

... 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

problems and let the States deal with it. They are doing it very well in the State of Kansas where I come from, and I have confidence in Governor Graves and Rochelle Chronister, the Secretary of Rehabilitation Services. They are doing a very good job.

What we have seen here is something very ineffective. Particularly agencies like the Department of Energy have been horribly mismanaged. Secretary O'Leary, the Secretary of the Department of Energy, has become a focal point because of her travel, but this is just the tip of the iceberg.

It started last year when we were looking at different agencies. The General Accounting Office said that the Department of Energy was ineffective as a Cabinet-level agency. Vice President GORE in his National Performance Review said that they were 40 percent ineffective in the environmental management area, and it was going to cost taxpayers \$70 billion over the next 30 years unless we do something about it.

Then we found out about the public relations office. The Department of Energy hires over 500 public relations employees at a cost of about \$25 million to taxpayers. Secretary O'Leary has a personal media consultant that she hires. She has even hired a private investigative firm to develop a list of unfavorable reporters and Congressmen so that she can "work on these people a little."

Let us focus a little bit on her travel, because today in the Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations, we found out that Secretary O'Leary has taken over 100 domestic and international trips. Now, some of this travel is needed, particularly in the domestic area, because that is where the Secretary of Energy's responsibilities lie. But the international travel, 16 trips, are outside the scope of her requirements as Secretary of the Department of Energy.

The GAO, the General Accounting Office, looked at two specific trips. One was to South Africa and one was to India. Now, this is reported in the Washington Times today. The trip to South Africa included 135 persons, 63 from the Department of Energy and 72 from the business and academic areas. It cost taxpayers about \$1 million, \$1,860,000, over \$1 million.

The second trip to India had 37 people from the Government and 41 guests. It cost \$729,000. One of the interesting things about this is that according to Chairman BARTON from Texas, the Department of Energy charged these non-DOE visitors, these guests, \$2,800 for coach fare on this, but the actual cost to taxpayers was \$12,860.

So who is going to make up that \$10,000? Well, the taxpayers are making it up, and I think it is kind of a sad state of affairs.

Second, we found out that Secretary O'Leary has transferred \$400,000 from a nuclear weapons-related account over to her travel budget so she can make these trips.

What it all boils down to, Mr. Speaker, is that we must balance the budget. We must remove Secretary O'Leary; we must eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet-level agency. Let us get the Government back to work, cull the deadwood out by eliminating the Department of Energy.

FRESHMEN NOT READY TO LEAD

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor this afternoon to express my very, very deep concerns about what is happening here in Washington, DC. It is absolutely amazing. This is the most extraordinary occurrence that I or anybody else could possibly witness at this time.

We have right here in the Congress of the United States a group of Members, elected by the people, being led by the newest Members of Congress, the freshmen; being led by the newest group with the least experience, who have decided to shut down Government. They have decided they do not care whether or not children are hurt, families are hurt; they do not care whether or not Social Security claims can be processed; whether or not our prisons are secured with employees who are working there who should be paid. They do not care about any of that.

They have come here not understanding the seriousness of their actions, and they have decided to try and hold this Congress hostage to their demands. It is a kind of immature action; nobody expects policymakers to respond in this manner.

One could ask, well, what has happened in the past? What happens when there are disagreements? What happens when you get to the point where the Government has run out of money and you have not resolved your differences? Well, I want you to know, until this Congress, it has always been worked out.

Even under Ronald Reagan, when there were serious differences between Republicans and Democrats, they had to hammer it out. They had to work it out. Nobody took their tent and closed it up and ran home and said, I do not care what happens. I do not care whether the services of Government are carried out or not. I do not want to play anymore.

Well, I want to tell you, I am utterly stunned and surprised that we have this group of new Members leading some of the more seasoned Members with this kind of catastrophe. It is unheard of. What are the people thinking out there, aside from those who are not getting paid, where the services are not getting delivered?

You must understand that the people are paying taxes. Nobody has stopped the people's taxes while this madness is going on. But what are they paying for? Many of them are not getting the

services that the taxes should be buying them.

I wonder about my Republican friends who claim they are concerned about the best use of the taxpayers' money. I am concerned that they are doing two things, maybe more: No. 1, they are having people work, they are having people work, some of whom I suppose will get paid sometime later on. We do not know. But many of them are being asked to work without knowing whether or not they are going to get paid.

Some of them have been disadvantaged already. They have gotten partial paychecks. I am concerned about that. I am also concerned about the attitudes, this extremism.

Do you know what Pete Wilson said the other day when he was asked for some help? Pete Wilson, the Governor up in California, up in this county called Mariposa, where they depend on the tourism trade because of Yosemite, they said they had a state of emergency because their economy has fallen apart because of what these young Republican Members are doing; and so they asked Pete Wilson for some help.

Pete Wilson turned them down, said the State of California could not help them; but then he had some advice for them. The Governor of the State of California, Pete Wilson, said, go break the locks on the gates. Let them in, he said. Defy the law. Commit a criminal act, he said.

Irresponsible leadership, but of course, NEWT GINGRICH and others have said, they do not care if they close Government down. All of this irrational leadership.

Mr. MICA was just on the floor and he talked about Head Start, and it was obvious he knew very little about Head Start and how it really works. I know a lot about Head Start, and I know why it is important.

Let me just wrap up by saying that the leadership and what is going on on the Republican side of the aisle is absolutely unconscionable. They are devastating lives. I think the people understand what is going on.

BLAME GAME DOES NOT BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, let me just share a little bit different perspective.

First of all, I think to hear Members from this side of the aisle get up and blame the President for the shutdown and Members on the other side get up and blame the Republican Congress, we get an understanding of why things are not working around here. It seems like nobody says they want a train wreck, but the President would love to have it down here at the Capitol steps. Some of our Members would like to have it down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. In the meanwhile, nothing gets done.