

So when we begin to understand the facts of the basis of the redrawn districts that are labeled majority-minority districts, I hope all America, as the gentlewoman from North Carolina did say, will applaud what America stands for. Its stripes and stars stand for inclusion. That inclusion, Mr. Speaker, would include, if you will, a recognition of human capital.

One, we do not want our citizens paying high gasoline prices. We want to be able to invest in them.

Two, we want to ensure the fact that those who make only \$8,000 a year get an increase in minimum wage.

Three and four, Mr. Speaker, if you will, that affirmative action and the redistricting process that has opened the doors to African-Americans, Hispanics, women, and other ethnic minorities, would end the basis upon which many of us have been discriminated against.

□ 1130

Slavery was real. It existed. Let us work together to ensure that we never go back, that we have representation in the U.S. Congress and that our children, our businesses, our men and women have opportunity for jobs and contracts and education.

FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly good to be here this morning and I certainly did enjoy the comments of the gentlewoman from Texas on gas prices, minimum wage, and other issues which I am also going to be addressing this hour, but I will be addressing them from a slightly different perspective. It may surprise the gentlewoman, many on her side of the aisle and also many in this audience that the arguments that I will be making today on gas prices, on gas taxes, on the minimum wage, on Medicare, on tax cuts, on a variety of issues are the same exact positions that Governor Bill Clinton took in 1992. But, of course, between 1992 and 1996, now that it is time to get reelected, things have changed.

Every time I walk in here, I am very honored to be a Member of Congress and honored by the history. This has been a great experience for me. It has been great to visit the monuments to Jefferson and to Washington and to Lincoln and to others who have made great changes in this country.

I think this is a good, decent Congress. I think it is a noble Government. I think that many, many Members try to do their best to make sure that working-class Americans do not suffer because of what Washington does. But, unfortunately, for the past 40 years

Washington has done more to damage working-class Americans than anybody else.

The gentlewoman talked about the Contract With America and talked about the Contract With America in very disparaging terms. All last year people talked about NEWT GINGRICH and the Contract With America and, in the same sentence, talked about how horrible it was.

I guess my biggest frustration, as much as I have loved being in Washington, DC, has been how short some people's attention spans can be. Because let us talk for a second about the Contract With America. Let us talk about these items that are supposedly so radical, that Democrats claim to be so destructive and radical. Let us have a quick refresher course on what the Contract With America was about.

The first thing it was about was balancing the budget and ending 40 years of waste and abuse, 40 years of deficit spending where this Congress, run by Democrats, passed deficit budgets for 40 years.

Now, of course they had to get a lot of Republican Presidents to sign those bills. I suggest that when we are \$5 trillion in debt, there is enough blame to go around for both parties. But let me say this. In 1994, part one of the Contract With America was, we said, "Enough is enough. We are going to stop stealing money from our children and grandchildren."

I have got two boys, ages 5 and 8, who right now have about a \$20,000 debt on their head because this Government has not had the decency to balance its budgets. We are spending so much more money than we have and we are sending our check to our children. We are \$5 trillion in debt.

I must admit I am not very good in math. That is why I went to law school instead of becoming an engineer, and I guess that is why I got in politics. I am not good with math. I try to deal in images and stories.

I had an interesting story told to me, an interesting illustration to explain to me what \$5 trillion meant. This is what it means. If somebody made \$1 million every day from the day that Jesus Christ was born to today, May 2, 1996, he would not make enough money to pay off our Federal debt.

Let me repeat that. If someone made \$1 million every day from the day that Jesus Christ was born until today, he would not make enough money to pay off our Federal debt.

Mr. Speaker, it gets worse. You can work another 2,000 years, making \$1 million a day for the next 2,000 years, and still be unable to pay off how much we owe by the Federal debt.

Democrats think that it is radical and have said that that plank of the Contract With America was radical because we wanted to balance the budget in 7 years. There are still many here, believe it or not, despite the fact that we are \$5 trillion in debt, who are telling us we do not need to balance the budget in 7 years, that it is too harsh.

Mr. Speaker, we are being too harsh on our children. It may be too harsh on their political fortunes to finally show a little bit of discipline and stop sending our bills to children and grandchildren, but it is not too harsh for an America that wants to take care of their future generations.

And if you do not really care about children and grandchildren and the 21st century, you are just in it for today, I will also appeal to your greedy instincts. If we follow the first plank in the Contract With America and pass the Balanced Budget Amendment and pass those budget deals that we passed, it will also cause interest rates to go down 2 percent. That causes the economy to explode.

We passed the first balanced budget in a generation and the President vetoed it. He did not like it. He said we were moving too quickly. He said last year that he has studied it and you just cannot balance the budget in 7 years. That is what he said last summer.

In 1992, he was on "Larry King Live" and Larry King asked the Governor, he said, "Governor Clinton, will the Clinton administration, if elected, give us a balanced budget?"

He said, "Yes, Larry, I will balance the budget in 5 years."

Mr. Speaker, his 5 years are just about up. He did not balance the budget. He went back on his word, he vetoed the first balanced budget plan sent to a President in a generation, and now is claiming once again that he wants a balanced budget.

Facts are stubborn things, Mr. President. Let those who have ears to hear, hear.

He has changed his position so many times on this issue that it is almost impossible to keep up with him.

Another plank that we had in the Contract With America was tax cuts for middle-class Americans. It is very interesting because we are talking about the gas tax today. The former speaker talked about how they wanted to get gas prices down. They were trying to figure out, "How can we get gas prices down?"

What the Democrats will not tell us is that they voted for about a 5-cent a gallon tax increase which costs this economy billions and billions of dollars.

The gentlewoman probably thinks raising gas taxes in 1993 was the right thing to do. I know the Democrats did. I know Al Gore did because, remember, he cast the deciding vote. It was tied 50-50 in the Senate and Al Gore, acting on the President's behalf, voted to pass the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

In that tax increase was a 5-cent tax increase on gas prices. The President was not happy about it, mind you. He actually wanted to pass even more fuel taxes on to the American people in the form of a Btu tax but even the liberals said, "No, that's taxing too much."

Today, after the President passed the largest tax increase in the history of

the country, after the President increased gas prices on all Americans, now the President is fighting our attempts to cut taxes, to repeal his tax increase. They are saying we are ridiculous for saying this will help working-class Americans, that this will help the poor.

I take out a quote that President Clinton made in 1992 when he was running for President. Again, Mr. President, facts are stubborn things. You can change your position a million times but we have got them all down on paper.

This is what the President said in 1992. During his presidential campaign Bill Clinton said:

I oppose a Federal gas tax increase. It sticks to the lower income and middle-income Americans and it sticks to retired people in this country and that is wrong.

Facts are stubborn things.

The President said it was wrong to raise gas taxes in 1992. He got elected, and 6 months later he passed gas taxes on to senior citizens on fixed incomes, on to working-class Americans that could ill afford to pay more in taxes, and on to all Americans who would have to pay not only at the pump but at the grocery store because when you raise fuel taxes, Mr. Speaker, you raise taxes on every item you buy. There is a multiplier effect because people have to drive your bread and your milk to the market, and these other issues, and it causes a drain on the economy, a multibillion-dollar drain.

But the President went ahead despite what he said in 1992. Again, facts are stubborn things. Let us remember what the President said then and what he said now. In 1992 he was running against Paul Tsongas who made fun of him and said, "Governor Clinton, you will not cut middle-class taxes," and the Governor was defiant. Bill Clinton in the New Hampshire debate raised his plan and said, "I've got a plan. I'm going to cut middle-class taxes."

Facts are stubborn things. He said that in 1992. In 1993 he passed on the largest tax increase in the history of this country, and, Mr. Speaker, he passed it with the help of liberals in Congress and passed it without a single Republican vote.

Yesterday I was on C-SPAN on the "Morning Round Table," and I had a Democrat with me who had voted for that tax increase and was trying to justify the fact that he and the President voted for the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

He said, "Well, Republicans voted for it, too." I said, "No, they did not."

And he said, "I will guarantee you Republicans voted along with the Democrats and the President for the largest tax increase in the history of the country."

Then I pointed it out to him again to check the record, and not a single Republican voted for Bill Clinton's massive tax increase. But I will tell you what we did do, because I had a caller call me up and say, "All you Repub-

licans do is talk about what Bill Clinton's not doing. What have you done?"

Let me tell my colleagues what we did. Again going back to the Contract With America, we promised tax cuts for senior citizens. We promised tax cuts for working-class Americans. We promised tax cuts for business men and women. We promised tax cuts for small businesses. Not irresponsible tax cuts, mind you, simply tax cuts that would repeal Bill Clinton's 1993 massive tax increase.

We promised a \$500 per child tax cut that Bill Clinton vetoed. We promised a tax cut for senior citizens because Bill Clinton in 1993 raised taxes on senior citizens' Social Security checks to 85 percent. We promised to repeal that, and we did.

Well, the President thought senior citizens needed to be taxed at 85 percent, so he vetoed our attempt to cut taxes for senior citizens. Republicans believe that senior citizens ought to be able to work and make money without the Federal Government punishing them for doing it.

□ 1145

So we had an earnings limit of \$34,000. The President and many of the Democrats here did not like that. I guess they do not think it is a good thing for senior citizens to remain productive in the work force, so they lowered that limit from \$34,000 to \$11,000. When you make \$11,000, the Democrats punish you, the President punishes you, because I guess he does not think senior citizens should be in the work force.

We repealed that and pushed it back to \$34,000, but the President vetoed that also. Yet today the President can stand in front of the camera, and I still have not figured out how he does it, but he can stand in front of the camera with a straight face and tell you that he supports tax cuts.

It is the most unbelievable thing I have seen in my life. I have no idea how he does it, but he has gotten very good at changing his story every week and acting shocked if anybody calls him on it.

I talk to reporters around here. I talk to people behind the scenes, even staffers for the Democrats. I talk to everybody. Everybody is shocked how the President and the Democrats can just move in so many different directions at the same time.

It seems to me either you believe that Washington taxes too much, spends too much, regulates too much, wastes too much of America's money and gets in our way too much, or you do not. Say what you will about Michael Dukakis and Walter Mondale, but at least those men believed in something. They would tell you where they stood, and, if you did not like it, you could vote against them, and Americans voted against them.

Well, Bill Clinton cannot afford that to happen and the Democrats cannot afford that to happen. So they attack

this thing called the Contract With America, when in fact they are attacking a balanced budget, they are attacking tax cuts, they are attacking regulatory reform, they are attacking term limits.

Let us talk about term limits. Ninety percent of Republicans voted for term limits, 90 percent of Democrats voted against term limits. Is that radical? I do not think that is radical. I think we need to limit the terms of people who serve in Congress.

I think that is how we keep it fresh. I see a lot of young people in the audience today. They should not have to wait until they are 65 or 70 for their Member to step aside. I think there are visitors up in the audience today, in the gallery today, that will be Members of this Congress, that need to be Members of this Congress, because the challenges facing us in the 21st century are going to be monumental.

If the future leaders of this country do not step forward today, tomorrow, next week, next year and the next 5 years, we will lose the momentum we have gained through the 21st century. The next century will not be the American century, the next century will be the Asian or Chinese century if we do not act now.

So I support term limits. I support younger people coming and infusing this Chamber with new ideas on how we save not only future generations, but how we save senior citizens.

I have got to say, I have talked about how the President has waffled and changed his mind on taxes and on the balanced budget and on term limits and on all these other issues. I have got to admit something to you: I think the most frustrated I ever was, was during the Medicare debate. Just mentioning Medicare on the floor, it is like the electrified third rail of American politics. Touch it and you die, supposedly.

Well, we dared to touch that rail last year, and, if it was not death, it was a near-death experience. You heard the President every day coming out shaking his fist, and he bit his lip, he is real good at biting his lip, kind of quivering, makes him look really sincere. And then he says, "I will not let the Republicans destroy Medicare. I am going to protect senior citizens."

Well, Mr. President, facts are stubborn things. In 1993, the President and First Lady of the United States, Bill and Hillary Clinton, were lobbying to save Medicare. And the First Lady in her testimony said before Congress, said before a Democratic Congress, mind you, "We have got to lower the rate of increase in Medicare to twice that of inflation." The First Lady wanted to lower the rate of increase from about 10 percent in Medicare spending to approximately 6.9 percent in Medicare spending.

In our plan to save Medicare, we decided to take it a step further. In taking it a step further, we said "Okay, we will save Medicare, but what we will do is cut the increase from 10 percent to

7.2 percent. So we will give Medicare recipients even more than the First Lady suggested in 1993."

After we made that recommendation, my goodness, you would have thought that this was a radical new idea that nobody had ever thought of before, and that we had gone into a cave one week-end, came out of the cave with clubs, and said "How can we stick it to senior citizens?"

But, Mr. President and members of the Democratic Party, facts are stubborn things. This proposal is more generous for senior citizens than even the President's proposal in 1993.

And what did the press say about it? Well, there was a silence. There was a conspiracy of silence for some time. In an article in Roll Call this morning, Morton Kondracke talks about how a new study shows that 89 percent of journalists in Washington voted for Bill Clinton in 1992 and only 6 percent voted for George Bush.

I really do not care who they voted for. I care about how they report the news. Unfortunately, during the Medicare debate, the way they reported the news for a good portion of the time was one-sided and shameful.

There are notable exceptions, and I have got to say one of the most notable exceptions has been the Washington Post, long considered to be an enemy of conservatives, the Washington Post told it straight when they talked about the President's demagoguery and shameful behavior on Medicare.

The Post started with an editorial talking about medagogy, talking about how the Democrats and the President were more interested in scaring senior citizens and allowing Medicare to go bankrupt than they were in helping senior citizens.

Later they wrote an editorial talking about what they called the real default when this Government was close to defaulting. They said the real default was the President and the Democrats' refusal to help senior citizens. In fact, the terminology was they said, "The President and the Democrats," quoting the Washington Post, "have shamelessly demagogued on the Medicare issue to scare senior citizens, because that is where they think the votes are."

Another editorialist, Robert Samuelson, for the Washington Post, wrote later in straightforward terms that "The President," and I am quoting Robert Samuelson, I would not say this on the floor myself, but Robert Samuelson said, "The President lied on Medicare to win votes from senior citizens when the President knew that Social Security was going bankrupt."

Matthew Miller, a former employee of President Clinton, wrote a front page article for the very liberal New Republic, and the headline was "Why the Democrats' Demagoguery on Medicare Is Worse Than You Thought."

And Miller's quote was, "The President has taken the low road on Medicare in ways that only the media could call standing tall."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The Chair would remind the gentleman from Florida that he is not to use any personally derogatory terms in relation to the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, are they permissible if they are not my terms?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules of the House do not allow the gentleman to quote from anyone, from any source, that may give some derogatory term to the President which would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Needless to say, many people have been concerned with the behavior of elected officials on this issue. Why do I bring it up? Why do I not just leave this issue alone? It is not a good issue, right?

Well, let me tell you something. I have got two parents that are about to go on Medicare. I have got a 93-year-old grandmother who is on Medicare right now. The fact of the matter is that the President of the United States had his own Medicare trustees come before him and tell him that Medicare was going bankrupt.

Unfortunately, the news got worse. This past fall they were aware of the fact that Medicare was going bankrupt even quicker than the April 1995 report stated. In fact, instead of Medicare going bankrupt in 7 years, the new reports that the White House got was that Medicare is going bankrupt in 5 years. And the CBO just came out with a new report that says it is even worse than we ever imagined. Medicare is going down the drain quickly, and something better be done about it fast.

I think it is time for us to put the demagoguery behind us. It is time to make a difference, and it is time to save Medicare for my grandmother and for my parents. I personally, if telling the truth costs me my seat, I really do not care.

The President came before this Chamber and talked about the era of big Government being over. I do not know how many of you saw the State of the Union Address, but he came before us and talked about the era of big Government being over. He said Government should not be involved in everything. Of course, 2 days ago he thought gas prices were getting too high, so he decided I am going to kind of interfere in the economy and sell off some oil reserves and we will try to cut gas prices that way, instead of course cutting the 4.56-cent per gallon tax he increased on us.

The next day the Washington Post ran an article, "Clinton Acts to Halt Drop in Beef Prices."

Well, apparently the President and his administration thought that beef prices were becoming too low for consumers, that they could actually afford to buy beef more, so they decided that they were going to do what they could to increase beef prices. And the Post says, "One day after intervening to hold down gasoline prices he said were getting too high, President Clinton yesterday announced steps to help cattle producers rally from prices they say are too low."

Clinton's action left White House aides laboring to explain the apparent contradiction of a President who says he supports free markets, but who is also launching initiatives aimed at fine-tuning prices in different industries on consecutive days.

Ladies and gentlemen, either you believe that Government is too big, that it spends too much money, and that the era of big Government is over, or you do not. We need consistency from our leaders, not only at the White House, but also in conference.

Now, we have been hearing Democrats talking for some time also this past week or two about the minimum wage. This is another one of those issues. You do not talk about Medicare, you do not talk about the minimum wage. It is a loser, right? A lot of Democrats think that they have found the Holy Grail. After being intellectually bankrupt for a year or so, now they think they have found the issue, and it is the minimum wage.

Well, facts are stubborn things. In 1992, Gov. Bill Clinton, running for President, was asked if he supported an increase in the minimum wage. The President said, then Governor, said that he opposed an increase in the minimum wage. Governor Clinton said he opposed an increase in the minimum wage. He said it would hurt too many working class Americans, it would cost too much money, and it would cause too much unemployment.

In fact, his chief economist wrote a scathing indictment of those people who would suggest that we would help the working class by raising the minimum wage.

There has been a study by a recent Nobel Prize winning economist who says that it could cost us up to 400,000 jobs, of not only high school students and college students, but also working class Americans that are holding down different jobs, that if we act this way we are going to lose 400,000 jobs.

Unfortunately, with every study showing that, with every single reputable study showing the same thing, that minimum wage increases cost jobs, we still have people advocating it.

It goes back to Medicare. If it costs me my job here to just simply speak the truth and to tell people what the facts are, fine. But facts are stubborn things. We have to tear through the emotionalism, the demagoguery, the politics of it all, and talk about what really matters, and that is figuring out a way to help working class Americans,