

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2677, passed earlier today.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SITUATION IN BOSNIA

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I spent the greater part of today up in New Hampshire. I was in California over the weekend. Everywhere I go, along with the budget and Americans telling Republicans, "Either get with it or get out of the way, you will not be re-elected if you do not keep your promises," but right up there, coequal and even more impassioned, is Bosnia.

I circulated a letter with 70 signatures, I only needed 50, last week. I have a conference at 9 o'clock in the morning. I do not think it is the most propitious time. I kind of have a suspicion I am being sandbagged. I am putting all of the Republicans on notice, 235.

One cannot go home this Christmas, particularly after the first American steps on a mine, and be truthful and say you did everything you could to support our troops by not sending them in harm's way.

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

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Let me just follow up. There is no excuse for any Republican to say he or she is too busy tomorrow morning, at 9 a.m. in the morning, to make a statement on what is going on in Bosnia, on whether we send young Americans to die in a conflict over Christmas in the snows of Bosnia in a three-way civil war that has been going on 500 years. I thank the gentleman for letting us get involved, and I will certainly be there.

MORE ON BOSNIA

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, there is nothing more important we can be doing tomorrow morning than make a definitive statement on Bosnia.

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

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, there is an aspect to this that can be like one of the best debates in this century, and that was the debate over Desert Storm and Desert Shield.

What I would say, we are not going to yell at anybody that says their vision of supporting the troops is just a caveat in to Clinton. We are going to discuss the Constitution, the powers allocated to the presidency, Republican, Democrat, or prohibition party. This is not an imperial presidency that can send people no matter what the needs to Tibet, Rwanda, Sudan, Somalia, Haiti, and back to all the Balkan countries, without the Congress, both the House and the Senate, weighing in in the debate.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the question is not whether we support the troops or not. Both the gentleman and I will support the troops, we will salute those troops, we will go over and visit them, in fact, over the holidays if they are in fact sent. But we have a responsibility to ask very difficult questions before we commit troops to get involved in a 500-year civil war.

RICH GET RICHER, POOR GET POORER

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to all members an article that appeared in the Washington Post business section last week, which I will insert in the RECORD.

The article reported on a bipartisan round-table discussion on the rising gap between rich and poor, and the shrinking middle class in our country.

This trend is no secret. Ask any working American. We have been downsized, laid-off, cut pay, cut jobs to the point that even the Business section reports it.

I was pleased to read that some of the speakers—notably Jack Kemp—emphasized economic growth and economic development as the way to narrow the income gap in our country, not just balancing the budget.

Mr. Kemp continues to be one of the few Republicans willing to address the issue of income inequality and the poor condition of our cities instead of treating them as inconvenient facts that should be ignored or denied.

Beyond balancing the budget, we need to emphasize education and training for our children and make the necessary public investments to help create economic growth.

It is a shame that programs such as the School-to-Work program—which connects high school students to the world of work—could be eliminated by this Congress.

I invite those from the other side of the aisle who believe that the income

gap is a real problem to speak up—as Jack Kemp has—and give this issue the attention it deserves.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 7, 1995]

INCOME GAP IS ISSUE NO. 1, DEBATORS AGREE

(By Steven Pearlstein)

The growing income gap between the rich and the poor has become the central issue in American politics, and the party that figures out what to do about it—or that makes the right noises about it—will dominate American politics.

That was the message from the left and the right, Democrat and Republican, politician and pollster, economist and financier at a forum on inequality held yesterday on Capitol Hill.

"The main cause of America's anxiety is the growing gap between the haves, the have-nots and those in the middle who feel they are on a treadmill in which they have to run faster and faster merely to say in place," said Rep. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), who organized the event with retiring Sen. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.).

Stanley Greenberg, who conducts polls for the White House and the Democratic National Committee, told the gathering that nearly all recent elections have been decided by "downscale" voters who swing between Republicans, Democrats and independents such as Ross Perot in a desperate search for an answer to their declining economic fortunes.

"There is no more central subject in politics today," Greenberg declared, "and no party will be successful without addressing it successfully."

Kevin Phillips, a free-ranging Republican theorist and author of "The Politics of Rich and Poor," said the reluctance of Republicans to face up to the inequality issue was now costing them the support of one-third of their natural base of voters.

Rather than signaling the rise of a new Republican era, Phillips predicted, last year's Republican takeover of Congress will go down as the last gasp of a Republican era that began with the election of Richard Nixon in 1968, but has now been taken over by a coalition of right-wing ideologues and Wall Street interests. He noted that two earlier Republican eras, the Gilded Age of the 1880s and 1890s and the Roaring Twenties, ended when progressives were able to ride into office on the inequality issue.

Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin opened the session by declaring that rising inequality has so torn the social fabric that fixing it amounts to not only a moral or political imperative, but also an economic one.

If no solution is found, Rubin said, angry voters will soon turn to radical measures such as restoring trade barriers or re-regulating entire industries—moves that he predicts would slow economic growth and ultimately be self-defeating.

And former representative Jack F. Kemp, who now heads a Republican tax reform commission, warned that the plight of the urban poor had become morally "unconscionable" and politically unacceptable. For that reason, Kemp said Republicans should make boosting economic growth rates, not balancing the budget, their top political priority.

Nobody at yesterday's session took issue with a raft of recent reports showing that the household incomes of those in the bottom 40 percent of the economy have slipped over the last 20 years, when adjusted for inflation, while all the income growth has been concentrated in the households in the top 20 percent.

But there was a spirited and, in the end, unresolved debate over what to do about it.

Steven Rattner, a managing partner at the Wall Street investment firm of Lazard Freres & Co., argued that the key to narrowing the income gap was more and better training programs to get a better match between the jobs demanded by the new economy and the skills of workers at the bottom of the income scale.

But Louis Jacobson, a researcher at Westat Inc. in Rockville, said his studies found that such programs inevitably reach only a small portion of the work force that could benefit from them.

And Cornell University economist Robert Frank argued that many labor markets now exhibit a "winner take all" quality to them that gives disproportionate salaries to whoever is at the top, no matter how much education and training the people below them have.

Kemp, along with Rattner, argued that it would be folly to address the problem of rising inequality by expanding government efforts to transfer income from the rich to the poor.

"I don't think poor people are poor because rich people are rich," said Kemp in arguing against welfare and other "redistributionist" programs.

But not everyone agreed.

"Redistribution is not a naughty word," said Gary Burtless, an economist at the Brookings Institution in Washington.

Burtless noted that the long-term shift in the government's income support programs from the poor to the elderly middle class was a major contributor to growing inequality in recent years. And he noted that countries such as Germany and Japan had been able to finance much more generous social programs than the United States while still turning in as good or better economic performance over the past 20 years.

Burtless's comment was seconded by Timothy Smeeding, an economist at Syracuse University whose recent study found that although the United States is the richest nation, its poor have a lower standard of living than the poor of all other industrial countries.

"I think we have no choice now but to take greater account of the losers," said Smeeding.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. JONES). 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.

AGREEMENT NEEDED ON REACHING A BALANCED BUDGET IN 7 YEARS

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

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is now coming under the third week where we have had an agreement with the administration to work together to achieve a 7-year balanced budget. Again, I need to call attention to the fact that our national debt of over \$4.9 trillion remains unaddressed from the standpoint of our ability to come up with a successful budget.

I happened to see an article dated from last week's New York Times, De-

cember 6, 1995, an article by David Sanger, with the headline that says "Administration says it can avoid a borrowing crisis through January."

As we all know, the administration is struggling to avoid dealing with the reality of the fact that we must work together to achieve a balanced Federal budget in the next 7 years. The article goes on to say, "Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin said today that the administration had found new, though legally untested methods, of keeping the government solvent at least through January."

The article goes on to say "While Mr. Rubin would not discuss how long he could drag out his delicate fiscal balancing act, other administration officials said the Treasury and Justice Department lawyers had been meeting daily to devise a legally defensible strategy for sidestepping the Congressionally set \$4.9 trillion limit on Federal borrowing well into the spring." I emphasize that.

It goes on to say, "Mr. Rubin declined to say what method the Treasury had chosen to keep the government paying its bills and the interest and principal due on government securities."

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely serious matter. As I read into the article, it goes on to say that the extent of borrowing that has been designed to sidestep the debt limit may well exceed \$60 billion. That is \$60 billion of potentially unauthorized indebtedness.

It goes on to say that, quoting from the article in the New York Times, Wednesday, December 6, by manipulating how the Government retirement funds are invested, the Treasury Secretary has put the Government about \$60 billion under the debt ceiling, enough to enable it to borrow the funds to make it through the month of December.

I think this is a serious issue, and I hope that as we try to work together with the administration through the rest of this week, as we work together with the administration to try to reach a balanced budget over the next 7 years, we can come to some complete and final agreement on how Republicans and Democrats can work together to finally balance the Federal budget.

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

[Mr. POSHARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 2045

REPRESENTATIVE MFUME SPEAKS TO HIS DECISION TO LEAVE THE CONGRESS TO HEAD UP THE NAACP

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

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I actually thought I would wait until later in the week or perhaps later in the month to come before the House and to express to my colleagues who are here and those who are watching in their respective offices a great sense of appreciation, a great deal of loss, and, at the same time, a great deal of anticipation of what, for me, becomes the beginning of a new journey of a thousand miles.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this institution in early 1987 with the class of the historic 100th Congress. It was a different Congress then, and in many respects there were different people. This institution, over the years, long before I got here, and I am sure long after I am gone, will continue, in many respects, to be the scorn in the eyes of some, the hope in the eyes of others, but the only institution that, as Americans, we have in our legislative branch of Government.

So as we contemplate coming and going, for me it was a tough decision and yet an easy decision. I was always taught that we come here with nothing and we leave this life with nothing, and that it is what we do between our birth date and our death date that determines our worth and our value and our substance as a human being.

Those of us who have come to this point to be in service to America and to our colleagues and to people all across this country, whose policies affect countless millions of nameless, faceless Americans, and whose conduct, quite frankly, and whose decorum is watched by persons who want to be here and by those who will never get here. But all of those things in the aggregate essentially determine what kind of government we have and how we, as caretakers of that government, are perceived.

Mr. Speaker, I will miss, obviously, this institution. I have come to love it. I believe in the necessity of an open and free Democratic form of government. I will miss the individuals here, who I have served with on both sides of the aisle, all from different walks of life. We have debated great issues together: The Civil Rights Act of 1991, the gulf war, the great decisions to think of and to ultimately pass an Americans With Disabilities Act, and numbers of other bills and measures that speak to the life style that many of America's people now enjoy.

I will also miss, to some extent, the process. But I think those who know me recognize that because I come from humble beginnings, it really was not a major decision to give up a safe congressional seat, with 82 and 84 H14354percent