

That is what put people back to work. That is good news.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on what the gentlewoman from North Carolina said.

It is a good day in America. We can work together. There are 48 Democrats who last week said that it was important that we balance the budget, and that we balance the budget using true and accurate numbers. I mean, let us face it, in Washington, DC, no one side has the high ground on smoke and mirrors.

We saw in the early 1980's that it was the Republicans and a Republican administration that played with rosy scenarios and numbers. We have seen it throughout the 1980's. We have also now seen it in the 1990's that we have a Democratic administration that is awfully nervous about using real numbers. But the fact of the matter is, we can work together.

Unfortunately, this past weekend I heard some people talking about how the Democratic Party worked hard through the weekend in the grand tradition of FDR and Truman. I will tell you what I heard was a lot of demagoging on the floor. I heard NEWT GINGRICH compared to Bull Conner in Birmingham, AL. And of course those of you who know your history and remember, Bull Conner was the police chief who sicced dogs on minorities in Birmingham to eat them alive and turned water hoses on minorities to enforce segregation. That is not helpful.

It is not helpful when extremists on the other side of the aisle refer to Republicans as Nazis for wanting to balance the budget. We have to get beyond that. We have got to get beyond the demagoguery on Medicare.

The Washington Post had several articles and editorials this past week calling the liberals' hand on what I, and I hate to say it, but just on, if not lying, on blatantly misrepresenting Republicans' plans on Medicare.

This past weekend, the Washington Post wrote, though many of President Clinton's advisors think the GOP's premium proposal on Medicare is sensible and it differs little from his own plan, the President fired sound bites from the Oval Office daily, taking the low road in ways that only Washington pundits could recast as standing tall.

As polls showed, it worked. The Washington Post on November 15 wrote that the Democrats have been prospecting harder for votes among the elderly and against the Republican proposal than they have for saving the needed money to bring the deficit down. Of course last week's Washington Post editorial wrote that the Democrats, led by the President, chose

instead to project themselves as Medicare's great protectors. They have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it, because they think that is where the votes are and it is the way around the Republican proposals generally.

The President was still doing it this week. A Republican proposal to increase Medicare premiums was one of the reasons he alleged to veto and shut down the Government. Never mind that he himself and his own budget would countenance this similar increase.

We have said it before and it gets more serious now. If the Democrats play the Medicare card to win, they will have set back for years for the worst of political reasons the very cause for rational government on whose behalf they profess to be behaving.

So let us get real, let us talk reality, talk real numbers. The fact of the matter is we are protecting, preserving Medicare for future generations, and more importantly, we have done what this Government has not done in a generation. We put forward a plan to balance the budget. And I hope more Democrats come on board.

ON THE WAY TO A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rejoice with all Americans that Government employees are back at work today serving the American public. That is the way it should have been all along. There was no need for the crisis we just went through. Apparently one person's ill-disposition got us in that jam.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the way to a balanced budget. We have been on that way for 3 years; 3 years ago, the annual fiscal deficit stood at about \$300 billion. It is now down to about \$160 billion annual fiscal deficit. It is coming down.

Every economist that studies this question will tell you how quickly we reach a balanced budget depends upon the strength of the American economy: How well does American business do, how well do American workers do, and how well the Government do because they all do well? That is what is going to bring the budget into balance. There are some problems that need to be fixed. They can be fixed and they will be fixed.

I notice that some of my Republican colleagues got up here and condemned the tax increase that the President pushed through 2 years ago. Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, the bill that comes to the floor from the Republican Party does not repeal a single one of those taxes that they have condemned so heartily. They control this place. They could repeal those taxes if they

wanted to, but they have not seen fit to do it. It is still the law of the land. So that is just crybaby time.

Now, the question before us all is not when the budget is balanced. We all want to do it as soon as possible. The question is how you do it and who is going to pay for it. Keep your eyes on that, American public. We do not want children, poor people, working poor people, sick people, or old people to have to bear the burden. Take the rich tax cut off for the very wealthy and the budget is easily balanced.

GOVERNMENT OPENS AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, this is the Thanksgiving season, and certainly we have a lot to be thankful for today, particularly. We can be thankful that 800,000 furloughed Federal employees are returning to work. We can be thankful that there is a glimmer of bipartisanship here in this Congress. We can be thankful that today this House will vote on a bipartisan agreement, not only to end the Federal shutdown, but to balance the budget in 7 years with honest numbers. No back doors and no gimmicks.

I believe this balanced budget will be the greatest legacy of this Congress. This Congress is committed to working with the administration to do what Congresses should do every year, and that is balance the Federal budget.

Now, the next step on the road to fiscal sanity is just as important, and that is agreeing to a Balanced Budget Act of 1995. We need to balance the budget by agreeing to spend an additional \$3 trillion over the next 7 years, rather than the projected \$4 trillion we are on course to spend.

As my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, has said, the debate is not about cuts. It is about whether we can forgo that fourth trillion.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am a bit confused today about the President's statement last night, as compared to the specific language of the continuing resolution which he says he will sign.

Now, the continuing resolution, which the President has said he will sign tonight, agrees to protect future generations and to protect Medicare, education, Medicaid, agriculture, national defense, and the environment. But it says specifically, and I quote, "The President and the Congress shall enact,"—shall enact—legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget, not later than the fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office," a very flat commitment to balancing the budget within 7 years, according to CBO scoring.

However, in his statement last night, the President said, and I quote, "And

you know I have expressed strong doubts that the budget can be balanced in 7 years, if we use the current Republican congressional budget assumptions. But I am nevertheless committed to working in the coming weeks to see if we can reach common ground on balancing the budget. The key is that nothing will be agreed to unless all elements are agreed to." Unquote.

I must confess that I am concerned about that statement. The agreement, the specific language which we will vote on today, is not an agreement simply to see if we do it.

So I call upon the President not to run from the language, from the specific language, that he has agreed to sign, even before he signs it. The majority of this House of Representatives has shown that we can balance the budget within 7 years using CBO scoring. Coalition Democrats have come forward and given their version of the balanced budget, within 7 years, using CBO scoring.

I now call on my friends from the other side of the aisle to get with the President and to make sure that he comes forward with an honest budget using CBO scoring, and to tell the American people how he proposes to balance the budget within 7 years using the honest CBO figures that he has agreed to.

The President so far has had it both ways. He has had the best of both worlds. On one hand, he has been for a balanced budget, and on the other hand, he has not wanted to make the difficult decisions to get us there.

The American people have told us that our days of having our cake and eating it too are over. I look forward to seeing where the President would reduce the growth of Government spending. Then we can reach a balanced budget in 7 years, show the American people that a promise made is a promise kept, and give our children the future they deserve.

THANKSGIVING TRUCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, surely all America can give thanks this Thanksgiving for a Thanksgiving truce in a truly senseless war. Our Republican colleagues in the Senate, as well as the President and his staff, deserve our praise for their hard work this weekend to try to reach a Federal budget eventually that will be balanced not only in terms of numbers, but in terms of the way it treats the American people with true fairness.

The only way that this agreement was implemented and 800,000 Federal workers returned to work today is because our Democratic colleagues worked together here in the House. I feel good about that.

Because of our willingness to work this weekend instead of to quit in the

midst of a national crisis, we were here on the floor last night, ready to implement this agreement. Had the adjournment motion that was forced on us on Saturday been approved, we would have had another day of delay for the American people, delay that would have cost them \$100 to \$150 million for our Federal workers to be idle again.

For, you see, from the very beginning, those who forced this crisis intended to pay people for not working for the Federal Government. Eight hundred thousand people were paid for not doing any work during the course of this crisis. Hopefully, those in this House who were so very determined and who spoke with such strident comments to impose their will on America, that they were willing to pay these 800,000 people not to work all of last week, those folks heard the message of the American people that Americans have been saying in one poll after another about the way this whole crisis was handled.

To be honest, the cost of that message was fairly dear to the American people. I think it can be estimated at well over a half billion dollars—\$100 to \$150 million a day. Hopefully the message is now heard and we can refocus on budget priorities, whether we want to give a tax break to the most prosperous Americans or protect our people on Medicare and who rely on educational assistance to have a better tomorrow.

PRESERVING NATIONAL UNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy on May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, if ever we needed to be reminded of the need for America to preserve our precious national unity, recent events around the world have provided us with helpful reminders.

The most obvious was the wake-up call America received earlier this month, when our great neighbor Canada narrowly avoided splitting in two over linguistic and cultural divisions. Canada may yet divorce, and a nation founded on many of the same principles America was, might actually cease to exist. Canada's continuing bushes with separation should be the red warning light that causes us to stop and think: Could our Nation fragment like Canada almost did?

The answer is a disconcerting but resounding yes. Columnist Charles Krauthammer in a recent essay notes that "Separatism is the single greatest political fact of the post-cold-war world." Today, it is increasingly difficult for diverse, multicultural nations to keep from splitting apart. And, as Krauthammer rightly remarks, the United States is not immune to the centrifugal forces of separatism.

It is a seldomly discussed fact in the debate over America's growing dis-

unity that countries the world over are dealing with similar problems. We are all familiar with the cases that have captured the headlines—Quebec, the end of Yugoslavia, and the fragmentation of the old U.S.S.R.—but this has truly become a global concern.

I know this because I have met and discussed with a number of foreign leaders and academics on this very issue. In March of this year, I participated in an international conference on this topic at the University of Paris. There, I met with the French Minister of Culture, who had just introduced legislation to preserve French in increasingly diverse France. I also met other Western European and South American leaders who were preparing to establish national languages in their respective countries.

It surprised me that so many nations around the world were dealing with many of the same concerns I have had about the disuniting of America. I probably shouldn't have been surprised; while our Nation is the most diverse in the history of the world, it is the hallmark of the late 20th century that almost every country is being enriched and impacted by immigration. With the advent of the global economy and the global village of communication and culture, the world has begun a mass migration of peoples that has no historical precedent. In a century, most—if not all—of the world's countries will be as diverse as America, or diverse nations will no longer exist.

The reason is because most nations are not addressing the fundamental challenge of the 21st century: how to defuse the time bomb of rising nationalism and tribalism in a post-cold-war world market by mass immigration.

The countries, whose representatives I met with in Paris, have begun to attack this problem. They are on their way to establishing national languages in their countries. They would join 87 other countries around the world who have declared official languages, 63 of which have chosen English as their national language. One of those countries is India, who recognized some time ago that in a nation where 14 different languages and dialects are spoken, one common language is needed to unite their people. They chose English, because of their colonial relationship with Great Britain, but also because it is the international language of commerce, diplomacy, air traffic control, and the Internet, among others. Ironically, India has recognized the need for making English their official language before the United States has.

I hope the events around the world and the emerging global realities of the 21st century will convince us in this country that we need to act to preserve our common language. We have seen the future of America if we don't; I pray we don't have to actually live it.

Congress should start to show the common sense that legislators the world over have demonstrated in dealing with the major challenge of the