

want to see hyperinflation in this country."

After you get through talking, we start going around the room and we let them ask questions. Inevitably, somebody will say, "You are not going to cut this program, are you?" Somebody will say, "You are not going to cut this program, are you?" Before you know it, everybody in the room has some program that the Federal Government funds, or partially funds, that they are all interested in; maybe highways, maybe Medicare, maybe Social Security, maybe welfare. It may be a number of things, but everybody wants the budget balanced and they want their kids to be secure and their future to be secure, but they do not want their programs to be cut.

We have had 40 years of movement toward socialism, toward complete government control over our lives. Make no mistake about it, we are at a point now where if we do not make some real hard decisions, we are going to get what we do not want as a Nation. If you look around the world, and I am on the Committee on International Relations, I can tell you a lot of countries that have hyperinflation have disintegration of government and government services because they have gone too far. We are heading in that direction. We have to make some choices.

The people in this country last year elected a Republican majority in the House and Senate because they wanted change. They wanted a balanced budget. Eighty-eight percent of the people in this country want a balanced budget. If I were talking to America tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would say, "Look, there is no easy way out. We are going to have to bite the bullet. Everybody is going to have to have a little bit of the share of pain."

We are not cutting these programs. We are slowing the growth of the programs. Medicare is not going to be cut. The growth in Medicare is going to be 6.5 percent over the next 7 years. It is going to grow. But we are not going to allow it to grow at 10 to 15 percent, like it grew before. We are going to give money for the school lunch program. It is going to grow, but we are going to send the money back to the States so the Governors can more efficiently spend the money, rather than have some bureaucracy here in Washington spend it.

We have to do something about welfare reform. The President now says he is going to veto welfare reform. Everybody in the country knows welfare is out of control. There is flagrant fraud in the welfare system. We have to do something about it. Now he says he is going to veto it.

The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, if I were talking to America, I would say if we want a balanced budget, then we are going to have to get on with it. We are going to have to get on with it. We are going to have to slow the growth in these programs. Yes, we are going to

have to cut out some bureaucracy and some governmental agencies. We intend to do that.

The President is pandering to the fears of senior citizens. He knows that the premiums for Medicare are going to have to go up, but he wants to postpone these major changes until after the next election. I am telling seniors, if they are paying attention, that after the next election these increases are going to be there, but they are going to be bigger, because we will have postponed them for a year. We want to deal with the problem now. We want to deal with it in an equitable and fair way.

The benefits will continue to go up. The premiums are going to go up a little bit. There is no question about it. But we know that the Medicare system is going to fail if we do not do something. The President's commission said it is going to go bankrupt if we do not do something, so we are trying to do it in a responsible way, and he is down there at the White House with his glasses down over his nose, vetoing it, saying he is going to save it for seniors.

The fact of the matter is he knows, we all know, we are going to have to deal with that problem. We want to deal with it now, in an equitable way, so the pain they are going to feel in a year is not as severe as it would be right now.

We have no deal with the budget deficits. We are at \$5 trillion. In a few years it will be \$7 trillion. The interest alone on the debt will be so high we will not be able to manage this Government without printing money and causing hyperinflation. We have to control the deficit. We have to balance the budget, and we have a plan to do it in 7 years.

He does not want to do. He says how about 9 years, 10 years, 11 years. There is going to be no end to it, America. We will never have a balanced budget until we make the decision to do it. We want to do it now. We want to hold the President's feet to the fire. I think that is what America wants. If we do not do it now, it will never happen, and we will rue the day that we turned our backs on this opportunity.

#### WHY CRITICIZE THE PRESIDENT WHEN THE HOUSE HAS NOT COMPLETED ITS WORK ON APPROPRIATIONS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad for my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to come back. I think the gentleman and I agree on most of what the gentleman has said, not everything. One of the things that has puzzled me about this emergency, and why we are sitting here 3 hours and 55 minutes from shutting down the Government, and we

keep talking about what the President has or has not done.

It has always seemed reasonable to me that the House should have completed its work, that the budget reconciliation bill that should have been addressed by October 1, which has not been addressed, which I was told tonight at 8 o'clock the conferees were going to meet for the first time, only to be told that we are not going to meet tomorrow until 3 o'clock, but it seems to me that the House should have done its work if we are going to be criticizing the President.

What am I missing?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman well knows, we made a commitment to the American people that we were going to pass a Contract With America in the first 100 days. Because we spent the time making good on that commitment and did it in 93 days, the appropriations process was set back. He knows that.

We are trying to catch up and we will catch up. We will pass all 13 appropriation bills, as well as reconciliation, but it is a bogus argument in my opinion, and I have great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, to say that we are playing games here. The fact is we want a balanced budget and we are on a trend line to do that. The legislation we sent to the President gets us on that track.

Mr. STENHOLM. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, there are at least 68 Democrats who agree with you.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I appreciate that.

Mr. STENHOLM. It seems to me if you have Democrats also saying balance the budget in a time certain, if you have Democrats also saying to balance the budget by the year 2002, it should not be unreasonable for us, before we shut the Government down as we are doing, that we ought to let the regular legislative process go before we start criticizing the President. It seems to me that what we ought to be doing is going ahead and doing our work.

We have wasted 5 days playing this game that we are playing. The gentleman and I do not want to play games, we say. At least he has made a speech, it was excellent, on what he is for. I would want to make the same speech. But it seems to me when we are talking about the President not engaging, under the regular legislative process that everyone in this House understands as clearly as anybody could, when you have a bill, the House passes it, the Senate passes it, you go to conference, the conference works it out, the conference then goes to the President, the President signs or vetoes the bill. If he vetoes it, then we try to override, or we start over and we start negotiating.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact of the matter is, and my colleague well knows, the President has stated his opposition to a number of the provisions

in the short-term CR and the debt bill that he said he opposes. These are things that we believe America wants. He said he opposes them. The only way we could get around the President was to send him a bill that he could not veto.

Mr. STENHOLM. If I could reclaim my time—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. He has chosen to shut the Government down, not us.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I find the logic strange that somehow the President ought to be questioned about his conduct before we have ever gotten appropriation bills to him. We can all have legitimate differences about what ought to happen on Medicare, what ought to happen on education. That is normal in this country. What is not normal is when you start criticizing the President for not signing legislation that has not yet been sent to him.

When the Congress has failed to pass 10 of the 13 appropriation bills, then the issue is not whether the President has vetoed something, the issue is whether the Congress has produced something for him to sign or veto. We have not yet done that, and until we do, it seems to me that it comes with considerable ill grace for this institution to suggest that we ought to short-circuit the process when this institution has not yet performed its basic duty.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. I would like to ask a question. There is nothing in these two bills that the President is talking about vetoing, there is nothing in these bills that could not go the regular legislative route if you had done your work, or will do your work. They could be separated out. You have got the majority. You could bring them up, even under suspension, if you wanted to.

Am I right? Is that right?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the minority well knows that in the past there have been many, many, many times when we did not pass all the appropriations bill and we ran this place with continuing resolutions, short-term CRs. When we did that, the Democrats, when they were in charge, sent to the President of the United States things that he did not want.

Mr. HEFNER. The gentleman is not answering my question.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The fact is you are turning everything on its head. The gentleman knows that.

tleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, we are today in a democratic debate about the size and role of government. It is important and involves a need for comity of purpose on all sides.

Nevertheless, despite differences on the question of whether and how fast governmental budgets should be balanced, let us not lose sight of the fact that this is a blessed country which can manage its affairs peacefully and democratically.

I stress this point because on another continent last week, the Government of Nigeria executed the playwright Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight other human rights activists. A generation ago in her seminal work "The Origins of Totalitarianism" Hannah Arendt noted that one of the hallmarks of totalitarian regimes is the capriciousness as well as the anonymity of death.

It is therefore incumbent on democratic legislatures throughout the world to register dissent against political atrocities of this kind, and shine the spotlight of decency onto the regimes responsible.

The international community cannot allow individuals of conscience to disappear unnoted from the face of the Earth. Names must be named and deeds recorded. The courage of Ken Saro-Wiwa, a Nobel Peace Prize nominee and the President of the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni Peoples, as well as Barinem Kiobel, Saturday Dobee, Paul Levura, Nurdy Eawo, Felix Nuate, Daniel Gbokoo, John Kpuinen, and Baribor Bara must be acknowledged and remembered.

Like Socrates, forced to drink hemlock because of his alleged corrupting influence on the youth of Athens, Ken Saro-Wiwa was found guilty of crimes committed by others because his enlightened human rights advocacy was said to have created the environment that fostered societal misdeeds. As the lessons of Socrates' life and the injustice of his death 2½ millennia ago are recalled, we as public officials in a free society must today demand accountability for the execution of these 20th century Nigerian citizens of conscience.

In referencing this human rights tragedy, I do not mean to divert attention from the importance of the debate this evening, but this Congress, despite our problems, remains the principal legislative beacon of freedom in the world. We are obligated to resolve our differences. We are also obligated to put our problems in perspective. Important differences of judgment exist, but we can reach a consensus without putting a gun to anyone's head. We are, after all, Americans.

GOAL OF BALANCED BUDGET NOT EXCLUSIVE TO REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE LEADERSHIP'S INABILITY TO SUBMIT TO THE PRESIDENT LEGISLATION HE CAN SIGN

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I rise here to speak to the issue that we are talking about tonight, the inability of the Republican leadership, Speaker Gingrich and the leader of the other body, to bring to us and take to the President a continuing resolution and an extension of the debt ceiling which he will sign.

I do that with a special interest tonight, because I have two constituents here with me in the gallery who are nurses in my district. They are very concerned. They are concerned that we continue the commitment that we have in this country to seniors through our Medicare Program, to others through our Medicaid Program, and to their colleagues, who work in Federal facilities, so I appreciate the gentleman giving me a moment to make sure that we remember there are real people who are being discussed in these issues. This is not just theoretical.

□ 2015

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky, reference has been made again and again this evening and in previous sessions of the House to a balanced budget, and reference has been made to the President. In fact, the President has been castigated for being unwilling, presumably, to move towards a balanced budget in a time certain, generally given to be 2002.

What is constantly left out of the equation is that there is no presentation for a balanced budget. Every time I hear that being said very frankly by Members on both sides, but most particularly as a kind of challenge from the Republic side, I would find it amusing if it was not so sad that this is based upon a palpable fraud. I will tell you exactly what it is. It is no great secret.

In previous times, Mr. Speaker, in order to mask the deficit that was accumulating, we have gone into what is called something off-budget. It is a bookkeeping trick. That is all it is, the Social Security trust fund. But before, at least we were honest about it with respect that it appeared from both the Republicans and the Democrats when we finally put budgets together that we were, in fact, utilizing the so-called surplus funds in order to achieve a budget. We were not pretending that we were trying to balance the budget at that point.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and others who have preceded me have indicated, that has been a goal of both Democrats and Republicans. This is not exclusive to the Republican Party. But the difference has

THE EXECUTION OF NIGERIAN CITIZENS OF CONSCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-