

saying the same thing in different ways and that neither side should be accorded more credibility than the other.

I hope that the President begins to reduce his rhetoric against the Republicans who want the same thing he does, and I hope that the Republicans will understand that a tax cut that is offered by the President is not out of consideration altogether. Someplace we should have both a tax cut and Medicare reform.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge here and now that we Republicans have failed the public-relations war to make clear to the American people why we seek a balanced budget, because every time we say we want this cold steel unattractive item called the balanced budget, we are met by the opposition who say, "What are you doing to the children, the orphans, to the disabled," and all of that. They win that battle, but the balanced budget that we seek will bring an era of prosperity in which all the needs of the American people will be met, and the balanced budget that the Republicans seek here and to which the President has agreed over 7 years will reduce the chaos that we have in this country and all the segments of the society.

BASING THE BUDGET ON ITS MERITS

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to comment on the events concerning the budget and the controversy that has engulfed the Congress and the Nation concerning it.

First and foremost I must say that I think that the contributions, the focus this year and the focus in the past campaign, which was largely due to efforts in 1994 on the part of the Clinton, the Bush, and the Perot factors to focus on a balanced budget, was a good focus for our Nation. I think that that is a desirable goal. In fact I think that in 2 years in the programs that were passed have actually moved us in that direction, probably not as dramatically as some would want, but they have moved us in that direction. But I think that it is very important, as we move toward trying to resolve the budget deficits on an annual basis, and in the long range we hopefully can get there, and I hope and I think that that is possible, I think we have to look also at the fact of what happens in terms of the balance of the programs that we have. Achieving a balance in terms of no annual deficits is important, but we also have to recognize that there is a human deficit that could develop and that is developing in our Nation today as we look at the disparities in incomes and wages that people earn and the unwillingness today in this Congress, largely by the majority party, the Republican majority, my friends, that they are not willing to move on the

minimum wage. I think that we ought to do that, try to address that. More importantly, I think we ought to be working to empower workers and to give them the skills, and the education and the ability in training and skills they need, as I said, so that they can be more productive workers, so that they can earn better wages.

But, Mr. Speaker, as we look at the events that have happened here, the controversy that is going on with regards to plans and schemes to try and achieve a balanced budget, I would just want to remind my colleagues that, having served here through the 1980's, this is not the first plan that we have had with good intentions to balance the budget, no, not at all. In fact I think, as has been mentioned on the floor by both Republicans and Democrats, both President Bush and President Reagan had sought and, of course, pledged their fidelity to a balanced budget, that they were going to attain it sometime in the future. In spite of the fact that that was the goal, and I think many in Congress, some in Congress, with regards to the Gramm-Rudman I, Gramm-Rudman II, they all had plans to achieve a balanced budget. So I think that they had 4-year plans, 5-year plans, but the fact is that what happened is that events in the economy overtook those plans. I think sometimes they were premised on unrealistic tax and unrealistic policy and program changes that did not achieve that, but, too, notwithstanding that, the other major factors, I think, are some of the unforeseen things that happened in the economy.

I note that one of the—throughout this week one of the accomplishments, or goals, or the basis for the balanced budget and the achievement of it is the suggestion that somehow interest rates are going to go down, that that is going to be a big accomplishment. Well, I would suggest modestly to my friends that the Congress of this country does not completely control the economy. We do have a free economy and a global basis. We do not control that economy, nor should we. I do not think that we should. I think we can have an impact on it. Whether it is going to be as dramatic and positive as what my colleagues believe I would very much question. So I think that most of us that have served in this body understand that we are going to have to address this issue of trying to achieve a balance each year. Each year we are going to have to take incremental steps.

Having a plan; well, that is very good. Trying to do this within a certain period of time, 4 years, 5 years, 7 years I think is probably more realistic than trying to do it all at once where we would cause a catastrophic impact on our economy in terms of its performance. But I must say that while we strongly disagree, I strongly disagree with many of the elements that have been put into the reconciliation bill, which is this year's, this 7-year pro-

gram to in fact try to achieve a balance, because I think while it might indeed balance the budget at the end of that given the—if the economic predictions were to hold out, which I think would not hold out, not because of any bad faith, but simply because of the nature of our economy; but I think the programs inherent in that, that make the cuts, that make the changes, are inherently, are inherently unfair.

I think the premise of a balanced budget that is going to work, the programs that are going to work, is going to have to be shared sacrifice. When you start out with half of the reductions taking place in Medicare and Medicaid, and start out with putting in a large tax cut, distributed in an unusual way to those that have higher incomes, I think you start out with a bad premise.

Now the fact is that—the fact is with regard to that type of budget—it simply is not going to do it, it is not fair, it is not going to get the support of the President, and it should not receive the support of the President.

So I would hope that this week we—if you cannot solve it on the merits, I think it is wrong to try to push this down the throats of the American people based in terms of the annual appropriations bills. You have to sell it on the merits. It has failed on the merits, so now we are trying something different, and that is trying to cut off the appropriations in November, and again now in December and through the new year.

So I would hope my colleagues would consider that and consider my words in terms of the decisions they make in the weeks ahead.

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

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

COMMENTARY ON BOOKS AND MOVIES IS IMPORTANT

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my subject, let me just comment briefly on what my colleague just stated in respect to the balanced-budget negotiations. He mentioned, the last thing he mentioned, were the tax cuts, and you know I have looked at the tax cuts, the \$500-per-child tax credits, and I do not think that is a strange tax cut, and that is, by far, the biggest amount of money that is manifest in the Republican package. That says that you get \$500 credit per child.

Now that means, if you are a person who is a working person who only pays today \$1,500 in tax liability, you have three children, at \$500 apiece your tax

liability is erased. A person who has a \$50,000 tax liability, an upper-income person, and you have three children, your children count just as much as anybody else's, and you get \$1,500 off your \$50,000 liability, and you still pay \$48,500 in taxes, and I just do not understand why that—I would be happy to yield.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate it.

I would suggest that there are two factors here that are inherent in this bill that weigh in against workers, low-income workers specifically. First are the changes prospectively in the earned income tax credit, which is reduced in the plans that have come from the House and Senate out of conference, and second of all is that, if you do not pay a Federal income tax, then you are not entitled to any type of credit, and of course I am talking about income tax because those same individuals of course pay Social Security taxes on a regular basis, so those children that are about a third of the children in this country come from families that are affected, where they would not get the benefit because—the fact that their wages—of the parent are so low that the child is denied the benefit.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me just answer my friend.

That is a long—what the gentleman has just described is a far cry from saying this is a tax cut for the rich. I do not consider a person who makes, who has only a \$1,500-per-year tax liability, as being a wealthy individual, and yet that person, if that person has three children, he get to multiply that by \$500 per child, and that totally eliminates his tax liability. That takes it from \$1,500 to zero. Now that is hardly a tax break for the Rockefellers.

So the gentleman was arguing in favor of having a balanced discussion, using not pejorative terms in trying to find a middle ground somewhere, and I would suggest that there is a lot of merit to a child-based credit—you know the tax credit we started with that we had in 1948, if you adjust it for inflation, is much lower in real dollars than it was back in the 1940's.

I think the gentleman—

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman would yield, I would acknowledge that, but I think that, if you look at the broad array of taxes here over a 7-year or even a 10-year period, you find that the majority of these taxes do go to those that have investment income and to corporations. You know, they way we get to some of these adjustments is first looking at the individuals and not treating the corporations—

Mr. HUNTER. Reclaiming my time, I just take my time back for a second. The difference that I have seen in the amount of money of income that is derived or the amount of money that is attributed to the child-based tax cut is roughly, if the last figures I looked at were correct, was about five times as much the amount of income that is considered to be given up, if you will, by the capital gains tax cut.

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman would yield back—

Mr. HUNTER. Child-based tax cut is by far the big—

Mr. VENTO. I think the issue here gets to be how long you run that, so first of all the Senate—the example you use, usually use a 5-year time frame. This is a 7-year program, but, if you run it to 10 years. You find that about three-quarters of the tax benefits in this go to investors, some, of course, small capital-gains beneficiaries, but a lot of it to corporations. You know in this measure that you have, Some of it will take the corporate tax down to zero.

Mr. HUNTER. I appreciate the gentleman's commentary. I would be happy to discuss this with him further but, Mr. Speaker, I would like—

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes it is important to comment on books and movies because those books and movies reflect history, presume to reflect history, and that history is drawn upon by leaders in government when we make further decisions, and one movie that is currently playing in this country is called "Nixon." It is a movie by Oliver Stone, and I think that commentary is always an important thing, and it is important to have a commentary that is delivered by an honest broker.

There is no more honest broker in this area and no person more qualified to comment on the movie "Nixon" than Herbert Klein, who first met Nixon in 1946 when he was first running for Congress, and ultimately became the Communications Director of the White House in 1969, and was the director until 1973, and I would offer for the RECORD this article in the San Diego Union entitled "Truth Subjected to Oliver's Twist" in which Mr. Klein tries hard to find a grain in truth in the movie "Nixon," but finds it very difficult to achieve.

So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this article by Herbert Klein be put in the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the San Diego Union-Tribune, Dec. 19, 1995]

TRUTH SUBJECTED TO OLIVER'S TWIST

(By Herbert G. Klein)

The Richard Nixon portrayed by Oliver Stone in the new movie "Nixon" comes nowhere close to the realities in the complex life of the late former president.

In its article on the highly publicized new film (which opens tomorrow), Newsweek saw Stone as having discovered "complexity, ambiguity and even a measure of restraint."

For those who knew Nixon well, that description of this picture is difficult to comprehend. Stone has created few movies that were not controversial, and "Nixon"—like "JFK"—is sure to create controversy.

For "Nixon," Stone recruited outstanding actors, including Sir Anthony Hopkins (who plays the president) and Joan Allen (the first lady). But given the script, which jumps without warning from fact to fiction, acting alone falls far short of reality.

I watched the movie at a private screening last week at Mann's Hazard Center, where I was alone to analyze my feelings as I recalled the highs and lows, the wins and losses, that I had experienced with Richard Nixon.

The film appropriately showed the warts of the president and then went beyond. The happier, high points were largely ignored.

It gave me a bewildered feeling to watch actors who never have known the sill-living people nor the issues they portray, and who miss true characterization.

This is a movie mainly tuned to Watergate and parts of Vietnam, but it is interspersed with scenes of Nixon's childhood and, finally, his disgraced departure from power.

Even the early family moments are inaccurate, particularly when they portray Nixon's brother as a renegade who died after suffering from tuberculosis for 10 years.

Scenes featuring Nixon's mother, Hannah (played by Mary Steenburgen), depict her as an "angel" who had tremendous impact on her son Richard. That was true. The scenes brought back memories to me of her Quaker funeral. Such memories included the Rev. Billy Graham, who later presided over the funerals of both Pat and Dick Nixon.

The early family depictions surprised me. I didn't expect to see shots of the happy days with kings, presidents and prime ministers in the state dining room, or other shots of congressmen crowding around the president for pictures of bill signings on major issues, such as school desegregation.

I did expect less Watergate and more of the international events that shaped Nixon's policies and that are a part of history.

Fortunately, I never met the Watergate burglars or its masterminds, G. Gordon Liddy and E. Howard Hunt, but most of the real-life persons portrayed in the film were men and women with whom I worked closely sometime during the time I knew Dick and Pat Nixon, from 1946 until he died in April of 1994.

Even with that background, I had difficulty determining which actor was which Nixon deputy or which parts of the movie were based on fact and which were part of a screenwriter's imagination.

RUBINEK AS KLEIN

The greatest surprise for me came when I discovered Saul Rubinek playing Herb Klein in scenes from the 1960 and 1962 elections. I didn't recognize myself or my role until someone on the screen called out, "Herb." Among other things, Rubinek appears to be short, dumpy, wears suspenders, swears frequently and smokes cigarettes. I'm not Beau Brummel, but none of those things applies to me.

In a more important way, the actor playing me on the screen was arguing a point that was directly opposite my point of view.

The debate was over whether Nixon should take legal action to protest the results of the close 1960 election against John Kennedy. In the movie, I am arguing with Nixon's early campaign manager, Murray Chotiner, on the night of the election.

In fact, the historic question was not seriously considered by Nixon until days after the election, when we were in Key Biscayne, Fla., and my position—along with that of Chotiner and (the late longtime Nixon confidant) of Bob Finch—was that Nixon should not contest the election because such action could endanger national stability.

Nixon listened to both sides and decided not to challenge the results, and in a historic scene not portrayed in the movie, he and John Kennedy met in a Key Biscayne villa a week after the election. Nixon rejected an offer to serve in the Kennedy Cabinet, declaring himself to be the leader of the "loyal

opposition." The two men agreed to try to unite a divided country, while recognizing their differences.

No one ever asked me or any other persons portrayed in the movie what the facts were.

COFFEE HIS BEVERAGE

The Nixon on Stone's screen drinks almost constantly and comes off as an evil, angry buffoon who believes that his problems center on not being understood by anyone including his wife.

Nixon was not a teetotaler, but coffee was his beverage during the day, and I can recall only a half-dozen times in almost 50 years when I saw him bordering on too much to drink during the evening.

Stone touches on Nixon's feelings toward the Kennedys, and at one point Nixon is seen staring at a picture of President Kennedy and asking: "When they look at you they see what they want to be. When they look at me, they see what they are."

That probably portrays Nixon's true feelings. He disparaged "Eastern intellectuals" and yet he knew that, in truth, he was an "intellectual" who liked to feel he was outside the Eastern elite community. Some of those he admired most were elitist. He resented the fact that the Kennedys "got away with everything" and that the news media and Congress looked for faults where he could be criticized. At one time, (chief domestic-policy adviser) John Ehrlichman Persuaded Nixon to set up a Camelot-like "royal guard" for the White House. That lasted only a few days.

The most dramatic parts of the film come in conversations between Dick and Pat Nixon. Those obviously are fabrications since no one witnessed them. Allen plays Pat Nixon's role well and shows her to be family-oriented, warm and intelligent. The Pat Nixon I knew also was a strong and caring "first lady." The film wrongly portrays her as a chain smoker. She smoked occasionally in private.

Nixon used to say everyone loves Pat. He was right.

During the scenes between the president and his wife, Nixon refers to her with the nickname "Buddy." I had never heard that, Nixon's daughter, Tricia Cox, whose White House wedding is portrayed tastefully, told me she never heard her father use the name Buddy, but she does recall that Buddy was a childhood nickname for her mother.

Julie Nixon Eisenhower also is shown pleading with her father not to quit. That was a plea Julie made, but the passion of the real Julie was far greater than that of the actress (Annabeth Gish) who portrays her.

STONE OBSESSION

As I watched the film unfold, the most surprising innuendoes concerned Castro, the Bay of Pigs and a mysterious attempt by Stone to insinuate that there was some type of plot involving Nixon, Howard Hunt, the CIA, J. Edgar Hoover, the Mafia and the Kennedy assassination.

Over the years, I have heard discredited theories involving the CIA or the FBI, Kennedy and the Mafia and attempts to assassinate Castro. Stone seems to attach these long repudiated stories to Nixon as if the former president had some part in the death of John Kennedy. That, of course, is pure Stone obsession on Kennedy assassination plots.

The vagaries of the Cuban-plot theories did stir within me memories of some of the most tense moments of the Nixon campaign against Kennedy in 1960.

Just prior to the fourth and final debate between the two candidates, both men addressed an American Legion convention in Miami, Kennedy got major applause with comments about organizing a force to attack

Castro. Nixon knew that such Cuban refugee troops were being trained secretly by the CIA under President Eisenhower's direction. Nixon felt that for him to take this hard line, as had Kennedy would break the code of secrecy he held as vice president. He, therefore, was made to look weak with a suggestion urging a blockade.

The encounter made Nixon so angry that it was difficult to prepare him for the all-important final debate. He had me call CIA Director Allen Dulles to see if Dulles had told Kennedy about the secret training exercise. Dulles denied this, but Nixon did not believe him. This exercise later became the Bay of Pigs.

In the final days of the 1960 campaign, Nixon was forced during the debate to take a weaker position than he believed in, and Kennedy scored points.

None of this was in the movie, but I recall taking reporters to Club 21 for a drink, hoping that would distract them from what was going on.

I became angry during the movie when Nixon was portrayed in sinister fashion as ready to bomb civilians in Hanoi, North Vietnam. Stone goes to the trouble of showing Nixon turning back a steak that was so raw that blood covered his plate. This bloody scene was supposed to be symbolic, but it almost made me sick.

The fact is that Hanoi was bombed, and nearby Haiphong was mined, a bold move that forced the North Vietnamese to agree to a cease-fire. I recalled that Henry Kissinger and I were in Hanoi immediately afterward, and I saw with my own eyes that Hanoi civilians were spared, but military targets such as bridges and airfields were hit with precision. This was not in the movie.

Among those who will resent this film most will be Henry Kissinger. Only recently, he was unfairly depicted as being evil in Turner Broadcasting's TV movie, "Kissinger and Nixon." In the Stone movie, Kissinger appears to be a devious fat, sycophant who was almost ousted from the White House staff by (White House chief of staff) Bob Haldeman and aide Chuck Colson.

One of Kissinger's happiest moments was when he won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1973. The disparaging movies may provide Kissinger with some new low points in life.

When, in "Nixon," I saw the Kissinger character having lunch or dinner with reporters at Washington's Sans Souci restaurant, I recalled dining in the same cafe and often wondering what Kissinger was leaking. This did become a White House controversy, and he may have wondered the same thing about me.

But the movie's implication that Kissinger was about to lose his job was the opposite of truth. The film reminded me of times when I was in Haldeman's office or on an airplane and heard Kissinger—then the frustrated national security adviser—seek to displace Secretary of State Bill Rogers. No one effectively threatened Kissinger.

For me, the saddest moments of the movie came near the end, when Nixon finally begins to comprehend that he has lost the battle, that he is about to be forced from office. I had left the staff a year earlier.

Stone is more sympathetic in these scenes and allows Nixon to ask why no one remembers what he did in ending the war, in opening relations with China and what he did in the SALT treaty agreements with the Soviet Union.

I left the theater wondering why the movie was made and seeking quiet where I could again sort out fact and fiction.

I also pondered the coincidence that within less than two years after Nixon's death, we suddenly see a flurry of shows reviving the Vietnam War and Watergate—TNT's "Kissin-

ger and Nixon," Stone's "Nixon" and a forthcoming History Channel program titled "The Real Richard Nixon" 3½ documentary hours of Tricky Dick."

The A&E Channel also has scheduled a two-hour presentation of Nixon on "Biography," to air in January. Its producers say it is a true documentary.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, VETERANS, AND CHILDREN BEING HURT

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor this evening to voice my utter dismay at how our Federal employees, our veterans, and children are being treated by this GINGRICH-led farce called leadership. Republicans are hurting those who do not deserve it. We have dedicated employees in the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments who are being manipulated by those who claim that they care about the American people. We have Medicare recipients and children who will not receive benefits because the Republicans simply do not care. We have devoted State Department employees who were called in from furlough to cope with an airplane disaster in the dangerous hills of Bogota, Colombia. There are individuals who were deemed nonessential and are not being paid but are risking their lives to travel into the guerrilla-controlled hills of Colombia to insure that Americans' lives are protected.

□ 1915

This is the Christmas season. This is the season where good will toward men should be the order of the day. However, we appear to have many Members of this body who have a personal agenda that not only casts a scrooge-like haze over this season and the lives of Americans, but demonstrates a cold-hearted callousness for the well-being of our elderly, our children, our most vulnerable citizens.

I am here this evening because it is a sad day for America and this Congress. We have a few Members of this body holding the entire country hostage, and behaving as if they are, in fact, involved in a guerrilla war themselves, high up in the hills of the Sierra Madre. It is unfortunate that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have truly made this a season not to be jolly.

I also have a lot of constituents who are undergoing quite a bit of concern right now as it relates to the 11th Congressional District and the recent ruling from the judges that really turns the entire congressional map upside down, topsy-turvy, and places incumbent Members of Congress in the same district, and generally creates havoc on the congressional election plain, just a few short months away.

While we are here trying to protect the rights of average, ordinary Americans who are going to be hurt by this