

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.

Let us talk frankly about what it would take to open up this Government. Four things could happen. First of all, the President could sign the appropriations bills that we sent him. He has signed a number of those bills. He has vetoed three and sent them back. The Interior appropriations bill we tried to override today, our second option if he does not sign those bills that would put people to work and put the Government to work, which is his prerogative under the Constitution, is that we can see if we have enough votes to muster a veto override. That takes two-thirds votes.

We voted on the Interior appropriations today. I think it was a reasonable bill. I did not like all parts of it. We had rejected that bill twice on environmental grounds, tried to make it a little better each time. The President vetoed it knowing, in the meantime, that this bill would have put 133,000 people to work; it would have opened up the national parks, the Smithsonian; it would have put the U.S. Geological Survey back to work. I have 1,000 workers in Reston that are furloughed at this time, so that they could do their work.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to make a point, a point that has been missed here. I have been around here for a long time, and this body has been here for a long time. It is the President's prerogative to veto bills. This should have been worked out for your sake, and I know how special this is to you because of all of your people that are here. A clean CR is not going to stop the negotiations on the budget.

□ 1545

I just do not understand why we make the balanced budget hold these people hostage of something that is going to happen 7 years down the road.

Mr. DAVIS. Reclaiming my time, let me just say to my friend, we have had 57 continuing resolutions since 1980 between the House and Senate. Most of those were with a Democratic Congress and a Republican President.

How many of those CR's were clean CR's? Many of them were not. The Bolland amendment which forbade aid to the Contras was put on a continuing resolution. We even put roads and the New Jersey Turnpike into the Federal Highway System on a continuing resolution. There is a loss of surplusage and riders in these. I am not defending, and I would like to see a clean CR. I was one of two Members on this side of the aisle who voted with you yesterday to bring up a clean CR. I am going to get to that in a minute.

But no one can sit here and say, "Gee, let's do a clean CR" when you all were on the other side and we had a Republican President you very often did not send a clean CR at the same time.

Mr. HEFNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Just for a second, because I want to make a few points.

Mr. HEFNER. We are talking about past history, and you folks were elected saying, "We're going to change things around here." But this is not changing things for the better. This is human misery. VA hospitals in North Carolina. These people are in dire circumstances.

Mr. DAVIS. Reclaiming my time, I do not disagree with the gentleman. I think what has happened here is a national disgrace. But to put it on one side or one party is, I think, a big mistake. I think that is part of our problem, is we end up too much time pointing fingers at each other and too little time working together and working these issues out.

Let me just get back to the Interior appropriations bill again. This bill I think had a number of good items. I think the President, part of him wanted to sign this. I know the Vice President urged him not to. We could still fix this bill. I think we have time to come back and fix this bill in a reasonable period of time and get these people back to work.

Some of the other appropriation bills that have been brought forward, I think, need a little more fixing and we need some time.

The President could have signed these bills, would have put people to work in fairness, Congress could have overridden the vetoes, the votes are not here to do that, so next comes to the continuing resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I would be happy to yield, but I want to make a few points, I only have 5 minutes, I say to my friend from California.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The point that I want to raise, the gentleman understands the dilemma that we are in.

You just said that this is a national disgrace. Putting any fault or blame aside, can you work to find 20 votes in your caucus to open up the Government, Republican votes?

We have 198 on our side and I think that you, being as reasonable and moderate as you are, that there would be 19 others?

Mr. DAVIS. Let me say to my friend that may be able to happen in time. We will have a discharge petition. But 30 days have to run. The problem with this recess is that you do not get the legislative days run during that time. Eventually this will happen, I think, if we could get it to the floor, it or something close to it would pass.

Ms. ESHOO. But 20 votes would stop that recess, and we could open up the Government, and we could move on.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, that would do it, but it does not solve some of the other problems. A continuing resolution is not a resolution. There are still a lot of issues at play in the continuing resolu-

tion that frankly ought to be worked out.

Ms. ESHOO. Of course there are. They have to be negotiated.

Mr. DAVIS. Let me just make a couple of final points.

It also does not get us to a balanced budget which is something else that I think needs to be done that we feel very strongly.

The fourth thing that could happen is the President could put a balanced budget on the table and we would get a continuing resolution like that. I think that onus is on the President. Both sides are at play here. I think we could all do a better job.

PASSAGE OF CONTINUING RESOLUTION URGED

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there are really any Members of this House of Representatives today that can feel very proud about having shut down the Government and causing all the pain and suffering, the many thousands of workers whose families were not able to have a Christmas or a New Year's celebration, and as they sit at home today, have no idea what the Congress is about to do with respect to their jobs. They want to go back to work. For those individuals who are working and who have been designated as essential workers, they are not being paid because their agencies have not been funded and their funds have already run out. The suffering among the workers is tremendous. I was home for a brief few days during our Christmas recess and heard from many workers.

The tragedy is that this is all absolutely unnecessary. The majority party wanted to make a point in November, and the point was that they were determined that the 7-year balanced budget was their priority and they were going to hang on to it no matter what. Even if it was necessary to close down the Government, they were determined to force the President to negotiate.

Those negotiations have taken place. They have not yet yielded the results that the majority party wants, but in point of fact these meetings have occurred. There is absolutely no reason to tie together the annual appropriations, which the Constitution says is the absolute requirement of this Congress to do, to tie it together to a 7-year plan. The 7-year plan is an entirely different, separate concept which the Republicans are saying is important because we have to have a plan in order to enable us to know what to do in the next fiscal year and the fiscal year after that and so forth until the year 2002.

But the reason that portions of the Government are shut down now is not because of the failure to have an agreement on the 7-year balanced budget. It