

America balance the budget on minimum wage jobs?

It is getting so bad the Department of Labor listed some new professions for Americans.

How about his: Gizzard skin remover. How about a corn cob pipe assembler? How about a brassiere cup molder cutter? That is right. If you want to hear the big one, everybody is going to school for this: How about a pantyhose crotch closer? That is right. That is a listed job.

Just think, if these jobs do not go overseas, they may even be able to move up the ladder and become a pantyhose crotch closer supervisor.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Congress has got to look at the trade deficit. You just cannot look at budget deficits and Congress don't know what they're doing in my opinion at this point.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD KEEP HIS WORD

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there is some bad information around that Congress is going to shut down the Government. That is not true. It is not even true that the Republicans are going to shut down the Government.

It is the President. The President signed a binding agreement with Congress last month to pass a 7-year CBO-scored balanced budget in the first session of the 104th Congress. After vetoing the budget last week, the President has failed to meet his commitment. His budget does not balance.

Mr. Speaker, the President has it within his ability to keep the Government open. All he has to do is keep his promises. President Clinton should keep his word, do as he agreed and sign an honest balanced budget.

The Government is not shutting down because of the Republicans or Congress. The Government is shutting down because President Clinton will not honor his commitment to give the American people a balanced budget.

ETHICS REFORM ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish an independent Commission on Congressional Ethics. It is obvious to me as I am sure it is to you and the American people that it is time to change the way ethics complaints are handled in this House. It is time to put an end to personal friendships such as has been displayed by the current chairman, and to put an end to associations with an organization that needs to be investigated as is the case with most majority members of the Ethics Com-

mittee. The committee has acted in the case of the Speaker, but quite frankly in my opinion is too little and way too late. The independent counsel's hands should not have been tied. We cannot remove this cloud that hangs over the Capitol until a complete, independent, unfettered investigation is completed. My bill will ensure that in the future friendships between the committee and the accused will not be a part of the process. My bill calls for a commission of five former or senior Federal judges. Two would be picked by the Speaker, two by the minority leader and the fifth by the four selected. This commission would take over all duties of the current Ethics Committee. I ask my colleagues to join with me and return fairness to the ethics process. Cosponsor the Ethics Reform Act of 1995.

ALLEGED MISUSE OF ETHICS CHARGES

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just walked into the Chamber and heard the preceding speaker and he prompted me to recall that week after week, month after month, the Democrats have been trooping here on the floor and up to the press gallery to make personal charges against the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am sick and tired of these attacks because they are frivolous solely for political advantage. These Members apparently have got nothing better to do than personally attack the Speaker of the House.

I think that every Member here ought to take note of the possibility that the ethics rules of this House of Representatives are being misused for political gain. They may be warned that ethics charges may be filed in the next year against any Member who misuses the ethics rules of this House and brings disrepute on the House of Representatives for political purposes.

PARLIMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, under the new gift ban and under the rules on limitation on outside income, is it permissible for me to collect the \$1 million I am entitled to by demonstrating that the Republicans are cutting Medicare?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

ETHICS SHOULD APPLY TO ALL MEMBERS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is an ad in Roll Call offering the million dollars for anyone who can demonstrate the Republicans are cutting Medicare, and I suggest there are almost 200 Democrats here who are entitled to share in that million dollars.

But I would like to respond to the last speaker on this whole issue of ethics, because of course that \$1 million pales by comparison to the \$4.5 million that was at stake with reference to the Speaker's book deal.

All this talk of partisanship, look at the nonpartisan conclusion of the House Ethics Committee, that the book deal was so bad we need a new rule with regard to books and royalties.

What is the response of the Republican leadership? Speaker GINGRICH says we need to delay it.

The chairman of the House Committee on Rules says the Ethics Committee, Republican and Democrats, and I quote, "ought to be horse whipped" if they think he is obligated to accept a new proposal to limit book royalties.

I would suggest there is bipartisan support for ethics but opine that it apply to the Speaker, also.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether it is proper for another Member to come and stand in the well while a Member is speaking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not interrupt Members in the course of their presentations.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the Speaker.

TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to hear my good friend from Texas get up and rant and rail against this fact. This is not a parliamentary inquiry, but this is a point of fact:

If anyone in the minority, if anyone in America can show us how going from \$4,800 this year per beneficiary for Medicare to \$7,100 in the year 2002 is a cut, come collect the check. Because the fact is the figures do not lie. Simple math tells the truth. And simple justice compels us to say to my good friend from Texas, and indeed to the American people that we should join hands and balance this budget because our children and the American people deserve no less.

Sure you can try to change the subject, but it does not change the agenda for America's future. It is time to make a difference, put this partisanship aside and build a constructive future as we confront the next century.

A MILLION-DOLLAR CLAIM

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I hope my good friend from Arizona and others will be here this afternoon when the House gives 5-minute speeches when I will display and walk the people of America step by step through and disprove Mr. Barbour's claim.

The first sentence is what I am going to disprove: "In November 1995 the U.S. House and Senate passed a balanced budget bill."

They did not. The law of this Nation says we can only allocate funds for 1 year. And the funds that are allocated for next year are projecting a \$270 billion annual operating deficit, of which \$100 billion will be stolen from the trust funds.

I again want to encourage people to pay attention to this. I am not going to ask for the money for myself. But, J.D., you can fill in the University of Southern Mississippi development fund in that space there because I will prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that this statement is false and I expect my fellow Mississippian, Mr. Barbour, to be a man of his word.

A SERIES OF FIRSTS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think there has been far too much caffeine consumed here this morning.

Mr. Speaker, in 1927 Charles Lindbergh was the first man to fly across the Atlantic. In the late 1940's Chuck Yeager was the first to break the speed of sound. In 1961 Yuri Gagarin became the first to orbit the Earth, and in 1969 Neil Armstrong became the first man to set foot on the Moon.

In 1995 Bill Clinton became the first man to veto a balanced budget since Neil Armstrong walked on the Moon. In vetoing last week's balanced budget bill, Bill Clinton said "no" to serious Medicare reform, he said "no" to serious tax relief for working families, and a brighter future for our children. Most important, he said "no" to doing the right thing, being responsible and balancing the budget, something that has not been done in a generation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to end the charades, end the Washington style excuses, do the right thing for our grandparents, our parents, our families and our children. Balance the budget of the United States of America.

GETTING GOVERNMENT BACK IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why 215 Members of this body just voted to go on a 3-day recess. We all want to be back with our children and our wives and do some Christmas shopping and get back to a little sense of normalcy.

But things are not normal. If we do not do our job today, 300,000 Federal employees will be locked out of their jobs, the Government will be shut down, and we just voted yesterday to put our Federal Government into default in its financial obligations.

Things are not normal. We ought not go home for recess. In fact, that is why 152 Democrats voted not to. We have been told by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], that we should be prepared to stay on the job until we have done our job, until the Government is back in business.

We might rectify this situation with a continuing resolution today, legislation the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has introduced that would at least ensure that Federal employees work for their pay. But we have got to get the Government back in business and do our job before we recess or adjourn.

CHANGE FOR THE BETTER

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

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we understand that according to Senator DOLE that this event is so important that Hazel O'Leary is flying in for it. We would also like to point out that the American people asked us to make a change here and, that is, to balance the budget.

□ 1100

The Democrats have gone after the Speaker of the House with 65 charges for political reasons. Why? To take the heat off the President so that the President can go on and cook his books.

We cannot spend \$300 billion more than we take in, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a rare find where you find a Speaker, a man or any woman that will stand up and take this abuse, take negative charges like TOM CAMPBELL did, and win. Well, the Abe Lincoln theory that you can fool some of the people some of the time stands. TOM CAMPBELL was elected, the Speaker of the House will balance the budget, do not cook the books, Mr. President. We are going to balance the budget, and my colleagues are right. We are not leaving this place. I brought my Christmas tree for here and for home. We are not leaving until we balance the budget using CBO numbers.

REPUBLICANS TAKING GOVERNMENT HOSTAGE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are here for a hostage-taking. The Republican Party wants to make very substantial reductions in what the law now provides for people who get sick, who are in economic distress. They brag on the one hand about how much they are going to reduce the rate of spending in Medicare that would otherwise occur and then bitterly denounce anyone who says they are cutting. My colleagues cannot take credit for substantially reducing Government expenditures and plausibly deny that they are cutting. They want to wipe out the legal guarantee that says, "If you are sick and elderly and in a nursing home you, will be taken care of medically." Why do they want to do this? To balance the budget? No. To increase military spending by a substantial amount.

We are going to have a defense bill on the floor today which votes billions of dollars more than even the Pentagon thinks necessary. They want to do it so they can make substantial reductions in taxes especially for wealthy people. People who make \$200,000 and \$300,000 a year will get a tax cut, and, on the other hand, people of 70 and 80 years old will see their Medicare premiums go up. Now they cannot win this on their own, so they will take the Government hostage to try to force us to go along, and it will not work.

STOP GROWING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans have done is to do what Mrs. Clinton asked us to do. She testified 2 years ago that if we slow the growth of Medicare down to 6, to 7, percent, we can take care of Medicare and balance the budget. We spend 7.2 percent on Medicare. It goes up 62 percent over the next 7 years.

Tax cuts. Our budget has \$245 billion in tax cuts for the American family and American business. The Democratic party criticizes us for having a tax cut for the American family. I ask, "If we gave you the money, what would you do with it? Would you put it on the deficit? No, you would spend it on the Federal budget, you would shrink the family budget."

That is not talk, that is fact, because in President Clinton's budget he reduced our tax package from 245 to 78, he took the money, and he put it on the Federal Government. He shrunk the family budget.

Stop shrinking the family budget, stop growing the Federal budget. The American public would love to have it on the deficit. They are not going to put it on the deficit. They are going to spend it up here. Spending needs to stop.