

using honest numbers. That is a very modest goal, but that is something that the Republicans have proposed, and that is something that the Congress has passed and sent to the President.

In November, the President promised that within 30 days he would present a balanced budget that met those criteria, balanced in 7 years using honest numbers. December 15, when his proposal was supposed to be unveiled, it did not balance. It was out of balance by a large amount, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which analyzes these things.

In the meantime, the House and the Senate passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. It passed on October 26. The President vetoed it. I can understand his philosophical problems with some of the issues, but I do believe he has an obligation to negotiate seriously and to present to the negotiators his version of a balanced budget. That has not come forth even up to this point.

As a result, the Government has shut down in an attempt to force the issue. It simply has not worked. He has still not presented a balanced budget. I am reaching the conclusion that the President does not want to balance the budget and he is not going to present his version of a balanced budget. I believe that is tragic given the enormity of the problem. He will not sign our balanced budget, he will not present one of his own, what do we then do?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious problem for this Nation, and it is a very serious problem for this Congress. We are trying to address it, and perhaps we have to take another track if the President simply will not respond and will not present a balanced budget of his own. After all, the House is the body that initiates the legislation dealing with appropriations. That is prescribed in the Constitution.

Perhaps what we have to do is present to the President bite-sized budgets. Maybe we should call them mini budgets, dealing with one issue at a time and saying, Mr. President, this is all we can afford to spend on this particular item in this fiscal year and ask him to sign each of these, almost a line-item budget, if we like. And maybe if we put it in bite-sized chunks, he will be able to understand the problem, we will be able to deal with it, and we can achieve a balanced budget in that fashion.

In any event, we have to take another approach, something that he will understand given the fact that he simply will present a balanced budget to us and will not sign the one that we have prepared.

So I urge all of us to look at this afresh, and I especially urge the President to work with us and negotiate in good faith as we try to solve this enormous national problem.

#### REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP ABDICATING ITS RESPONSIBILITIES FOR GOVERNANCE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that partisanship has never been the major reason that I have been serving in this Congress, and I think, over the years, I have tried very hard in my career to build bridges across the aisle on all the committees I have served on and build bridges between regions and representatives from different regions of the country. But as I witness the current impasse, and have never seen anything like it in my career, I would have to say that we have a serious problem within the Republican Party.

This week we saw that the Senate, which is in Republican control, pass a bill to end the shutdown, this historic shutdown of the Federal Government. As we have seen workers temporarily laid off, without checks, across this country, the House Republicans cannot find it in either their management or their personal skills to pass the bill that was passed in the Republican Senate.

So my question this afternoon, with all due respect, is what is wrong with the Republican leadership in this Chamber that is abdicating its responsibilities for governance? I would say it is not only the budget that needs to be balanced, but, I think, it is the Republican leaders in this House that are out of balance, and it has gotten to the point where it is not just the Federal workers that are being affected, but the taxpaying public of this country that is being denied services.

Let me say in that regard, as someone who has taken a lifelong career interest in veterans affairs, that today I received a communication at my request from the Veterans Hospital in my region of the country, which has jurisdiction over the Ann Arbor Medical Center, as well as the Toledo Veterans Outpatient Clinic in my own home district, and I asked the chief of medical services there, Dr. Lloyd Jacobs, for a report on what was happening in our region of the country, and learned that the personal in that particular hospital, in our outpatient clinic as well, received paychecks with less than half of their normal amount, as only time worked before December 15 was credited for pay.

In fact, in those checks deductions were taken out in full, and that accounted for significantly less than half a paycheck in many instances.

Dr. Jacobs indicated to me that this has caused very significant hardship for people working in our clinic and hospital. For example, a clinical pharmacist, who is the sole supporter of two young children, is already having trouble meeting mortgage payments for that family. Another single mom in that hospital, with a 13-year-old child,

is seriously worried about adequate food until the next paycheck. And one employee told him about the fact that she was unlikely to be able to come to work because she was having difficulty buying gas and she really did not have her full payment.

Before I recognize the esteemed member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs here, let me just say that the doctor told me that his staff is now so demoralized, sufficiently distressed, and distracted that he has recommended, as medical center director in our region of the country, that they are going to diminish medical services to our veterans, including cutting back and stopping reconstructive vascular surgery, cardiothoracic surgery, interventional cardiology, and other risky and stressful procedures, because he is worried about the people who support him in the operating rooms concentrating on the operations they are supposed to be performing on our veterans. He wrote me saying he hopes this is temporary and can we not do something here in Washington so that he can begin doing the job the taxpayers expect him to do, and that is to operate on the veterans in our region who are seeking medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. What she said is exactly true, and is happening in all our 171 veterans hospitals across the country. We are really headed for a disaster unless we come up with something to pay these people, to pay our bills on surgical equipment, medicines, and the things we have to use and do to be sure that these veterans get the proper medical care.

It is a problem. I congratulate the gentlewoman for pointing it out. We have to do something. We have to pass a continuing resolution to take care of these veterans hospitals. If we do not, we are not taking care of those that marched off and did a great job for our country and have served well. I appreciate the gentlewoman's yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, who has served in this Chamber with honor for many, many years, has he ever seen anything like this before?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Never in my 30 years.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that.

All I can say is that one quality seems to be missing in this Chamber, and that is good measure, good measure, on the part of the Republican Party. And if I could plead with the Members who are here on the floor, please heal your wounds, take us away from this edge of brinkmanship. Pass the bill that the Senate has sent over here.

TRIBUTE TO 100TH BIRTHDAY OF  
SENATOR EVERETT DIRKSEN

□ 1845

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond quickly to my friend from Ohio, and I think it is important that we recognize that, yes, it is true nothing like this debate has taken place, and yet if our Founding Fathers were here today, they would say, wait a minute, let me get this straight, we are almost \$5 trillion in debt; we spend \$20 billion each month in interest on the debt; if a child is born today he or she owes \$187,000 as his or her portion of the interest just on the debt, above and beyond local, State and Federal taxes? I think our Founding Fathers would be shocked and appalled that we are even negotiating a 7-year balanced budget and not an immediate balanced budget.

This is a tremendous moment in history that we have got to address, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, and I would have done this earlier had I not been in the Chair most of the day, to insert into the RECORD an article that appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Peoria Journal Star. Today commemorates the 100th birthday of one of the greatest leaders of the U.S. Senate, Senator Everett Dirksen.

I do not think it could be really more fitting for me to be inserting this article and commemorating the 100th birthday of Senator Dirksen, because many people have used the quote that he said, "A million here, a million there. Pretty soon it adds up to real dollars." This is what we have been talking about for so long around here, the idea of a balanced budget.

Senator Dirksen lived in the district that I represent, and at one time he was the Congressman from the district that I now represent. He hailed from Pekin, IL, and when he died in 1969 was the minority leader of the Senate; and, actually, prior to being elected to the Senate, was the Congressman who became ill, retired from the House, was cured of his illness, which was an eye problem, and then returned as a U.S. Senator, and had a distinguished career serving under President Johnson, who was a very close friend of his.

Nobody knew more about trying to balance budgets, working with Members on both sides, trying to reach agreement and compromise than Senator Dirksen, and I do want to insert this article in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to yield to my friend from California, who was actually a staffer in the Senate during the time that Senator Dirksen was the minority leader, and I would ask if the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] would have any comments with respect to Senator Dirksen.

Mr. HORN. Just briefly, Mr. Speaker. Senator Dirksen, without question, was one of the great legislators of the twentieth century. That is why his colleagues in the Senate named one of the three buildings of the Senate after him.

I spent a good part of 1965 in his back office as assistant to the Republican whip, Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, who was his principal deputy, and there is no question the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was completely drafted in Senator Dirksen's back office by a joint bipartisan team from the Johnson administration, the Democratic majority leader, the Republican whip and the Republican leader.

When we finished one day and his chief counsel announced to the Senator we were done, he said, "Get me the President." When his secretary did, he said "Lyndon? Everett. You now have a bill that you can send to the Congress of the United States."

That was the first major legislation since before the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration completely drafted in the Senate. Senator Dirksen was also the key person on the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Without Everett Dirksen's leadership, there would have been no Civil Rights Act. We had to break a southern Democratic filibuster of 18 Senators, and it took 1 year to do it and Dirksen's leadership is what got the job done.

Earlier in the House, Dirksen proved himself to be a true legislative craftsman. More than anyone else in the House, he was responsible for passing the only reorganization act in this century pertaining to Congress. That was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

So, it is correct that my friend from Illinois honors a great legislator and a great human being.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would also add, and I appreciate very much the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] participating in this commemoration of the 100th birthday of Senator Everett Dirksen, who was, as I said, from Pekin, IL.

I would also add that in the last 1960s, when Senator Dirksen was the minority leader in the U.S. Senate, that was the end of the decade when we had balanced budgets around here. Since that time we have had a very difficult time balancing our budget. As I said, the quote that has been used so often I think really deserves to be attributed to Senator Dirksen. I appreciate the opportunity to commemorate his 100th birthday today.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Jan. 4, 1996]

DIRKSEN BROUGHT SENSE OF REALITY  
WHEREVER HE WENT

One hundred years ago, fathers might have dreamed that a son born in a log cabin could become president. But no way could Johann Dirksen have imagined Jan. 4, 1896, that his baby boy's birthday celebrations one day would launch the social season in the nation's capitol.

Yet, Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen's birthday bash, usually at the Mayflower

hotel ballroom, was the opening "must go" event of the social season each year in Washington, D.C., even before he became minority leader of the Senate and a national figure beyond the Beltway. Everybody who was anybody, as the saying goes, attended from both political parties and from the administration and the congress.

Those glittering parties were a long way from the neighborhood in Pekin known as "Beantown." Yet, growing up in Beantown may have been an important part of "Ev" Dirksen being the toast of the town in the nation's capitol.

Actually, the residents, themselves named it that—or rather in their own language, "Bohncheffiddle." They were German immigrants who didn't indulge in euphemisms. They had a strong sense of reality. And the reality was that rich folks had flower gardens in their yards; immigrants grew beans. They were who they were, and saw nothing wrong with it. Beantown was just their American starting place.

In fact, most residents in Pekin, and millions more across America, gardened

town lot was 50 feet front, 150 deep, and provided space for people who didn't own a horse and didn't need a barn. There was space for berry bushes along the lot line, half a dozen fruit trees set wide apart, orderly squares of garden vegetables, and a grape arbor.

There was a lot more than beans, and it all required care. Many folks kept a small flock of chickens by the back porch as well. At one time, in fact, the Dirksens raised a pig.

The bigger boys spaded the gardens and raked them smooth. Before he was old enough for school, the youngest son, Ev, could help punch holes in the prepared ground with the wooden split pegs used as clothespins keeping a straight line along the board on which he knelt.

Keeping clothes as clean as possible was important when washing them was a major weekly chore. As the produce grew, ripening in sequence, much of it had to be "put up" for the winter in fruit jars and glasses, sealed with hot paraffin or special lids, after being well cooked. Cabbage was chopped and salted and then pounded and pounded until it was soaked in its own brine to be kept for winter—sauerkraut.

The Dirksen boys took part, and it was the boys who peddled surplus vegetables door to door. The basics of life to the German families were food, clothes, shelter from the cold and cleanliness. So, before he learned to read and write, Everett Dirksen became part of a family team, doing his share in providing those basics, and grew up knowing from whence came the necessities of life. Somebody had to do the work to produce it.

Their father had a stroke in 1901 when Ev, the youngest, was only 5. By the time Ev was 9, Dad was dead. The boys were raised by their mother, and the team game of survival that they played put a solid foundation under his whole life.

In those circumstances and in the absence of radio, television, telephones or computers, he found school and learning downright fun. Learning was an adventure and a kind of game. He loved reading. He loved to discover a new big word and roll it off his tongue. In books, he could explore the far reaches of this world and of the world of ideas.

Thus in his youth, and progressively thereafter, Everett Dirksen combined those wonderful opposites, the contradictions of idealist and a realist. It fit the Lincoln tradition of central Illinois.

With his older brothers grown and earning money, the family could let young Everett go off to college. He worked nights while

schooling at the University of Minnesota, until World War I interrupted.

Three years of ROTC there gave him a leg up on a lieutenant's bars. In France, he was an artilleryman. His job was to ride a wicker basket under a rough, hydrogen-filled balloon, held by a cable and linked by a primitive telephone to the gun batteries, overlooking the battlefield. There, he observed the fall of the artillery shells his battery mates were firing and tell them how to adjust their fire to bring it on target.

Of course, such balloons like his were sitting ducks, even for the primitive planes of the time.

When the war ended, the army found his ability to speak German useful and kept him in Europe. He remained overseas for 18 months in all, much of the time interpreting for others or dealing directly with the local German population. He also knew Paris, Berlin, other German cities, and visited England and Ireland. In Rome, the ambassador asked him to join his staff, but Ev was homesick for Pekin.

Thus, young Lt. Dirksen returned to Pekin and Bohnchefiddle at age 24, with an extraordinary range of experiences. He was now a college man, a combat veteran and an ex-officer who had traveled, often in very sophisticated circles, in postwar Europe.

Back home, he married a Pekin girl and launched his remarkable political career as the youngest person ever elected to the Pekin City Council.

As city councilman, he was a young man dealing with a rapidly changing world. Streets needed to be paved for the growing number of those new motor cars. The fire department needed trucks to replace the horse-drawn rigs. The aging streetcar, one car running back and forth on a single track, needed replacement with bus service.

Power plant were under construction bringing electricity. The Edison resolution was on, and radio was waiting in the wings. These were not hypothetical or abstract problems to be solved abstractly for the young councilman. He was intimately involved with the reality of finance for technology and the even tougher reality of the effects and demands new technology and dramatic change made on the city workers and the public.

When he grappled with these problems as a councilman, he also worked delivering his brothers' bread to 50 small groceries scattered about town. Everybody knew his route, and at many a stop he confronted people with problems to take to their councilman. Before he went to the national macrocosm, this man had a thorough and heavy dose of the microcosm.

Thus, the nature of the man was well-founded long before he became one of that city's best-loved figures, before he crafted the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 and brought over the votes to pass it with him, before he won a Grammy for recording "Gallant Men," before he was the confidante of presidents both Republican and Democrat, and before he became a darling of the once-skeptical Washington press corps.

He brought to Washington the prestige of being the Congress' best orator, a skill founded and practiced in Pekin and which largely won for him his original seat in the House of Representatives in the first place.

He also brought the attention to detail, the realism, of Bohnchefiddle, and was, undoubtedly, the most skilled parliamentarian in the Senate of his time. He knew how the system worked in every detail, and he knew who was the person that counted, the person to talk to, not only in the Senate, but in every department of the national administration.

Finally, he made many friends and no enemies in the best tradition of the small town

where he grew up, and where some of his local political foes were also lifelong personal friends.

When Everett Dirksen died, the President of the United States gave the eulogy—proclaiming that Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen had more impact on history than many presidents.

That he was, and he didn't learn that in Washington. That was the boy from Bohnchefiddle.

#### SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET PLAN

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations. Observation No. 1 is that I believe that the struggle we are in is a very significant and fundamental one. This is not a testosterone test. It is not an ego test. It is a fundamental struggle.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the 7-year balanced budget plan offered by my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it contains three significant features.

No. 1, they significantly change the function, nature, and role of the Federal Government in the lives of people in this country. Nothing can be more fundamental than redefining the nature and the role of the Federal Government. I would argue that when we put down the Articles of Confederation and moved to a constitutional government, that brilliant minds thought that it was an important function, the role of the Federal Government in people's lives. To redefine that is very fundamental.

Second, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to significantly reduce the size of the Federal Government and, third, significantly reduce the revenues designed to carry out the business of Federal governance.

Nothing can be more fundamental than that struggle. The give and take that is necessary to resolve those fundamental problems, in this gentleman's humble opinion, cannot be dealt with in the context of an artificial crisis that wreaks havoc and brings pain and creates peril in the lives of people who offer the services and people who receive the services of the Federal Government.

We ought to dignify the significance of this fundamental struggle by moving beyond this crisis, and I would echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues who suggested we ought to pass a continuing resolution, and yet with all due respect, I think my colleagues are going in the wrong direction.

The first factor that contributed to the deficit was the \$260 some odd billion tax cut to the wealthy during the Reagan era. But rather than pass a simplified progressive tax based on the notion that the people most able to pay, pay the most, what we see here is a bill that passed the House that origi-

nally had a tax cut of \$305 billion. Now we are talking about a tax cut of \$245 billion to the wealthy. Been there. Done that. That is a mistake.

No. 2, the rapid rise in the military budget during the Reagan era that took us from \$170-some-odd-billion climbed up over \$300 billion and leveled out for the 10 years of the decade of the 1980's. We find ourselves in the context of a post-cost war world where we ought to be downsizing the military budget, but what does this budget do? It added \$7 billion over and above the President's request, and it adds to the military budget during a period when the United States and its allies outspend the rest of the world 4 to 1. It seems to me that that is going in the wrong direction.

The third contributing factor to the deficit was the rapid rise in health care costs. But rather than us embrace a national health care policy based upon the principles of comprehensiveness and universality, what we see here is a challenge to Medicare, a challenge to Medicaid, and no effort to bring this country to the 21st century with a coherent, rational and comprehensive approach to national health care.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a major contributing factor to the deficit is high unemployment. Depending upon which economist we subscribe to, for each point we reduce the unemployment rate, we reduce the budget deficit by \$25 to \$55 billion each point we drop, but rather than embrace a policy of full employment, we embrace a policy of restricting employment, and I would suggest that jobs are not created in a vacuum, Mr. Speaker.

A society generates employment to the extent to which we are prepared to come together to solve other social problems. We address the problems of transportation in this country; you generate employment in the field of transportation. We address the issue of education in this country; we generate employment. My point is that to the extent to which we are prepared to spend resources to solve the social problems of this country, we solve that problem and we generate employment. The 7-year budget plan in my opinion goes in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying the process is flawed. We have created an incredible crisis here and, No. 2, on substance we are going down the wrong road that does not take us toward reduction of the deficit. Ultimately, I think it is going to contribute to it.

#### MR. PRESIDENT, IT IS TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I came down out of my apartment this morning and picked up the Washington Post on the front porch and, as I looked through it, I turned finally to page A-