

years \$60 billion. It is worth it. It is our children's future. It is the future of this country. I hope the American people will listen to reason. I know that they believe in what we are trying to do.

□ 1515

THIS IS ABOUT REAL PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the last speaker, this is a great debate, this is a debate about who is important, who is not. It is a debate, I think, about the future, it is about the future we will allow all Americans to share in, hopefully. But I want to share with my colleagues a letter I received today from a mother of a 10-year-old girl. This letter is about a young girl that lives in Wilmington, my congressional district, with her mother and father. Her mother and father are musicians who have served as ambassadors for the U.S. Information Agency. On December 20 this little girl, 10 years old, traveled to Germany to visit her ailing stepmother, a stepmother who has cancer and is in treatment taking chemotherapy, but this is not where the story ends; it is really where it begins.

Let me read her mother's letter. It is self-explanatory. She writes: I hope you can help. We have a 10-year-old stranded in Germany who is supposed to return home by January 8 and whose passport expired January 2. This mother continued: She is flying Delta from Frankfurt to Atlanta, and the Delta Airline international desk has told me that they will not let her board. This concerned mother goes on: The Hamburg consulate has told her father that they cannot issue a new passport due to the shutdown. Then she asks, could you please ask them to make an exception? She is an unaccompanied minor. Mr. Speaker, I enter this letter into the RECORD:

To Eva Clayton:

I have not been able to reach you by phone. I hope you can help. We have a 10 year old stranded in Germany who's supposed to return home Jan. 8th, but whose passport expired Jan. 2nd. She's flying Delta from Frankfurt to Atlanta. Delta Airlines International Desk has told me they will not let her board. The Hamburg Consulate has told her father that they cannot issue a new passport due to the shut-down. Could you please ask them to make an exception since she is an unaccompanied minor? We appreciate your help! Thanks

Mr. Speaker, imagine a 10-year-old girl alone, away from her parents, away from school, in a foreign land, and she is told by her government she is not able to go home and she is not able to come to the United States to go back to school. Why? Because its government is closed.

On an average day the State Department processed some 23,000 applica-

tions for passports. On this day and each of the days this Government has been shut down no application for passports are being processed. On an average day the State Department issued some 20,000 visas to visitors who spent an average of \$3,000 for a total of \$60 million, but for this little girl who is 10 years old this is no average day.

They are not just numbers; they are people. When we talk about the common good for the multitude, we must remember those multitudes are made up of individual people who make up this great America.

I intend to do all in my power to help this little girl get home, but I cannot do it alone. We need reasonable people on both sides to understand what we are doing to this Government is foolishness and this needs to stop. But a simple act by this House following the responsible bipartisan act of the Senate where both Republicans and Democrats unanimously say that this Government should be open while we have this great debate. We should do that. All we need now is 20 reasonable Republicans to join with the Democrats on this side to follow the example that the Senate has done. Both Republicans and Democrats have come together to say the Government should go on while we have this great debate.

Do not hold this little girl in hostage. What will we tell her when we come home? What lessons are we teaching her as we do this? What lessons are we exemplifying to the rest of the world, that we cannot have a serious debate unless we hold people who are innocent as leverage, as hostage?

This is no way for responsible people to govern their Nation. Yes, we are not being responsible, Mr. Speaker, because indeed we are making real people suffer, real people, not just some imaginative number of the future, but real people are suffering; senior citizens are suffering, and the prospect of their Meals on Wheels not being there to feed people who desperately need those. We certainly are making people suffer who are eligible for Social Security who cannot even process their application. Why? There is no one there to take the application.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, if that is not bad enough, in this bitter cold season we do not have heat. The heat program that we had made available for what we call the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program is no longer available. No one has that opportunity. In the bitter cold we will say no to those people. Why? Because we want to make them sacrificial lambs.

Mr. Speaker, on this 20th day we hope again we could find 20 reasonable Republicans to join and follow the exemplary bipartisan responsible act of the Senate and put this Government back to work while we have this great debate.

BALANCING THE BUDGET IN 7 YEARS IS NEITHER RADICAL OR EXTREME

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two things to say about the budget debate: First, the overwhelming majority of the American people do not believe it is radical or extreme, in any way, to require the Federal Government to balance its budget in 7 years; and second, if this was a Republican President in office, the national media would be pointing out every day and in fact harping on the fact that the President has still not submitted a balanced budget plan some 6 or 7 weeks after he promised to do so.

Apparently he is keeping the Government shut down because he sees partisan political advantage in doing so.

Now on the something else, also related to the budget, and that is the spending of billions and billions of our tax dollars in Rwanda, Haiti, Somalia, and now Bosnia.

Anyone who opposed all this waste has been insulted with the description of isolationist, even if that description was totally inaccurate and even if they wanted trade and friendly relations with all nations. It is just not politically correct or fashionable today to be an isolationist.

That is why I read with such great interest a syndicated column this past Tuesday by Charley Reese, which I include for the RECORD.

Mr. Reese does not live inside the beltway, and he frequently writes with such great commonsense that he is about as plain spoken and politically incorrect as you can get these days.

Time will not permit me to read all of his column, but I would like to read most of it. These are words you do not often hear in Washington, at least in polite company.

The column previously referred to is as follows:

[From The Sentinel, Jan. 2, 1996]

(By Charley Reese)

Those of us who oppose squandering American flesh and treasure in foreign places where we have no national interests are called isolationists by the internationalists.

That's OK. It is intended as an insult, as when Alan Ladd called Jack Palance a "low-down lying Yankee dog" in *Shane*. We Americans understand that because the internationalists are too embarrassed (or afraid of prosecution) to tell the truth, they have no choice but to resort to name-calling and wind-bagging to rationalize these misadventures.

Wind-bagging is when you toss out a lot of undefinable words and phrases such as "saving America's soul," "maintaining American leadership," "preserving stability," or "moral obligation."

It would be embarrassing indeed if the internationalists were forced to explain why they have a moral obligation to intervene in a foreign civil war while they feel no moral obligation at all to tell the American people the truth, rebuild their infrastructure or balance their budget.

... Washington said "It is our policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world. The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible."

America prospered under that policy and could prosper under it again. Why do Americans have to defend 300 million Europeans from 150 million bankrupt Russians? That's the question Pat Buchanan asks, and it's a question Americans ought to ask of every internationalist politician. Why do Americans have to enforce peace in Bosnia? Why do Americans have to finance peace treaties in the Middle East? Why do Americans have to rebuild Bosnia when (a) we didn't tear it up, and (b) our own cities need rebuilding?

Medal of Honor winner and Marine Gen. Smedley Butler, who became an isolationist, said, "I spent 33 years [in the Marines] * * * most of my time being a high-class musclemans for big business, for Wall Street and the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism."

What we isolationists are in favor of are: peace, friendly relations with all countries, trade, independence and respect for the independence of others, American prosperity, American liberty and American security. We are also in favor of sound war-making capability to defend America, and no place else.

GINGRICH PLAN TO HOLD HOSTAGE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN THE BUDGET DEBATE IS NO PROFILE IN COURAGE.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a big difference between courage and kidnapping. Courage is sacrificing oneself for a cause. On the other hand, kidnapping is sacrificing someone else for a person's self-interest.

I would suggest that the Gingrich plan to use Federal employees as hostages in the budget debate is far more akin to kidnapping than to courage. It is no profile in courage to sacrifice innocent victims for someone's own cause, and that is exactly what the Speaker and his supporters in the House have done. They are getting their congressional paychecks while they are stopping innocent Federal employees from getting theirs. That is not courage, that is hypocrisy at its worst.

The issue before us is not whether we should balance the budget. I support that. That is an important cause. The issue before us is how we will balance the budget over the next 7 years, and the Gingrich Republicans have no right to use Federal employees, hundreds of thousands of them and their families, to force upon this country their own particular plan. If the Gingrich budget cannot withstand the light of day, if it cannot stand on its own in an open public debate in our democracy, then it would be morally wrong to pass that budget simply because it is the only way to free hundreds of thousands of Federal employees. Hostage taking, kidnapping, and blackmail have absolutely no place in a free society.

Mr. Speaker, I think Senator DOLE, the majority leader of the other party, a Member of the Republican Party, leader of the Senate, was right when he said enough is enough. I do not see any sense in what we have been doing. Let me repeat that. Senator DOLE said, "I don't see any sense in what we've been doing. I would hope that we would have quick action in the House. People have been gone from their jobs long enough. Enough is enough."

BOB DOLE was right. NEWT GINGRICH and his supporters in this House are wrong. We should pass a clean continuing resolution and immediately reopen the Federal Government.

We are not talking about statistics and numbers here, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about real people with real families. Let me tell you about some of those from our district who have written me:

Dear sir, I am scheduled to be in surgery for colon cancer on the 3rd of January. Because of the government shutdown I have not been able to resolve the question of income. This thing has put my life savings in the toilet, so I don't have the money to come for the surgery. Since this thing is going to wipe out my career if I can't get some type disability, I'm going to be the only homeless person with an oxygen bottle for emphysema and a colostomy for colon cancer. I don't find much quality of life here. I have paid into Social Security since 1954. I also served in the U.S. military for 8.5 years. I find it a bad situation when I can't get any help. At 56 I'm too young to retire and too old to be retrained.

□ 1530

A veteran in my district, Mr. Speaker, who served his country in the military for 8½ years, cannot get any help for colon cancer because of the shutdown, the unnecessary, unfair shutdown of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is fine and it is healthy and it is good for us to debate a balanced budget and how we are going to get there. We should have that debate. My feeling is whether that debate takes 2 days or 2 weeks or 2 months longer, it is better that we do it right than to do it under the blackmail threat of shutting down hundreds of thousands of Federal employees from receiving their paychecks.

Another real person with a real family in my district, who is a victim of the Gingrich strategy:

Dear Representative EDWARDS: Both my husband and I are employed at the Central Texas Medical Center in Temple, Texas. Because we both work for the VA, an underfunded Federal agency. We will receive only one-half of our paychecks on January 2. My car is five years old. We saved \$1,100 to put into a badly needed transmission. Fortunately, we have that money to get us through this pay period. It do not know what we would have done if it were not for that. I cry every night when I watch the news because I am so angry and worried.

We have another constituent that wrote, "Dear Mr. EDWARDS. I was furloughed for two weeks even though I was told purchasing agents were essential on December 28, 1995. I am a single parent, and I am not whining about

this, I am very proud of it, but there is no second income in my family."

It is time to put Federal workers back to work.

ONE TRILLION DOLLARS MORE IS TOO MUCH

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Dole campaign is going to be very pleased with all of the support he is getting from across the aisle in the Democrat Party. I hope they will attend the fundraisers and help Senator DOLE gain the Presidency of the United States, because I think he is a good leader, which is demonstrated right here by the support that he is getting from the Democrat party.

Although I currently disagree with the policy he has on this continuing resolution, I still see him as a fine leader, and the type of man that I want for President of the United States; and I am glad to see many of the members of the Democrat Party on the other side of the aisle join with us in their support for Majority Leader DOLE over President Clinton on this.

I want to move on to something else, though, because I am really wondering how long the President is going to tolerate what is going on. I am wondering how long Congress is going to tolerate what is going on. I am wondering how long the American people are going to tolerate what is going on, even though we are finally talking about a balanced budget.

Now, we have been talking about a balanced budget a long time here in Congress. Ever since the 104th Congress has been going on, we have been very specifically targeting a balanced budget that would take 7 years to achieve. But now we are seeing a very dramatic change. The President is talking about it; even the liberals here in Congress are talking about it. But the President still wants to spend \$1 trillion more over the next 7 years than Congress does, \$1 trillion.

Now, that is a lot of money. To give you some kind of an idea how much money it is, if you were to have gone in business the day after Christ rose from the dead and you lost \$1 million that day and every day up until today, almost 2,000 years, you would only be about 80 percent of the way to losing \$1 trillion. That is only \$800 billion that you would have lost.

One trillion dollars is a lot of money, and that is what the President wants to spend over what Congress has put in their budget. Do you ever wonder why?

There are some liberal organizations the President obviously supports that do not have the support of the majority of this Congress, like the national bureaucracy for the Education Association, our current welfare bureaucracy. We here in Congress would like to send the solution or the money closer to the