

number of years is simply nothing but a baby sitting job or a baby sitting activity. How egregiously wrong that perspective is.

In my district, in the city of Houston, we will lose some 6,000 summer jobs. Across this Nation, we will lose millions of dollars that have helped young people be directed away from activities that would cause criminal results to more constructive activities that have exposed them to career activities.

There have been accusations, for example, that the monies have been misused. I am not sure of the extensiveness of any hearings that have suggested that cities that have been, and quasi-public agencies that have been in partnership with the business communities throughout this Nation have not effectively utilized youth summer program monies.

We have been able to hire 6,000 youths in my community. All of them have managed to be exposed to unique experiences. Whether it was with NASA and the space station, whether it was with city government, or whether it was with one of our major energy companies in the community, they have learned independence, self-sufficiency, self-esteem.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I had a young person who worked in my office when I was a local elected official who did real work, by the way, this young intern, who, when she got the offer to be an intern under the summer jobs program, called with excitement but yet sadness and said, I cannot accept, because I do not have the proper clothes and I would be embarrassed to show up. I said to that young person, if you have to wear a paper bag, come to this office to know what you can do, how you can be challenged and what the opportunities are for you in the future.

The Budget Reconciliation Act must give to the American people hope. It must give to them a direction. It must give to them focus. What we have now is an ill-spirited and misdirected opportunity.

So I would ask, as the process continues, that we begin to look at where this country wants to go in the 21st century. Do we want to turn back the clock on environment with respect to clear water, clean air, and would you believe, food safety inspections? How outrageous when we have come so far that now we would deny citizens the adequacy of food safety inspections.

We have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to fairly strike a chord of reason in the Budget Reconciliation Act process. I will participate. I ask my colleagues to participate.

**BALANCED BUDGET
ELIMINATING AND
PROGRAMS**

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the House today on the budget and on the process of balancing the budget.

I have listened to a number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle today and in the weeks past on the budget, and I really think that maybe an honest step would be for them to say that we do not want to balance the budget, just get it over with. Because what we are hearing is, well, not here and not there, and do not do this, and do not do that.

Federal jobs programs, for example. Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have 163 different Federal jobs training programs. Is it possible that some of those could be trimmed back, some could be consolidated, and perhaps, oh, do not say it too loudly around Washington, but maybe some could be eliminated? Is that not what the American people actually want?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his perspective.

The gentleman from Georgia mentioned several job training programs. I would only raise an inquiry for what I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to do and what I would hope that we could do together, and that is to turn this country around to a level of self-sufficiency. Part of that comes from our youth. If I can just separate out your comments to focus on the summer jobs program that have been effective in our communities, because, in fact, they have been a partnership between the public and the private sector.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, one of the things that is very important to remember is that the AmeriCorps Program, which the gentlewoman has been discussing, for example, is \$26,000 per child. Well, I would say to my colleague, we can produce a heck of a lot of great opportunities for kids at that rate.

The problem, as the gentlewoman knows, is that if we want to do something for kids, we have to reduce the deficit. We cannot pass them our bankrupt legacy, the \$200 billion debt that we have year after year, the \$4.9 trillion that is eating away at these things.

Now, the gentlewoman and I know that when we were kids, an old trick used to be to go to the corner drugstore and charge a Coca Cola or an ice cream to your dad's account down there. Well, at the end of the month your father would find out, well, you charged something to me, and I am going to make you pay that back.

Well, now what is happening is we parents are going down and we are charging things for our kids to pay, but these are 4- and 5- and 6-year-old children who for years and years are going to be paying.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I thank the gentleman for his thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very quick on this point. If we have analyzed the \$26,000 on AmeriCorps, we have not yet juxtaposed or compared that against the investment or resources that they provide to the community which balances off, because they are giving labor for free, in essence, and the summer jobs exposes children to opportunity.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is important, but out of 163 job training programs I would challenge the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] to say, let us cut these. We are in agreement that maybe we need 100 job training programs, or maybe we need 2, or maybe we need 50. Where I think the Democrat Party is being somewhat disingenuous is you all are saying, let us cut the budget and let us balance it, but not here, not now, not in my area.

These are good programs. I would say to my colleague that, in each case, many of them are good programs, yet we are still in debt. So why do we not try to take the good ones that are good and consolidate them together and reduce it and, most importantly, cut out the Washington bureaucrats who are the middle people who are sucking up so much of the money that should go?

I want to make one more point. Mr. Speaker, it is already November, almost December. We keep hearing, balance the budget, but not here, not now. We want to work in a bipartisan fashion. To my knowledge, the only serious plan that has come from you all has been on the Blue Tick Hounds or the Hound Dog Democrats or whatever you call them, and I know that the gentleman from Mississippi has been a part of that. That is a great counter-punch to the debate, and I applaud it. But it is still a minority group within the Democrat Party.

We do not have a serious Democrat proposal to balance the budget yet. So as long as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to say, not here, not now; I would say, get in the arena with us. I mean, it is difficult to balance the budget. If it was not, we would have had one in the last 25 years.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Mississippi. If we can get more time, I will continue this debate, because the lady from Texas has been a very positive person in this debate process.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think there is more that we can do, the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate it. I think we have tried to meet on different issues. I wish that the budget now before us was not so strident.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

**REQUEST TO EXTEND SPECIAL
ORDER TIME**

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request. I would like to extend the gentleman's time by 3 minutes so that he

could yield to me so that I could have the opportunity to answer the question that he asked of me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to recognize that unanimous-consent request. The gentleman is limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, how many additional people are there on the list, sir?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Approximately 15.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with going back and forth between Democrat and Republican, is it not true that a Democrat can ask for unanimous consent for 5 minutes to speak out of order and then the gentleman from Mississippi can get 5 minutes if no one objects?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

□ 1345

A BALANCED BUDGET?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry before we go on.

I understand what is at stake here. But is the ruling of the Chair about continuing because, if we start this process, that means those who have signed up will have to wait a longer time? Is that the reason for proceeding this way?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot recognize Members for extensions of 5-minute special orders.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I understand. I thank the Chair.

I have the time, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to my friend from Georgia, and I do consider him my friend, that what the coalition and what I hope every Member of this body is asking for is honesty in budgeting.

I did some checking yesterday from the Congressional Budget Office, and even the Republican budget for 1996 would run up a \$296 billion annual operating deficit; \$118 billion of that would be taken from trust funds.

I have continually heard that bill being referred to on the floor of the House of Representatives as the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. Sir, that is not a balanced budget. I think the gen-

tleman knows that, and I know that, I think the people of America ought to know that.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, following up on Mr. TAYLOR's comment, as you know, yesterday I started what I said would be a series of discussions as to what constitutes a balanced budget in the context of the Speaker's admonition to us that we use honest numbers.

I invited the Speaker to come down and discuss that if he wants. He is not here today. I do not know whether he will be here tomorrow. I am going to be here right through the 15th. He may be in negotiations right now, I do not know, about this so-called balanced budget. But every time we see on television or hear on radio or read in the newspaper the Speaker talking about a balanced budget in 7 years and using honest numbers, I submit to you and I submit to him and would be very happy to have a discourse with him that this is illusionary. This is entirely illusory in nature. These numbers do not reflect an honest balanced budget.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] indicated, every single budget proposed from the years 1996 through 2002 has a massive deficit attached to it in the Republican plan. Every single one of those budgets is going into the Social Security trust fund. It is stated right in the budget documents of the Republican proposals, and I do not object at any time to someone coming forward with the idea of saying let us get to a balanced budget as I indicated yesterday.

In time to come, I will come on this floor and propose the kind of alternatives that some of us are putting together and are willing to get behind that which will achieve that in an honest way. This is dishonest in the sense that you are putting forward, or we are having put forward to us by the majority the idea that somehow they have exclusive claim to a balanced budget.

I will indicate that this year alone, and I may be off \$1 or \$2 billion, a couple of billion dollars depending on what the final figures come out to be, but the proposal is that they take \$63 billion from a so-called surplus in the Social Security system.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I will yield briefly because I have got a long way to go and you folks are on the floor every single day with this line and you have hundreds of people saying the same things, and we are just a couple of us here right now. But I will yield for the moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would say this to my friend from Hawaii whom I know to be a learned and honest gentleman. This is an 18-inch ruler, and what is unbelievable to me that over here 18 inches may be different, if we were talking money on the other side of the aisle, and I agree with what you and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] and the gentlewoman from

Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] are saying, let us use the same ruler when we debate this so that balance really is balance. No deficit really means no deficit.

So I would say to you in the spirit of let us get to the bottom of it, I am with you 100 percent on what your assertion is. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. To enter into a dialog with you on this, then, is it your position that the budget as put forward by the majority at the present time is not going to balance the budget if at the end of 2002 we have almost \$1 trillion owing to the Social Security trust fund?

Mr. KINGSTON. If we are making by a ruler that is the same ruler that we measure all plans on and that is the case, then we need to look at it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If you could be so kind, would you try and answer my question. Is it the Republican budget position that in the year 2002 when you have ostensibly balanced the budget that you will owe the Social Security trust fund \$636 billion plus interest, approximately \$1 trillion will be owing to the trust fund?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this. Last night was the first night that I listened to what you are saying and it raised something that I want to go back and do my homework on. But I can assure you that I would be happy to answer that question afterwards and continue a dialog in an honest manner.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, do I have time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ten seconds.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I very much appreciate the honesty of the gentleman from Georgia. I will indicate to him and to the rest of the House that if they go back and do their homework as he suggests, they will find that in the year 2002 we will owe almost \$1 trillion to the Social Security trust fund, and in the time to come, Mr. Speaker, over the next couple of weeks I am sure we can explore this issue at greater depth. I thank the Speaker very much and the gentleman from Georgia.

BOSNIA

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

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, just to follow up briefly, I was going to be talking on Bosnia but to follow up briefly on what the gentleman said before, anybody that comes up with a plan that does more to balance the budget than what the Republican plan has done this year is fine with me. But I am hearing conflicting signals.

The first thing I am hearing is that the Republican budget does not go far enough to balance the budget. And then we turn around the next day and