

□ 2045

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.]

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

of the vote election after election, and to walk toward an organization considered by some to be in disarray and perhaps by some to be in disrepair.

Because I have an excitement inside of me that speaks of a new vision, a new vision of hope and possibility, I believe in the aspect of coalition. I know what it will take in this country for us to be a better Nation. I want to be a part of the process. I agonize, like many of my colleagues going home at night, in the comfort of my own surroundings, and knowing that violence still plagues our Nation, that hatred and racial polarization have not gone away, that many people who look like you and look like me, regardless of their station in their life, still have a dose of despair in their eyes, that are young and have given up on themselves, and they plan now for their funerals because they do not expect to reach the age of 25, that drug abuse and spousal abuse and child abuse run rampant in a Nation that ought have been beyond that and ought to have found lessons to have gotten there.

All of those things are also part of the America that we love, but they beckon me in a different way tonight, and they call me in such a way that I cannot say no.

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

Mr. MFUME. I would be more than happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. First of all, there will be a lot of the conservatives that will miss the gentleman. Your willingness, I know on the civil rights bill, and other issues that were very complicated, it does not mean we do not disagree on certain models, but the gentleman will leave this House with integrity, value and substance, Mr. MFUME. And I want to let the gentleman know that of a lot of the Members on that side, the gentleman has been someone that I have been able to sit down with, even with differing issues. The gentleman has been very amendable, very supportive, and I want to thank him.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind and heartfelt words.

There is an aspect of service in this America that I talked about, even fraught with all those problems and difficulties, that I also need to say before I yield back any time I have remaining, and that is the relationships, the personal relationships that we develop in here and the desire to always want to believe in the best of other people.

I looked at the gentleman from Missouri, HAROLD VOLKMER, go through the agony of watching his wife, die of cancer over a sustained period of time. I have talked to Members on both sides of the aisle about the birth of a child, or a wedding, or the ability to get a child through college, or the need just

to find a way to get away from the day-to-day agonies of the job and to be people again. I would hope that as we all come to grips with what we do in this institution, that we recognize that as individuals and as Americans, aside from party affiliation, it really is what we do between that birth date and that death date that will determine our worth as human beings.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MFUME. I would be more than happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, just to add my comments to our friend and colleague from California. I came to the session of the Congress that the gentleman came to and have had the highest respect for him in the 9 years I have known him.

The gentleman will leave this body and will leave a great loss to us because he has been a key leader and someone that all of us respect on both sides of the aisle. But he certainly is the gain for the NAACP and those issues which he will lead this country forward on.

We look forward to working with the gentleman in his new capacity and pledge the gentleman our full cooperation. He has been a real inspiration to Members on both sides of the aisle. We will miss him, but we look forward to his leadership on an even greater height for all of America.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I know I am out of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired, but we would like to give 3 or 4 additional minutes to the fine gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MFUME. I thank the Chair for his generosity, and I promise I will not use all of that, because despite the best wishes of some, I am still going to be around here for a few more weeks raising you know what.

I do want to say, before sitting down that I believe that we have a golden opportunity, and certainly I do, heading up the NAACP, America's oldest and largest civil rights organization, to bring a sense of balance, to add to the dialog, to seek coalition, to give hope to our young people, to defy the odds, to put in place an apparatus for economic empowerment, to do away with some of the disparities in our society, to emphasize against educational excellence and individual responsibility, and to really provide a clear and consistent path that might be visible to other people.

So I welcome that task and I thank all of my colleagues who I have served with, for their friendship over the years, for their counsel, for their ability to engage in debate on those principal issues that they believed in, but most of all for being a part of what I

consider to be the greatest institution of American Government, and that is the House of the people.

VOTE ON BOSNIA IS ESSENTIAL BEFORE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1995

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss today why it is absolutely essential that we have a vote on Bosnia before Thursday. The President will initial and actually sign the peace agreement on Thursday, and I believe it is absolutely vital that we go through this one more time so that we are certain we have done everything that we can to be sure about such things as what is the vital U.S. interest. The President's discussion of that in his speech was absolutely inadequate. It would apply to any trouble spot in the world.

I said during the campaign, and I would say now, I would only support U.S. ground troops anywhere in the world if clearly defined and easily understood vital U.S. issues are clearly threatened. In addition, the President promised specific detailed information on the mission, the objective, and the objective to be achieved so that we can leave in 1 year. Specific detailed information. I have not seen that. It may have been given, but I have not seen it.

Mr. Speaker, sad experiences have taught us it is very easy to move troops in; it is very difficult to accomplish the objective once they are there, and extremely more difficult to get out in a timely and honorable way.

I believe we must do everything we can to prevent funding, to in every way tell the President this is not a good idea and that the American people are not thrilled about this Bosnia adventure. I think we must do this before the signing, before the decision is irrevocable.

We know and the people know, Mr. Speaker, that the Bosnia adventure is folly. The President is ignoring the public, as he ignored the 315 Members of this House that voted asking the President not to make our troops in Bosnia a part of the peace agreement. He went and did it anyway. I think ignoring the people and the Congress is a shocking thing, and I think that we do have to have the vote to either endorse the President's action, which may happen, or tell him clearly that it is not in the public interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]