gone.

Mr. STUPAK. That was defeated. Pregnant women and infants who need some medical help, pregnant women, and infants, that amendment was defeated. Rural health clinics, I mentioned my rural district. In many areas the only access to health care is through Federal rural health clinics, so you can have access to it. That was defeated.

You mentioned estate protection, the family farm liens; two separate amendments, both defeated. Alzheimer's disease. If you have a loved one, a parent or grandparents who have Alzheimer's disease, we always provided for their care in nursing homes under the Medicaid Program. That was defeated.

Transitional benefits to move from welfare to work, to help you out, give you a little bit of health insurance coverage while you move off public assistance into the work force, that was defeated. Women with breast cancer who receive help under the Medicaid Program, at least allow them to have some help in coverage to pay their medical bills, and that was defeated.

We tried in the Committee on Rules to make these amendments in order, but they were all defeated, not even an opportunity. What did we do? We did a motion to recommit, so the Democrat Party has been here, standing for just 10 basic elements to give you some dignity if you get ill, to provide for care for your parents or grandparents if they need a nursing home, and to leave you with a little something left in the estate. It was all defeated.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I will make one more comment, because I know there are a number of colleagues on the floor who want to engage in this conversation.

If you could make the case that some of this cut were going, in fact, to balancing the budget or bringing down the deficit, you might be able to make a case in some ways for it. I do not know how in terms of nursing home standards and putting working middle-class families at risk, but the fact of the

matter is here there is, as part of this budget, a \$245 billion tax break to the wealthiest Americans in this country.

I do not deny people the opportunity to increase their salary and achieve a good status. That is a part of what the American dream is all about. No one questions that. But at this moment if you are going to cut Medicare, as they will, \$270 billion, cut Medicaid \$163 billion, in order to pay for that tax break for the wealthy, it is wrong, it is not part of the American tradition, and we need to fight it with every single breath we have.

I compliment my colleagues, and I am proud to join with you this afternoon in having this conversation.

□ 1700

Ms. DELAURO. I would be delighted to yield to my colleague there of Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] get away, because she has raised so many provocative issues here that allow us to play off of those in some way.

The gentlewoman mentioned the misunderstanding about what Medicaid covers here in Washington and around the country. Well, it is really quite deliberate. I am convinced that it is quite a deliberate effort to convince people that it is really those unworthy welfare cheats and only those illegal immigrants who are part of the Medicaid Program. Because if you can somehow demonize the process, it is derogatory; it is an abstraction and a derogatory extraction. It is even inflammatory. If you can do that, then it is all the more possible to make this very severe cut, the \$163 billion in cuts, and eventually to dismantle the program, which is ultimately the purpose of this, this pillar which has provided wonderful health care for a group of people who otherwise could not afford it, and for older citizens who have used all of their resources.

When we think about who actually is covered by it, they are our neighbors and our friends and our family members who are covered by Medicaid. It is the mothers and fathers in the nursing homes who have used all of their other resources somewhere along the way, and have only that to get their health care. It is the widows who have too little income to be able to even pay for their share of the Medicare that then gets picked up and paid for by Medicaid. It is the people who are disabled by birth defects or by crippling diseases that mean that they cannot be independent any longer. Yet somewhere along the way it is mothers of young children who are struggling and need that care, that health care for their kids, and it is for two-parent families.

Mr. Speaker, one of the grand ironies that we were talking about just before the gentlewoman from Connecticut

[Ms. DELAURO] came in was the business of taking \$30 billion away from low-income families, people who are working, who have been paying in their withholding tax money out of their pocket; and if their income was under \$25,000, they were working on the various sliding scales in that range, then they could get a tax credit. Well, in fact, the ones at the lower end of that scale are also people who, under these provisions, are in danger, in serious danger of losing their medical care as well.

So when we are talking about trying to get people to work, we are taking the incentive to work, because if you work, you are going to lose your health care, or you are going to lose your earned income tax credit, which was the thing that may have helped you get off poverty. You are driven back toward poverty and your kids are going to maybe lose their health care in the process.

Mr. Speaker, think of what this means in terms of family values. How can one talk about this being family values when so many of those 12 million families that will lose their earned income tax credit are families with kids and those kids then become more in danger of growing up in poverty?

So what you say is a double whammy, and we could go on about other kinds of whammies that are built into this system, because you take away and take away and take away, and ultimately, it is all, all of those monies that come out of the Medicaid cuts for kids and all of those that come out of the ITC are less in total than just the amount of money that is given in tax breaks to the small couple of percent of families, those couple of million families at the very upper end of the scale who already have incomes among the top couple percent of American families. It is really ironic, and it is highly unfair.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is absolutely right.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I see that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is here joining us, and I would like to yield to him at this point.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. I am very happy to be here today, because you are looking at a new million-dollar man here in the House of Representatives. I am here to collect from this man right here: Haley Barbour.

This is one about the Republicans cutting Medicare. He has an advertisement in the Roll Call magazine this week, and he is offering anybody who can show the following: In November 1995, the U.S. House and Senate passed a balanced budget bill. It increases total Federal spending on Medicare by more than 50 percent from 1995 to 2002,

pursuant to Congressional Budget Office standards. He says he will give \$1 million to anybody who can prove that is not true.

Mr. Speaker, you are looking at the guy that can do it. You put my name, Mr. Haley Barbour, right there. It says, your name here, ABERCROMBIE, A-b-e-r-c-r-o-m-b-i-e, I will fill in the rest, it is OK, just like Abercrombie and Fitch, in case you cannot remember it, and I will see that that million dollars goes to the people that deserve it: the children that you are attacking, the elderly that you are attacking, the disabled that you are attacking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know, I am used to seeing jolly Republican guys like Haley Barbour out there attacking weak people, but when he says he is going to give \$1 million, and by the way, it is interesting that the Republicans have millions to give away, millions of dollars on Medicare, they say, let us see who they are going to give it to. They do not have a balanced budget by the standards of the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in my special orders down here, and I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] that I will not take all the time up today, but the gentleman knows that I can show and have shown in these special orders over and over again, and I think my good friend, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], is going to be able to show you some figures from her area, that proves there is no balanced budget here.

On the contrary, the deficit is going to go up by billions and billions of dollars. They are going to expropriate from the Social Security trust fund money to try and make up that deficit. Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues where that money is going to go from this unbalanced budget. We can prove that budget is not balanced. It is not going to be spending on Medicare. On the contrary, we assume, and the average American assumes, when you say Medicare spending, that is going for expenditures having to do with the medical needs of the people of this country. Yet, what is it that is being proposed by the Republicans in Medicare?

This is from the New York Times, October 31 of this year. The plan would give doctors new ways to make money. It is not Medicare for your mom and my dad. This is Medicare-looting for the doctors and the insurance scams all over this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is not me saying it. Let me tell my colleagues what the New York Times says.

Medicaid measures working their way through Congress would remold the role of many doctors, turning them into medical entrepreneurs, permitting them to engage in business enterprises now forbidden. The House version of the legislation would allow doctors to start physician-run health groups without financial and regulatory requirements that States impose on similar organi-

zations. The bill would make it easier for doctors to set prices in ways that now violate the antitrust rules.

Can you imagine what a boondoggle this is? It is not being spent on Medicare; it is being spent on people who are going to give campaign contributions to the guys that are bringing them the Medicare money. That is what it is all about, and their medical savings accounts.

I have the analysis right here by the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation that proves that these medical savings accounts is another scam artist activity for the insurance companies that will have the following effect. Under these medical saving plans unhealthy individuals are going to be unlikely to gain. Under certain scenarios, the traditional Medicare Program may cease to exist or exist in a reduced form.

I am telling the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], friends and neighbors, colleagues, we are in the chips. I want Haley Barbour to have that pen ready to write my name on that check so that we can follow up, and we are going to be down here every day exposing how the Republicans have taken something as serious as Medicare, as serious as that is, to the mothers and fathers and the families of this country, having to count on Medicare, and take it and try to turn it into a joke where they are putting a \$1 million check up there as if it is some kind of a sideshow that they want to put on.

Well, we are taking them up on it. We are showing people that this Medicare expenditure is a serious issue with the Democrats in this Congress, a serious issue for the families in this country, a serious issue for children, for the elderly and for the disabled; and we are going to expose this for what it is.

Mr. PALLONE, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Hawaii, and I totally agree.

I just want to say one thing before I introduce our next participant here. Even though that Roll Call article talks about how more money theoretically is going into Medicare, what we are really talking about here is the amount and the level of growth.

When I say that something like 18 percent of the people who are now eligible for Medicaid are not likely to be eligible in 7 years, that is because the amount of money that the Republicans are putting into the plan will be 18 percent less than what it would be under current law. If you translate that into the number of people who would be ineligible for Medicaid, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, in nursing home care, the children, the disabled, whatever, that is what we are talking about. It may be that in actual dollar terms there is more money, but in real terms, it is an 18 percent cut, and 18 percent less people are going to be eligible.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would be kind enough to

yield for a moment, I agree with what the gentleman is saying, although I think the gentleman is being entirely too kind. Not only was the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] correct in the analysis that she made, but I was showing even further cost transfers that are being made.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot say that we are spending more on Medicaid, except by an accounting trick, if at the same time, simultaneously, we are increasing the deficit and the interest that must be paid on that deficit. If we are transferring money out of the Social Security trust fund, which must be paid back with interest, what happens is, on a net basis, not only are we not spending more on Medicare per se, but we have actually increased the indebtedness of the people of the United States with respect to that budget.

So on any grounds that we want to put it, if we want to compare the tax cut, I should say the tax giveaway that they want to put out there is in the neighborhood of \$240 billion to \$250 billion, and even Mr. Barbour, at his most hyperbolic, says that under their plan, the government spent \$289 billion on Medicare, just on the tax giveaway alone, 250 that is already gone. That leaves 30 right there that we are dealing with.

As I said, that can be made up just with the other points that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) made up and that the gentleman made up. So the plain fact of the matter is that on paper and paper only, by way of illusion, and by accounting trickery can we even presume that we are going to spend more on Medicare.

The actual facts of the matter are that the public debt will increase from \$5.2 trillion to \$6.8 trillion over this 7-year period by the accounting methods that are used in the Republican budget document itself.

Mr. PALLONE, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying.

I would like to yield now to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for his leadership on this issue and for his untiring efforts to call to the attention of the American people and this Congress what is at stake in this fight that we are having.

I welcome the opportunity to convey to my colleagues what the impact is on my community in San Francisco and on the State of California. Before I do, I wanted to follow up on the remarks of our colleague from Hawaii in terms of generally what these cuts mean in terms of balancing the budget.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that any proposals that are being put forth on the Republican side now do not represent balance in terms of the values

that our country holds dear. When we would cut all of the kinds of money we have out of investments in our children, we cannot be talking about a balanced budget. It is unbalanced and imbalanced.

In addition to that, I think it is very important to recognize that the proposal being put forth by our Republican colleagues will not fiscally balance the budget either for the some of the reasons that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] has put forth, but also, we will have a better chance of balancing the budget to the extent that we invest in our children, in their education and in their health and in their well-being. Only then will that investment make our economy more dynamic, a healthy and educated work force, make our country more competitive, and therefore produce the revenues that are necessary to balance the budget within 7 years or beyond, depending on what our basis is. I say that, meaning in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, I do think that the cuts that we are talking about here have to be recognized, as the gentleman has done so eloquently, as to what the impact is on the individual and that individual's family, but also in terms of what the impact is on the local communities which will be impacted by these cuts, their budgets, as well as the economies of those regions when you take away the personal assistance and the assistance that goes to the area.

□ 1715

In the State of California, I do not have my California chart right here but I have used it many times to show that under the Gingrich budget, the Republican budget, over \$72 billion will be cut over the next 7 years just in the Medicare-Medicaid cuts, we call it MediCal in California, earned-income tax credit, school nutrition programs, those. Not even going into the cuts in appropriation, in terms of protecting the environment or assistance to disadvantaged children in chapter I and on many other cuts that will be made through the appropriation process. Just looking at what is being done on the entitlement, the guaranteed side, guaranteed to this point.

It is something that just does not affect those individuals but as I mentioned it affects their local government's budget and the economy of the area.

Our State probably, if you take the appropriations into consideration over that 7-year period, will be over \$100 billion. Our State budget is about \$57 billion a year. So you are talking about nearly 2 years of a budget of the State of California being cut out of the 7-year, and think of what that means to the economy of a State like California. And then just take it to your own States and figure out how it relates to

your own States. I know you have all done that and made presentations to that effect.

But in California with such a heavy weight, $\frac{1}{2}$ of the country, if it has a very negative impact on California, of its nature it will have a heavy impact on the country over and above what it does to your States individually.

In the city of San Francisco, and I have this chart to show some of these figures. As you can see right now, employer coverage and privately purchased insurance covers about 48 percent of our population; uninsured are 21 percent; MediCal, which is Medicaid recipients, represent about 16 percent; Medicare recipients the remainder, 15 percent.

If the cuts being suggested are made, that will move our uninsured to nearly 30 percent of the population. In the high 20's to 30 percent of the population of the city will fall into the uninsured. Those people who may need emergency care, the costs are shifted again to employer coverage and privately purchased.

That is where we were when President Clinton came in and said, we need to improve, we need to reform health care coverage in our country. That is the real answer. We missed that opportunity because of the complexity of the issue, the partisan nature of the debate, et cetera. But nonetheless, that is the answer to reducing the increase in health care cost and the impact on the public budget.

But nonetheless, when you make those cuts, that means 40,000 people, 13,000 families now covered by Medicaid, would be losing their health coverage, would be severely impacted.

As a result, even if we say it just goes to 25 percent, the impact would not be just on the poor. According to a recent study sponsored by the National Leadership Coalition on Health Care, cost-shifting would cost the private sector payers \$87 billion—now we are talking nationally—over the next 7 years. Most of the cost shift would be passed on to workers by employers in the form of forgone wages and an increased cost for health insurance premiums.

But to San Francisco. Our San Francisco city comptroller has estimated that the Republican budget will impose \$600 million in cuts to the city budget over 7 years, with half of these cuts alone for Medicare and Medicaid programs alone.

The city will have little choice, and I say this, substitute the name of any city, will have little choice except to greatly reduce services or increases local taxes.

Because of the impact on local budgets and public hospitals, you will have a problem finding lifesaving trauma care if you or a family member are involved in a serious accident requiring emergency care, and that is assuming that you are in this employer coverage

and privately purchased care. So it would even affect you in that category.

The severe cuts in Medicaid are required in order to fund this massive tax break, and that is what the saddest part of this story is. Because here we are in a situation where we are hitting people—I heard one of my colleagues say earlier, we do not want to be engaged in class warfare. Of course, we do not. But fair is fair. Not welfare. But fairness. And it does not seem right.

Most people that I know who are in the brackets which would benefit from these tax breaks say, "We don't need this tax break. We have decided we want to balance the budget, so don't give us this tax break. If that is your value, then don't balance it. But don't take it from the poorest of the poor."

How could it be fair for the earned-income tax credit for the working poor to be cut, to be eliminated for many families, many people, while we give a tax break at the high end?

Now our Republican colleagues will say, "Oh, we're just taking it away from people without children." Well, these young people would like to have a family, too. They are families, they are potential families, and they want to be strong families.

So when you talk about the cuts in earned-income tax credit, and I just want to add one more point on this tax fairness issue. The much-heralded family tax credit that our colleagues have talked about in their tax plan, \$500 per child, you have heard of it. It ironically is retroactive until October 1 of this year, while the capital gains tax break for the high end is retroactive until January 1, giving them the full benefit of the tax break, while families only get 25 percent of the break, so that \$500 tax break for this year is \$125, and you cannot collect it until October 1, 1996. Yet, if you are in the upper brackets and you get the capital gains reduction, we can accommodate you until January 1 of last year.

This is about fairness. It is not about class warfare. But if you are stomping on the people at the low end who need a safety net at some period of time in their lives in order to give a tax break to the wealthy who are not clamoring for it but who do want a balanced budget, you have to have a balance in values, you have to have an investment in children in order to produce the revenues in order to reach balance in a very fair way.

I say to our colleagues, look to what it does to individuals. But see what it does to the local budgets in your area and the impact on the economy in your area to have, say in our case, about \$100 billion pulled out over the next 7 years.

With that, I yield back to my colleague and thank him for the opportunity to present the concerns of my community on this unfair approach to Medicaid, particularly Medicaid, in this instance in this budget.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentlewoman. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know we only have a minute or two left.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentlewoman has given very dramatic data there as to what it is that happens in your home State. I would just like to connect it to what the gentleman from Hawaii had said.

In your chart, the uninsured group gets increased, it gets increased by taking people who presently have insurance, the only kind of insurance they have, from the Medicaid Program, out your MediCal recipients, increases the uninsured, the people who are really destitute and do not have health insurance.

The thing that is offered in return is the medical savings account which you have already to be able to have a large amount of income that you can risk in the process, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000 that you can risk in the first place, which is only people who are very wealthy.

So the medical savings account does not do anybody any good who is in the red category or that white category of uninsured. All we are doing is increasing the uninsured and making it harder for those who are modestly and marginally insured and trying to transfer it to people who already have a not in this society.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank everyone who participated in this special order today. I think we really brought out a lot of good points.

LONG-TERM CARE JEOPARDIZED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Americans are living longer, and they are living longer with chronic and often incapacitating illness. For many of them, nursing home care is the only option. It is a difficult and painful choice, not one that any individual or family would take lightly, particularly given the cost of nursing home care. Mr. Speaker, in northern Virginia, in the district I represent, the average cost of nursing home care is \$45,000 per year.

So the State of Virginia has been very stringent in determining Medicaid eligibility. That is why this is relevant to the discussion that just took place. Without the cuts to the Virginia Medicaid program, Virginia would be providing 54,000 individuals with access to home and community-based care, 24,300 nursing home recipients, and 2,300 individuals in intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded.

But in the face of the Medigiant Program, which caps Medicaid long-term care spending as soon as 1996, next year, \$968 million, or 27 percent of the budget for long-term care in the State

of Virginia by the year 2002 would be cut. That translates into a reduction of 9,000 people who would no longer be eligible for assistance next year, and 37,000 nursing home residents who would no longer be eligible for care in 2002. We have to ask ourselves, where would these people end up?

In 1987, President Ronald Reagan signed into law Federal standards for nursing homes. This was a direct consequence of the inability of the States to establish standards and monitor and enforce them. The newspapers were filled with horrible accounts of abuse of our Nation's seniors. That is why President Reagan responded to the abuse that was taking place across the country.

This Medigiant Program turns back the clock. It turns the responsibility of establishing, monitoring, and enforcing nursing home standards back to the States. Clearly President Reagan would not have usurped that responsibility if there were any alternative way of ensuring quality care for our Nation's seniors.

All families with members needing long-term care have been paying for many years to care for their parent or child at home. In the end, their ability to care for that person, both physically, emotionally, or financially, runs out.

In my district, the eligibility requirements to receive Medicaid assistance for long-term care are already very stringent. Thirty-four percent of all Medicaid dollars are spent on long-term care assistance. This is considerably lower than the national average. But once an individual is determined to be eligible, the State does not come after the adult children to pay for nursing home care.

This legislation included in the 7-year balanced budget plan, the Medigiant legislation, empowers States to require payments from adult children if the family income is above the State median, regardless of other financial obligations. Governor Bush said, and I want to quote him, "I plan to go after all adult children of nursing home residents."

Many allude to middle-class seniors divesting their fortunes in order to qualify for Medicaid, but the anecdotes do not add up. The GAO found in a 1993 study that less than 10 percent of all Medicaid applicants had transferred their assets in order to qualify for assistance, but even that did not result in increased Medicaid spending. Furthermore, Congress changed the law in 1993, requiring that Medicaid eligibility could not be considered within 3 years of the asset transfer.

In 1993, Congress required States to recover from the estate of deceased Medicaid beneficiaries. It did not require the seizure of homes or businesses, and it even prohibited such actions if the home was being lived in by

a spouse. Current law also protects against liens and estate recovery while dependent children are living.

But Medigiant repeals these protections. The Medigiant bill empowers States to pursue family homes to recover long-term care expenses, even if those homes are currently occupied by families members. All that protection is repealed.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take any more time. There is so much more that I could say about this. It is all of a critical nature, because we are taking away the security that is currently available to families who desperately need it.

□ 1730

We are enabling States to go after homes, to seize assets, no matter how impoverished the spouse might be, to take away the standards that President Reagan put into place to protect our senior citizens. This goes far beyond the dollars and cents.

I think this is a profound erosion of the kind of security that Americans have come to, and should be able to, expect.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to express this on the floor today, and I would hope we are going to turn this back.

The Medigiant Program repeals protection for the spouses and children of nursing home residents. Medigiant gives States the flexibility to deny coverage. Income and resource set-asides for the spouse of a nursing home resident have been maintained in Medigiant, but these are only available after a resident has been found eligible for coverage.

Under Medigiant, there is no assurance of coverage even if you meet income and resource standards; no required fair hearing to challenge a determination of noncoverage; no protection against having a lien placed on the home; no requirement for clarity about what is included in the Medigiant rate; no requirement that Medigiant cover a specific set of services; and no allowance for putting aside money for a disabled child.

I have been told that Medigiant requires States to set-aside considerable resources for nursing care services. Although the amount Medigiant requires to be set aside for the elderly is based upon expenditures for current nursing home services, nothing in law requires such services to be offered. The funds set aside are considerably less than what Medicaid sets aside today. In fact, a number of studies have suggested that the first cuts will be made on community and home based long-term care, forcing disabled and frail elderly to apply for the much more costly nursing home care.

Why? Because the nursing home industry is much stronger and financially able to lobby for dollars than the burgeoning community based care community.

The block grants are capped, regardless of economic or demographic changes. The rate of growth will not keep pace with inflation or increased use due to an aging population. The bill, on average, increase spending at 5.2 percent a year, while long-term care spending will

increase at about 9.5 percent a year. Virginia is particularly hard hit because of the aging of the population. Residents older than 65 years will increase from 7.3 to 15.7 percent of the total population. In the next 15 years, there will be five times as many Virginians older than 75 and nine times as many Virginians older than 85 years as there were in 1960.

This Nation made a commitment 30 years ago to investing in medical technology and medical assistance to extend and improve the lives of senior citizens. Assistance for long-term care is the humane extension of medical intervention and assistance. Those who seek long-term care are seeking to complete their lives with dignity, as independently as possible and certainly, not as a financial burden on their children or grandchildren. The Medicaid bill takes away this dignity from those who need long-term care and from their families.

HOW THE MEDICAID CUTS AFFECT VIRGINIA

Issue: The current proposed block grant for the Medicaid program relies on a formula which rests on the current federal match now received by each state. This unfairly penalizes Virginia, because it locks in current funding patterns among the states, regardless of need or changing demographic patterns, while high cost states that have not been efficient or judicious with their Medicaid dollars will continue to benefit at high levels of federal assistance.

Congressional proposals do little to address vast disparities in federal Medicaid grants to the states. Both lock in generous payments to some states at the expense of others. Under both plans, New Hampshire and Connecticut would get twice as much per poor person as Virginia. Under both proposals, Virginia will continue to have the seventh lowest grant per poor person in 2002. (Poor is defined as those in families earning 100% or less of the federal poverty level, which is \$11,817 for a family of three in 1995).

History: Virginia has been very conservative in its determination of program eligibility and benefits; management of Medicaid dollars and beneficiaries; and in its claim on federal resources.

Virginia has the seventh lowest federal grant per person in poverty. Virginia is below the national average in state Medicaid spending per beneficiary. 75% of its Medicaid expenditures are on mandatory services and 25% are on optional services... this is below the national average.

(States must offer a minimum acute care benefit package to their eligible populations. They can cover other acute services at their discretion. States vary widely in their coverage of optional acute services.)

Virginia has established tight eligibility standards. Thus, although Virginia has a higher poverty rate than Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island (and closely trails New York), Virginia covers less than half of its poor residents in Medicaid, while these other states have enrolled 60-90% of their poor.

DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE PAYMENTS TO HOSPITALS

In the early 1990's, some states aggressively pursued DSH money in order to leverage more federal dollars. DSH payments were intended to help hospitals serving high volumes of uninsured and Medicaid patients. They did this by adding money generated from hospital assessments and "voluntary payments" from hospitals and adding that to state funds, in order to leverage more federal matching funds, and then paid back that

money to those hospitals. Until these schemes were controlled in 1993, many states received huge amounts of federal Medicaid dollars, which they spent on general state needs. Two-thirds of DSH spending is concentrated in 8 states. DSH payments to Northeast high cost states are 6-16 times higher than in Virginia.

Virginia chose not to participate in aggressively capturing DSH dollars, as they felt it was an inappropriate use of federal funds.

The proposed Medicaid block grants lock the DSH inequities into place, leaving Virginia with only a small amount of DSH funds. Those states like NH, LA, NY, CT, NJ, will continue to receive significant DSH dollars under the block grant.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The block grant does not take into consideration the changing demographic trends in Virginia. The population is aging and the percentage of older Americans moving into Virginia from other states is increasing.

By 2020, the total population of Va. will number 8.4 million, up from 6.5 million in 1990. The elderly are the fastest growing segment of the population. Residents older than 65 will increase from 7.3% to 15.7% of the total population. There will be five times as many Virginians older than 75 and nine times as many Virginians older than 85 as there were in 1960. The elderly are the heaviest users of health care; it is reasonable to assume a growing percentage of this population will become Medicaid-dependent for nursing home care and other long term care services at an increasingly high cost.

WHAT HAS THE STATE DONE TO MAXIMIZE ITS MEDICAID DOLLARS?

Virginia has implemented a number of cost containment techniques to improve "efficiency" of the Medicaid program. The Va. Dept. of Medical Assistance estimated in 1994 that since 1982, Virginia has realized about \$217 million dollars annually in savings and cost avoidance through cost containment measures including:

- Medicaid managed care
- Moratorium on nursing home construction
- Limits on inpatient hospital admission before non-emergency surgery
- Expanded use of generic drugs
- Utilization management for hospital and other services
- Preadmission screening for nursing home applicants
- Adult day care alternatives to nursing home placement
- 24-hour obstetric discharge using a home health alternative

As a result of improved efficiency, Virginia has not required continued large increases in federal matching dollars. Yet, the state will be penalized for prudent and judicious use of Medicaid money. Those states with inefficiently run programs that are high cost to the federal government, including those states that illegally garnered DSH dollars, will continue to receive the highest contribution. The current Medicaid program is flexible enough to allow Va. to receive more federal dollars as the needs and available resources change. The proposed block grant proposal bases consideration of future federal funding on current levels, regardless of each state's future needs.

What should be incorporated into the Medicaid block grant is an effort to move all states to an equitable level of federal financial support per capita. That is not unlike the policy in place for the Medicare program. When that program moved from a cost-based reimbursement to reimbursement by diag-

nosis-related group, formerly vastly different rates paid to providers were moved to a national rate adjusted only by the special labor costs within regions. This uniformly provides the same incentives to all states to operate efficient Medicaid programs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 12:30 p.m. today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of a doctor's appointment.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOGGETT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POSHARD, for 5 minutes today.
 Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes today.
 Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. ROEMER, for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes today.
 Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. FALCOMA, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes today.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIAHRT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes today.
 Mr. COX of California, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOGGETT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR.
 Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIAHRT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HERGER.

Mr. SAXTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. RUSH.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

Mr. REED.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1331. An act to adjust and make uniform the dollar amounts used in title 18 to distinguish between grades of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1465. An act to extend au pair programs; to the Committee on International Relations.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 325. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for an optional provision for the reduction of work-related vehicle trips and miles travelled in ozone nonattainment areas designated as severe, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 1240. An act to combat crime by enhancing the penalties for certain sexual crimes against children.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 15, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1840. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of December 1, 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 104-146); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1841. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the 59th annual report of the National Labor Relations Board, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 154(c); to

the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1842. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1843. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Parole Commission Phase-Out Act of 1995"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1844. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report entitled "The Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation Program, Annual Report to Congress FY 1994," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9604; to the Committee on Science.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 307. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-407). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLINGER: Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. H.R. 2661. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to permit the District of Columbia to expend its own funds during any portion of a fiscal year for which Congress has not enacted the budget of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year, and to provide for the appropriation of a monthly prorated portion of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia for such fiscal year during such portion of the year; with amendments (Rept. 104-408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky:

H.R. 2778. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing services for the peacekeeping effort in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be entitled to certain tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. HEFNER,

Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. JONES, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LINDER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 2779. A bill to provide for soft-metric conversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MICA, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 2780. A bill to specify the circumstances in which compensation may or may not be afforded to Federal and District of Columbia employees for the period of a lapse in appropriations for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. ENSIGN:

H.R. 2781. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide loan guarantees for water supply, conservation, quality, and transmission projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. BLUTE):

H.R. 2782. A bill to authorize funds to further the public service mission of the Joseph W. Martin, Jr. Institute for Law and Society; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the President to issue loan guarantees for economic development and job creation activities in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. PARKER):

H.R. 2784. A bill to provide clarification in the reimbursement to States for federally funded employees carrying out Federal programs during the lapse in appropriations between November 14, 1995, through November 19, 1995; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 264: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 528: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 761: Ms. DELAULO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 878: Mr. KING.

H.R. 1050: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1094: Mr. EVANS and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1377: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1448: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1499: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1535: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1627: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 1684: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1701: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1889: Mr. FOX, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 2027: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 2098: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2178: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2198: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 2220: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 2281: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 2350: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2443: Mr. FOX.

H.R. 2450: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2567: Mr. HAYES and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2580: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2618: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2657: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GEJENSON, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr.

HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. EWING, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KIM, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWDER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 2682: Mr. QUINN and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2727: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. NEUMANN.

H.R. 2740: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2748: Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 2757: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. FOX.
 H.R. 2772: Mr. FORBES.
 H.J. Res. 117: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. LUTHER.
 H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. FUNDERBURK and Mr. COOLEY.
 H. Res. 220: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H. Res. 285: Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ZIMMER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2644: Mr. BROWNBACK.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MR. ENSIGN

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 19, line 23, insert after the period the following: "If the construction of the rail line authorized by subsection (a) is not completed by 5 years after the date the Secretary first used heavy-haul truck transport under this paragraph, the Secretary may not use such transport after the expiration of such 5 years."