

underfund a block grant to the States, and those persons who are now covered by Medicaid, currently covered by Medicaid, will now have to compete among others, if they will be covered at all, in the year 2002.

So Medicaid as a program, we must understand, is the underpinning for at least 26 million very, very poor persons, and at least 36 million Americans. Again, who are they? They are the elderly, they are pregnant women, they are children, and they are the disabled; no other health care do they know other than that. So when we reduce that by \$163 billion over 7 years, choices will have to be made as to who will be covered and who will not be covered.

States will be forced to make some very difficult decisions with their limited Medicaid funds. They must choose now, who will they offer health care? Which among those who are disabled now will have a health care and which will not have health care? Those are difficult choices to make between people you are now serving; and why should we have to make those difficult choices when there are other options? These choices are unnecessary in the very beginning.

We should remember that when we created Medicaid in the first instance, it was indeed to speak to the most vulnerable of those who need health care. This is not to suggest that Medicaid does not need to be reformed; of course, containment needs to be made. There are ways to have cost containment. There are ways to have better health care and prevention without denying people the opportunity of having health care.

Again, if you have to choose between \$245 billion worth of tax cuts at the same time by reducing the growth of \$163 billion over 7 years, you will have to make choices between millions of disabled persons, thousands of elderly persons and an unknown number of persons who are covered as mothers and children.

In my judgment, that is no choice, no choice whatsoever. Again, the President has offered a plan that cuts Medicaid by one-third as much as the Republican plan and yet balances the budget, cuts Medicaid by one-third as much and balances the budget. But more important than that, he maintains Medicaid as a Federal program, as entitlement to the people, not to the States, where the Republican plan would be an entitlement to the States. They would say, States, you have a right to this program, not people, not those 36 million people.

We will now be saying, North Carolina, California, Montana, whatever, States, you have that right, not people who live in the State.

So the President's plan would preserve Medicaid as a federally sponsored program that would be provided for those who are least among us and the poor.

Medicaid is indeed an important program. We need to know how to make it

more efficient; we need to make sure we serve as many people as we can.

Again, Medicaid as a block grant with no guarantee of health coverage whatsoever will mean that children and older Americans may have no place to turn. Indeed, America can do better than that. America can find a way to keep this entitlement for all of its citizens.

□ 1330

WHY WE NEED A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the first day during the budget negotiations to try to come to a compromise for a balanced budget, the administration and Congress, I think, have made some progress. Maybe some of the hopefulness is in what has been suggested, that the CBO has estimated now that approximately \$135 billion extra will be available in their new baseline, and that means the differences are less in the dollar amount between the House and Senate.

Here is one problem, though, in the CBO estimate of their prediction of a somewhat rosier economy in the next 3 or 4 years. That is the fact that it is exactly that, it is 3 or 4 years. The projection in the fifth, sixth, and seventh year is so ambiguous that that is not where additional revenues coming into the Government are coming from.

Therefore, when you decide the social programs that are going to be continued and expanded, when you decide the entitlement programs that are going to be continued and expanded, you have to take into consideration what is going to happen the fifth, sixth, and seventh year. Those issues still need to be addressed today.

I particularly am very concerned about what happened on November 15 when the President disinvested the so-called G fund and the thrift savings fund as well as the civil service retirement trust fund for a total of \$61 billion.

Congress, who is given the authority in article 1, section 8, of the Constitution to control borrowing, has now had some of that power taken away from them by an administration that has found a special way to increase the debt load of this country by raiding the trust funds, \$61 billion.

It took this country the first 160 years of its existence, through Pearl Harbor, into World War II, before we had amassed that kind of a \$60 billion debt. In one fell swoop, the President and Mr. Rubin increased the debt load of this country another \$61 billion.

What I would suggest is that it is important to try to regain control of spending in this country and the debt ceiling in this country.

Mr. Rubin suggests, well, once we have appropriated the money, it is the responsibility of Congress to come up with whatever is necessary in additional borrowing authority to pay off those debts.

Here is what is being left out of the discussion, Mr. Speaker. It is the fact that most of the spending, most of the cuts to achieve a balanced budget are coming from the entitlement changes. Since a majority in Congress can no longer reduce spending through the entitlement programs without the consent of the President, we have lost some of our authority to control the purse strings of this country. So it is very appropriate to tie the debt ceiling limit to conditions of changing the entitlement programs of this country, to try to have the U.S. Government live within its means.

We need to remind ourselves what we are talking about in terms of what borrowing is doing to our economy and the obligation that that is passing on to our kids and our grandkids.

We are borrowing money now because we think what we are doing and the problems that we face are so important that it justifies us going deeper into debt and telling our kids and our grandkids that they are going to have to pay back this debt out of money they have not even earned yet. They are going to have their own problems.

Most people conceptually say, well, yes, Government should try to live within its means and balance its budget. The fact is, is that it has such an impact, not only on our moral obligations of what we pass on to our kids as far as increasing their obligation and problems, but also its effect on our economy.

Alan Greenspan, our chief banker of this country, head of the Federal Reserve, came into our Budget Committee and said, "Look, if you are able to end up with a balanced budget, interest rates will go down between 1½ and 2 percent."

Two weeks ago, he went to the Senate Banking and Financial Services Committee and said, "Look, if you do not end up with a balanced budget, interest rates could go up another 1 percent," a dramatic difference in the effect of our individual lives, on how much it costs us to buy a home or borrow money to go to school or buy a car.

Let me just say that it is so important to our future, to our economy, to our well-being in this country and the well-being of our kids, that we have got to have a legitimate balanced budget, and I sincerely hope the administration and Congress will get together and achieve that particular goal of a real, no smoke-and-mirrors balanced budget.

RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pain that I come to this House floor as the senior woman in this House to discuss what I watched yesterday in the press conference coming from Salt Lake City by our colleague. No, I am not here to talk about shedding tears. I have been one to shed tears. In fact, if Members of Congress had corporate sponsors like race car drivers do, my corporate sponsor would probably be Kleenex. But I am here to remind this body that shedding tears does not shed us of our responsibilities that we take when we assume this very solemn task of stewardship for the people in our district when they send us here to represent them.

I watched and was terribly troubled, because I think it is time we as Members of this body realize that when we get elected, we are the ones that get elected. Our spouses do not get elected. Our staffs do not get elected. If we choose to delegate some authority to our spouses or to our staffs, then we must stand and take the responsibility for that delegation. Because only our name is on that ballot, and that ballot is a very, very sacred act in the democracy. When you vote for a person, you are to get that person or that person's judgment, and that is all we have that holds representative government together.

So as I watched yesterday and I heard the many explanations, I was even further troubled by the explanation that, even though everybody knows none of us are allowed to receive more than \$1,000 to campaign with from either a spouse or a family member or a friend or anybody. No one is allowed to receive more than \$1,000. You can only spend more than that if it happens to be your own money.

And so hearing that, "Oh, well, I did it but, you see, you cannot give an election back, so on with the show."

Well, you may not be able to give an election back, but I must say you can step down. You can step down. If any American went out and procured items with illegally-gotten money and that was discovered, they would have to give it back. They would have to give it back. You can never undo what was wrong, but you try to make recompense.

I think we have these laws that we either honor or, if we are going to ignore them, find out about them later and say, "So be it," it does not work. It does not work.

Saying that you signed blank statements and you are very sorry that they filled them in, hey, let us see the average American be able to use that defense with the Internal Revenue Service: "I just signed a blank 1040. Someone filled it in, and I did not really mean to do it." That does not work. None of us are allowed to delegate our citizen responsibility, our representative responsibility, unless we are will-

ing to stand and take the consequences for it.

So I think in this society where there has been so much talk about people trying to become victims and "Because I am a victim, therefore I am not responsible," that does not work.

This great democracy only works if every one of us stands up and takes responsibility for what we undertook and takes responsibility for being the captain of our own ship and our own lives.

So it is with great pain that I say these things today, because obviously my colleague has been very hurt and been very hurt in love, which many people can be hurt. But that does not give people an excuse to walk away from their duties or to overlook all the different things that went on that should have been warning signals, and I do not think we should allow that to be used in this case, either.

So I hope all of us take that seriously, think about our responsibility seriously and wonder how in the world this democracy can ever work if we allow people to be able to shed tears and be able to shed responsibility, or claim victimhood and therefore shed responsibility.

Responsibility is not another layer of skin like a snake has, and you can just say, "Oops, I am out of there, I am someone new."

No, we must be held accountable for our acts. That is the very, very basis of this Government. And yesterday for me was a very sad day.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE EXPULSION OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER R. TUCKER III, FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX of the House of Representatives, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House. The form of the resolution is as follows:

A resolution providing for the expulsion of Representative Walter R. Tucker, III from the House. *Resolved*, That pursuant to article I, section 5, clause 2 of the United States Constitution, Representative Walter R.

Tucker, III, be, and he hereby is expelled, from the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce scheduling of that privileged resolution within 2 legislative days.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

SECRETARY OF ENERGY MISUSES PUBLIC FUNDS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, more than a month ago I came to this floor and called upon President Clinton to dismiss the Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary. I said that she should not remain in office for even 1 more day after we learned of her use of public funds to rank news reporters based on their treatment of her.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the White House condemned her conduct the President allowed Secretary O'Leary to remain and to continue spending public funds. Now we learn that she has soaked the taxpayers for millions more by living the high life on foreign junkets—while padding the payroll here at home.

Half a million dollars for a trip to Pakistan? Unbelievable. \$850,000 for a trip to China? That's an outrage. No wonder this administration has such difficulty swallowing a balanced budget and letting taxpayers keep more of their own money. Cabinet status ought not entitle one to take a perpetual five-star vacation at taxpayer expense. Instead of dismissing these concerns, this time the President ought to dismiss Secretary O'Leary.

FULL FUNDING FOR LIHEAP

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, winters in Massachusetts can get pretty cold. This Sunday, with the windchill, it went down to below zero—and we're not even half way into December.

These low temperatures mean that a lot of homes can get dangerously cold