

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I saw the Monday night Nightline on what the gentleman is doing, and I thought it was absolutely compelling. It is bordering on the legendary, and I wish you good luck. If there is anything I or any of the more senior Members can do around here to advance your seeking the truth, please tell us.

Mr. LONGLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Federal debt is now \$4,989,213,998,043.63, again a slight decline from yesterday of about \$370 million, but still the national debt stands at about \$89 billion, higher than what has been actually authorized by Congress, nor does this number include the additional \$61 billion that the administration has chosen to borrow from the Civil Service employee retirement accounts.

I mention that because, in light of all the talk about the unfortunate result of this stalemate causing many Federal employees to be on furlough pending some resolution of the disagreements between the President and the Congress, I would suggest that the ultimate disrespect is the extent to which the administration is cavalierly dipping into these retirement fund accounts, again, to the tune of in excess of \$60 billion. That is unprecedented.

I mentioned this morning briefly on the floor that given the current stalemate in Washington, that unfortunately I was not going to be able to return this week during Christmas recess. I spoke with my daughter Sarah this morning, who was very disappointed that I was going to be unable to attend her Christmas play tomorrow morning. Again, she has a role in the play and she is quite excited about it. Obviously, I am very disappointed that I will not be able to see her, because I am sure she is going to be very excited and do a tremendous job.

But, Mr. Speaker, I attempted to explain to my daughter, my 7-year-old, why it was important that we remain in Washington to deal with these issues. The plain facts are that this Congress has in the past, and will, at least for the next 5 or 6 or 7 years, be borrowing additionally, increasing this debt in order to continue to finance a level of spending that is in excess of our revenues and that ultimately my daughter Sarah, age 7, and my son Matt, age 11, are going to be faced with the obligation of retiring or redeeming this debt. The taxes in their lifetimes could well exceed over \$100,000 just to keep up with the interest on the debts.

Earlier this morning I challenged Members on the other side who were parading about their concern for Medicare, welfare, education, veterans, and the environment, but yet they have been absolutely unwilling to put their names on a line telling us what they would want to spend; nor have they been willing to address their financial priorities in a manner that would allow us to balance the Federal budget, and that effectively, this fight is about

truly whether or not this Congress is going to insist on a balanced Federal budget using legitimate, honest numbers as certified by the Congressional Budget Office. In fact, it is clear to me that this is at the root of the disagreement.

As a practical matter, the amount of money that we would spend is not that far off; a few, \$10 billion or \$20 billion here or there, which in Washington is not a large amount of money, given the fact that over the next 7 years this Federal Government will be spending in excess of \$12 trillion. That amount of money totally dwarfs any of the issues we have been talking about.

There has been a great outcry about the \$245 billion tax cut, with yet barely any attention whatsoever to the fact that \$245 billion is barely 2 percent of the total amount of money that this Government will spend in the next 7 years. I have to raise the question whether this Government would be severely handicapped at the prospect of only spending 98 percent of \$12 trillion, as opposed to 100 percent of \$12 trillion.

I might also mention, let us talk about the issue of Medicare. As we all know, this is a program that is paid for by taxes on the wages of working people. It has become exceedingly clear that our failure to slow the rate of growth of Medicare spending could result in a doubling or a tripling of these highly regressive taxes on the wages of working people, working people who are already holding down two and three jobs, trying to make ends meet.

□ 1945

Nor has there been any attention to the fact that these dollars are invested in a trust fund which consists not only of taxes that are collected on the wages of working people, but also on the premiums that the seniors pay on a monthly basis. Nor has there been any attention to the fact that we are still maintaining a system whereby two-thirds of the senior's premium will be paid by the Federal Taxpayer in addition to the one-third that is paid by the beneficiary.

#### NO MORE EXCUSES

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to see you in the chair tonight. I very much appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY]. In fact, perhaps we should leave this here at all time while we are proceeding with our business, the people's business, on the floor of the House; and I join my colleague from California, [Mr. DORNAN] in saluting the gentleman from Maine for his leadership in the balanced budget fight.

Mr. Speaker, it has been exactly 1 month, 30 days, since the President made a commitment in the form of a bill which he signed into law, a resolu-

tion to balance the budget in 7 years using honest numbers provided by the neutral, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. In fact, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, it has been 1,293 days since candidate Clinton promised on the Larry King show to balance the Federal budget in 5 years.

Sadly, the President has failed to keep his commitment, and now he says he will propose a 7-year balanced budget plan only if we go along with his Medicare charade.

Well, let me just tell my colleagues, for months now, and I think the American people are beginning to see through this smokescreen, but for months the President has demagogued many of the people in his party here in the Congress, they have demagogued on the issue of Medicare.

The President's real concern is to be able to spend billions of dollars to fund his liberal agenda and his liberal pet projects. He is concerned about keeping intact his political base. Of the \$436 billion difference in total spending between the President's proposal and our plan, only about \$32 billion is allocated toward Medicare. That would leave the President, if we did not insist on a balanced budget, with \$404 billion to dole out to traditional Democratic social welfare programs.

Of course, there is no way the President can admit this, and that is really why he has never proposed a balanced budget, even though again, 30 days ago, back on November 19, he signed into law a bill that says, "The President and the Congress shall," mandatory, not discretionary, "shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office."

Again, the President has failed to keep his word, and in the process, he has caused the Government, at least part of the Government, to shut down again. He has also defied the wishes of Congress, because last night, the House of Representatives votes 351 to 40 in favor of a resolution reaffirming our commitment to a 7-year balanced budget using CBO scoring. Mr. Speaker, 133 Democrats and one Independent crossed the aisle, this center aisle right here, to join us Republicans in an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote.

Earlier today this House took a unanimous vote on the President's latest budget proposal, the Clinton budget "IV", if you will, which comes nowhere close to balancing the budget and projects annual deficits in the range of \$200 billion well into the next century. So clearly, Mr. Speaker, it is not just Republicans who feel the President should be forced to keep his word.

I would also like to point out to my colleagues that today the leaders of 80 major American companies, Democrats and Republicans, concerned about the economic cost of failure to achieve a balanced budget took out a 2-page newspaper ad endorsing nothing less

than a balanced budget in 7 years, using Congressional Budget Office numbers.

So Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we Republicans have kept our word. We have done our job. We have made good on our promise and our commitment to the American people to pass a balanced budget and to finally get our Nation's fiscal house in order. We have worked hard, fought many battles over these past 11 months to develop the first balanced budget in 26 years and to do it in a way that offers real deficit reduction based on honest numbers and does not entail a major tax increase imposed on the backs of the American people. To the contrary, we want to relieve and reduce taxes on the middle and working classes.

So no matter how hard the President might try to wiggle out of his agreement, which again he signed 30 days ago, we Republicans are not going to settle now for a phony budget based on cooked White House numbers.

The worst thing, the worst thing that we could do now is to go along with the White House in pretending to balance the budget, while leaving all of the difficult decisions to be fought out again in future Congresses. So that is why, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we are insisting that in this session of Congress, before this month and this year are out, we work out a bipartisan agreement here in the Congress and with the President and his administration on a 7-year plan which balances the Federal budget, again using honest numbers provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

This is so important because the American people lose faith in their political institutions when politicians fail to keep their word.

Republicans in this Congress are establishing a new standard. We have said that from now on, any politician who makes a promise to the American people had better be prepared to keep it; and that certainly goes for Bill Clinton who again, 30 days ago, promised by signing this law to enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

So no more excuses, no more Washington gimmicks, it is time for the President and our colleagues, Democratic colleagues here in the Congress, to do the right thing for our children's future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The Members are reminded that the President is to be referred to with the proper respect accorded him under the Rules of the House.

#### AMERICANS SEE THROUGH SCARE TACTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the administration and the minority have waged a real campaign of misinformation regarding the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, and I think it is finally starting to catch up with them.

On Medicare they say that the Republican plan is extreme, will gut the program and will devastate the program, but ABC's Ted Koppel on "Nightline" last week showed that the President and the minority were misinforming the public, that the Republicans were increasing Medicare, and that senior citizens were the victims of an orchestrated scare campaign.

We have the same type of scare campaign lodged against Republicans with regard to what our balanced budget plan does with education, including student loans. The administration has used the power and the high profile of the office of the presidency to scare young people into believing Republicans plan to balance the budget, and that would prevent them from obtaining student loans. The President just as recently as last week said the Republicans cut deeply into student loans.

He also claims we are increasing the cost of student loans, and I think it is time to set the record straight. As you can see, in 1995, we spent \$24.5 billion on student loans. At the end of our 7-year plan, we spend \$36.4 billion. That is a 50 percent increase, hardly cutting student loans. Therefore, who knows how many young people out there have been scared by these tactics, have given up on college because they think loans will not be available? How many parents believe now that they will not be able to help their children with a college education because of the scare tactics that are used? As I said, it is time to set that record straight.

They also tell us in relationship to Pell grants that student should worry. Well, here is the Pell grant chart. In 1990, maximum grant \$2,300; 1995, maximum grant, \$2,340; in 1996, under our plan, \$2,440, the highest point in history for Pell grants. So again, I think it is very important that we set the record straight so that we do not have students or parents worrying about what we may be doing or may not be doing with student loans and Pell grants.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the same thing about education in general, and I think it is very important that we take a look at this and set the record straight. You will notice from this chart that the minority, when they were in the majority during the previous 7 years, spent \$315.1 billion over a 7-year period on elementary, secondary education, job training, student loan funding. Our 7-year proposal proposes to spend \$340.8 billion during that 7-year period, which again shows that we plan to spend \$25 billion more on education than what the minority spend during the last 7 years, again setting the record straight.

I would like to briefly review again some of the things that were said this afternoon when we had the debate in relationship to the President's budget. The minority leader indicated that he has real concerns about school lunch, and I said that I welcome him to the group who has that concern, because I have a real concern about student lunches. My concern is that after all of the money that we have spent from the Federal level, 50 percent of all of the students who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals are not participating, 50 percent. Where are those children getting any food? Where are they getting any nutrition? Are we trying to educate them on an empty stomach?

I am not so concerned about the fact that only 46 percent of the paying customers, the eligible paying customers participate, because obviously they have money for breakfast, obviously they have money for lunch; but what about that 50 percent who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals and are not participating? That is why the minority leader and I should have a concern; that is why we should do what the young lady from Arkansas said this afternoon.

She said she did not come here to promote the status quo, and I welcome her to our opportunity to change the status quo and do a better job in providing education for our youngsters and providing school lunch and child nutrition programs.

One other said that we are decimating education. Well, again, as I indicated here, we increase dramatically in a 7-year period our participation in education programs.

So again, I would hope that we can make sure that the public understands exactly what we are doing. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to get something straight. The President was on television the other night saying that he rejected, quote, the Republican package because among other things, according to him, it slashed and cut education.

Now, are these the same numbers, the increase, for example, in job training and student loan funding, the \$340.8 billion that is projected under the Republican plan for the next 7 years, those numbers were in front of the President while he was standing there telling the American people that the plan cut education?

Mr. GOODLING. It is just the opposite of what we are doing. We are increasing by \$25 billion over the next 7 years over what the former majority spent.

Mr. HUNTER. But he had that increase in front of him in the plan and obviously his analysts put it into executive summary for him: What it does in education, what it does in other areas; but he had that while he looked at the camera and said, this slashes education. He had those numbers in front of him, correct?