

The issue will take on added urgency in the first five days of November, when the Government must pay \$50 billion in Social Security benefits, Medicare and pay for active-duty members of the military. On Nov. 15, about \$25 billion of interest payments are due.

As Treasury officials concede, a number of financial tricks are available to keep the Government afloat even if the ceiling on debt is not raised. There are temporary debt limits, emergency "cash management sales" to keep money flowing in the coffers as short-term loans, and borrowing against other Government reserves. But all of the steps come with a cost, and none can go on for too long. Though the overall Government debt is \$4.9 trillion, the Treasury sells about \$2 trillion of debt securities every year because so much of the Government's borrowings are "rolled over" into new bonds.

The debt limit exists as an institution in Washington because the Constitution mandates that only Congress can authorize borrowings. Before World War I every bond issued by the United States required separate Congressional approval. Today, the raising of the debt ceiling essentially permits the Treasury Secretary to make the day-to-day decisions required to meet the Government's obligations.

#### 40 YEARS OF TAX AND SPEND IS EXTREME

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we have been called many names, the majority has. We have been called revolutionaries, just a few minutes ago even Bolsheviks maybe, but the main term has been extreme, extreme and mean-spirited, the "E" word.

Mr. Clinton has used it, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has used it, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has used it. It seems like there is a concerted effort to use the "extreme" word to describe the new majority.

Mr. Speaker, the new majority was elected by a majority of the people in this country. I do not consider them extreme; I think they saw something wrong with 40 years of one-party rule in this House. I think they saw something extreme about the spending over 40 years, and something extreme about the rising taxation that this one-party rule for 40 years had placed upon the American people.

What is extreme? What is extreme and mean-spirited about wanting a reasonable balanced budget within 7 years? What is extreme about wanting to reform welfare and end welfare as we know it? What is extreme about a plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy? What is extreme about wanting to reform Medicaid and allow the Governors, just like Governor Bill Clinton wanted, to see a change in Medicaid to save it and to make it more easily administered through the States. What is extreme about wanting to give tax cuts to families when the average family today is paying 40 percent of their income, and some approaching 50 per-

cent, in local, State and Federal taxes? What is extreme about that?

Mr. Speaker, what is extreme about spending \$2.5 trillion over the next 7 years, more than what we are spending now? How much more does the President want to spend?

What is extreme is a President that has said over and over again he wants a balanced budget, but he never can bring himself to do it. What is extreme is 40 years of tax-and-spend that has brought this Nation almost to bankruptcy with a \$5 trillion debt. What is extreme is putting our children's future in jeopardy.

I have a 13-year-old daughter that, if we continue spending and spending and spending without ever balancing the budget, in the year 2012 every tax dollar will be consumed by entitlements and interest on the debt. What kind of future will she have? What kind of future will she have when she approaches my age in the year 2030? The deficit for 1 year will be over \$4 trillion, just for 1 year.

□ 1500

We are talking about the future of this Nation. What is extreme about wanting to save the economic viability of this Nation?

It seems that our liberal friends, led by Mr. Clinton, are more concerned about next year than the years after.

Extreme, mean-spirited. I have parents that are both 78 years old. I want to preserve the future of Medicare for them. I am a mainstream American. I came from mainstream America. I was elected by mainstream Americans that saw something critically wrong coming out of this Federal Government.

There are a lot of 78-year-olds just like my parents back in the Second District of Kentucky that want to have Medicare in their future. But because of an extreme point of view from the other side they are willing to see it go bankrupt before they are willing to save it for the future.

#### INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. Speaker, this week has been proclaimed by President Clinton as "International Human Rights Week" to commemorate the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The United States is a world leader in advancing the cause of human rights and is a signatory to two international treaties that guarantee these human rights, the U.N. Charter, and the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. Both of these treaties have been ratified by the U.S. Senate, and are therefore binding.

I call our Nation's attention to Article I of the U.N. Charter and Article I

of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—in both treaties, the right to self-determination of peoples is affirmed.

Self-determination for non-self governing peoples is the foundation from which other human rights are exercised. Guam is a non self-governing territory, and its status as a non self-governing territory whose people are entitled to exercise self-determination is specifically stated in the U.N. Charter. And we should note that Guam was placed on the United Nation's list of the non self-governing territories by the United States over 47 years ago.

Within this context, it should be of great concern to this Congress and to the President that the desires of the people of Guam to exercise their rights and to improve their political status have not been met with the same fervor and the same level of attention that the United States gives to other peoples' problems.

Every year it is always someone else or some other nation who needs to repair its record on human rights and self-determination. But what about Guam? What about our desires for political rights and for our exercise of self-determination by our indigenous people?

As President Clinton stated in his proclamation, "Peoples throughout the world look to the United States for leadership on human rights." Yes, Mr. President, that is correct, and to this I would add that people in the non self-governing colonies of the United States look to you for leadership on human rights. We look to you to respond to Guam's desire to create a new commonwealth within the American political family. And we look to you to respond to our desire to exercise self-determination in deciding our political status.

We ask that the United States fulfill the commitments it made to the people of Guam and to the community of nations when it signed and ratified the U.N. Charter and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to be responsive to the inherent political commonsense of this Nation to extend full democracy everywhere.

So far, the Federal Government's reaction has been sincere pledges to respond to Guam. And, for a while there, the Clinton administration looked like it had the commitment to respond in a serious way to Guam's efforts. But now we are stuck in neutral because of what surely would look like a comedy of errors, albeit unintentional, on the part of the administration. We have now gone through three status negotiators in 1995 alone. We have been unable to negotiate because there is now no one to negotiate with.

Can you imagine this happening with the Bosnian peace talks? Why would United Nation and international commitments now be meaningless when applied to a United States colony?

I call on the administration today to heed its own words, to live up to the

international commitments and international standards of human rights that it has agreed to in the U.N. Charter.

We normally think of human rights violations as the violent denial of basic freedoms in many parts of the world. There is the denial of free expression and the incarceration of dissident voices. This is the violent abuse of human rights.

But there are other forms. In much the same way that the neglect of children is also a form of child abuse as is violent behavior, ignoring the political desires of a people for whom you have a responsibility qualifies as an abuse of human rights. The people of Guam have spoken through local referenda and they deserve serious and sustained attention to their political aspirations. To ignore these political aspirations is an abuse of human rights by neglect.

The Congress and the President as the representatives of the American people have consistently delivered the message throughout the world that good government can only begin when there is true consent of the governed. This is the core American creed. In the American territory of Guam, the vast majority of laws, the very political structure that the people live under are determined not by the people, but by a Congress in which they have no voting representation and by a President they have not elected.

Government through the consent of the governed is the most basic of all political rights and should remain the cornerstone of the structure of human rights. We should challenge ourselves to make sure that human rights are defended not just under the American flag when our troops are deployed in foreign lands, but that these human rights are also defended under the American flag when it flies over the non self-governing U.S. territories.

#### CELEBRATING COMMUNITY: THE OPENING OF THE NEW MARTIN LUTHER KING CENTER IN FREEPORT, IL

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, as we debate reaching the balanced budget by the year 2002 and what role the Federal Government should play in restoring hope to our children's future, one of the misguided arguments that some of my colleagues continue to banter in Congress and in the media is that the American people cannot trust anyone but the Federal Government to provide assistance and/or programs in the areas of need.

By what arrogance can this argument be made? To suggest that left to their own devices, the American people cannot provide for their families and neighbors? The notion that local communities and local governments cannot

be trusted? Please. This country was built through the goodness of people helping people. From the earliest days of the original colonies, the people of this Nation have thrived off the common goodness of its neighbors, its communities.

If we are to believe that there is nothing trustworthy outside of the Federal behemoth bureaucracy, whom are we accusing of being untrustworthy? Which Governor? Which State legislature? Which county? Which city or school district? Which community can we not trust?

I believe men and women, parents, elected officials, churches and other community leaders are best able to achieve the longest lasting and most effective changes we need in our society. Day by day, neighborhood by neighborhood, child by child, family by family, America gets stronger.

President Coolidge once said: "No person was ever honored for what he received. Honor has been the reward for what he gave."

Let me tell you about what one community has done. On November 18 of this year, the city of Freeport in the 16th District of Illinois celebrated the achievements of hard effort and leadership when it opened the new Martin Luther King Jr. Community Campus, and this is a picture of that beautiful campus. This beautiful \$3 million facility was built and paid for without any tax dollars or Federal grants. The facility was built with the commitment and dedication of the local community.

It started with a vision by the late Rev. Robert Huff to create a community center where area children and families could get whatever assistance they needed. Unfortunately, he passed away before he could witness the reality of his vision.

This beautiful new facility was made possible by the hard efforts and dedication of people like Jack Meyers, who led the fundraising campaign, and Ray Alvarez of Honeywell's Microswitch, who was instrumental in rallying community support for this construction.

The new MLK Campus in Freeport has not been erected only of mortar and bricks. It stands firmly on the convictions and hopes and dreams of the people dedicated to making Freeport a city committed to the future of their community, a future that is unified behind helping their neighbors locally.

The community campus has already provided many tangible results. It helped Wendy Mader realize her dream of becoming a licensed day care provider; Tameka Carter, who is reaching her dream of becoming a lawyer. And the Martin Luther King Campus helped Sharon Serna work through the single parent program to get off public aid, get an education, and become a registered nurse. Her dream was made possible by the local people who make the MLK Community Campus not only the envy but a model of what other communities in this country are accomplishing.

Again, the facility was built without one Federal dollar, built by the dedication and hard effort of the people of a small city in rural Illinois. Have any of their programs used Federal dollars? Yes, but the programs are designed and tailored by the local people for the local people.

Currently, Congress is working on major changes on how social services in this country are funded. The idea is that after 30 years of spending 40 cents out of every dollar on a huge Federal bureaucracy, we can be more efficient with our programs if we get the money back to the local people in the best manner possible.

If centers like the King Campus choose to apply for tax dollars, they should be able to get the most out of every tax dollar, not just 60 cents but 90 or 95 cents. That kind of efficiency cannot be accomplished through a huge Federal bureaucracy.

The campus is the perfect example of local control and local success.

I salute the efforts of everyone at the MLK Campus. I salute the people who have found a second chance or the special assistance they need through the center. And I want to salute the people of Freeport, who in their own way have proven that we do not need the Federal Government dictating policy to provide for their community.

What we need is the commitment and dedication of the people of the community who are willing to face a challenge and willing to meet the needs of the people they love so dearly and the people they serve so well.

#### KEEPING THE DISTRICT IN BUSINESS

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is day one of the countdown to shutdown. I have been on the floor virtually every day since the last shutdown. But I speak not of the shutdown of the Federal Government. There was an unintended consequence. The city I represent was also shut down.

A shutdown of a complicated big city is nothing short of a catastrophe. If there is a continuing resolution, it will be marginally better, but imagine putting handcuffs and a straitjacket on a city at the same time and then saying, "Run your city well on a weekend CR or a weeklong CR, and keep from over-obligating, and make sure you spend enough money."

I am here this afternoon to express my gratitude to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and to the DC Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, these two committees unanimously passed a bill to allow the District of Columbia to spend its own revenue instead of being shut down. I express my gratitude to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the