

I asked to speak tonight as part of the special order on two issues, one, a bit more general, as to why it is so important to be talking the balanced budget and, then, second, this issue of the continuing resolution.

It may well be these points were covered far better by speakers prior to me, in which case you may reclaim the time. So indicate.

Let me just take a moment because we correctly have focused upon the hardship to the Federal employees, the hardship to those with contracts with the Federal Government, to those who depend upon the Federal Government at least in part for necessities of life. It is appropriate that we do.

But it is even more appropriate to focus upon the hardship to the next generation who are not here to vote, whose money we spend every year, that we deal with a budget that is not balanced. It is really the worst form of democratic misrepresentation where people who do not have the vote are taxed by people who do.

Democrats and Republicans alike have participated in building the budget debt to where it is today, and the deficit each year being out of balance adds to it.

When I had the honor to serve here before, we did not balance the budget, and the President at that time was Republican. So let us just put that issue to one side.

What is critical for the American people to understand, and what I hope I have some effect in raising, is the unethical, immoral nature of our spending the next generation's money. That is the No. 1 and principal reason why we need to focus upon a balanced budget.

Second, the baby-boomers are going to be in their retirement years in 15 years. Now, every actuarial assumption about Medicare and Social Security falls through the cracks when you have that huge influx of retirees coming into their Social Security and Medicare recipient years. We have got 15 years.

If we spend 7 of those getting to a zero deficit, we then ought to spend the remaining 8 to build up a surplus. If we go into those retirement years of the baby-boomers without a surplus, God help us, God help us. We will not have the funds to treat them fairly. There will not be a Medicare for those who would be retiring 15 years from now, a second reason for the appropriate focus on this budget.

Third, the debt of the United States is unlike the debt of almost every other developed economy. It is not predominantly financed at the present auctions the way other countries do. We rely upon foreign investment to purchase our Treasury bonds for the new auctions, and every time we do that, we put our economic future in the hands of others, and that is a tremendous risk when you contemplate the amount of debt that we add up and the claims upon that debt by those who are

not citizens, participants in the United States.

Now, that is why it is appropriate for us to consider the deficit, the debt, and the unfairness that it brings to the next generation. What about the continuing resolution that brings us to the floor tonight?

I thank the gentleman for yielding and pointing out that I was recently elected to this body, and it was an honor to be selected by the people of the 15th District of California.

I had one message, one message in my campaign. It was, "If you elect me, I will do my utmost to vote to balance the budget."

And I will stay here as long as it takes, if that means giving up vacation, which it did, if it means giving up my paycheck, which it does, I and a number of others, I understand, have voluntarily given back our paychecks to show the seriousness of our resolve on this matter.

Thirty days ago, roughly speaking the President agreed that he would put forward a plan. It would not necessarily be one that you or I, Mr. Speaker, would agree to, but he agreed to a plan, and it would balance the budget in 7 years, using honest methods of measuring, and the Republicans were going to put forward their plan, and then we would sit down and hash it out between the two, and in return we agreed to keep the Government operating through continuing resolution.

The President did not put forward that plan, and instead negotiations are of a one-sided nature. To have a continuing resolution tonight, therefore, is to invite similar response. If we were to concede to business as usual, we would say "yes" to a continuing resolution, and if we did that, we would be postponing yet again the time when we actually balance our Federal budget.

But critically to the present context, we would be saying it is all right if you go back on what you pledged you would do; put your own proposal forward.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to come forward with his proposal that balances the budget in 7 years using honest scoring. It can have no tax cut at all; that would be all right with me. It might have totally different numbers for Medicare and Medicaid; that would be all right with me. But we have to have something from which to deal, and I am very worried if we say all right to a continuing resolution before we have that, that we will never have that.

The last point I want to raise draws from my previous experience in this body, 1988 to 1992. I remember we came upon those years coming out of the years of President Reagan, and there had been a continuing resolution for a substantial part of the time that President Reagan was in office for his first term and the deficit grew.

□ 2100

If you want to postpone what we must do, business as usual says "continuing resolution."

Mr. Speaker, I was not elected to do business as usual. If we miss this chance, we miss the last chance, the best opportunity, to be fair to the next generation. I urge my colleagues not to give up on that opportunity; not to be unfair to the next generation, as previous generations have been by building up debt upon them. But to say to them "We will give you something better. We will give you at least a chance at a balance, a clean slate in financial terms." To do that, the sacrifices that must be made, which I believe my constituents are willing to sustain.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, during the course of these special orders, is it in order or appropriate, even though I control the time for this hour as the designee of the majority leader, is it appropriate to find some way to yield the time in an orderly fashion so we might invite our friends from the minority to engage in a dialogue about the future of this country? For example, in 3-minute allotments to each side. Indeed, if I may be so bold and with unanimous consent from my friends from the Democratic side, to perhaps continue this through the following hour, as they are the designees of the minority leader? What would be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the gentleman that he controls the time and he has the right to yield time under whatever conditions he may wish to impose.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I would control the next hour, and would be happy to agree for the following hour after the next 45 minutes that the gentleman from Arizona controls; I would continue that exact same procedure on a 3-minute type basis.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If that is fine, we would ask the Chair's indulgence and that of the timekeeper to allow us to know when 3-minute increments expire. Is that appropriate? Could we do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that the gentleman should keep his own time by watching the clock that is on the floor. Otherwise he is perfectly entitled to yield as he sees fit.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I certainly, certainly appreciate the Chair's reliance on self-sufficiency. I am armed with the second hand of my watch from my alma mater, which is altogether reliable. With that in mind I would be happy to yield 3 minutes to my friend from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Thank you. I appreciate this. I think this is what we should be doing in really having a dialogue. That is a lot more healthy in

terms of debate. And I am not questioning anyone's motives in terms of what they are doing and believe.

I listened intently to the gentleman from California in terms of his statement. But I would just question him, and I agree really probably with 95 percent of what he said, I voted for the balanced budget amendment, I believe exactly the way the gentleman does about the future of our children and our grandchildren in terms of the fiscal responsibility of this country.

But my question really to the gentleman would be, I agree with 95 percent of what the gentleman said. But why not pass a continuing resolution? How does the gentleman defend the fact that you folks are stopping us from passing a continuing resolution, which does not have anything to do with that issue? It is just that it is a leverage approach, which I think is ultimately going to hurt you politically, but I think it is really hurting the country today.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Since my friend from Florida addressed the question to the good friend from California, I would be happy to yield time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In response, there are two reasons. The first is not at all regarding leverage. To pass a continuing resolution is to continue the business as usual. It was in this vein that I made my reference to the Presidency of Ronald Reagan, President Reagan. What happened in those years was a substantial amount of the time that he was in office, certainly in his first term, was governed by continuing resolution. That postponed the necessity and the eventual achievement of a balance.

The continuing resolution, there are several possibilities we are speaking about, but the essence of it is we postpone the hard choice, keep a present level of funding, until we get to where we want to be. So that could be continuing forever.

So the first and most important answer to the gentleman from Florida's question is that a continuing resolution constitutes business as usual, with the assumptions that will eventually get to that which has not yet been resolved, and that is what I think we must say no to.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would yield for a comment to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to answer the question with something practical, not necessarily philosophical, but strategically important, and that is when we had the November shutdown, the 6-day shutdown, you will remember we had a continuing resolution passed that reopened the Government for a 3-week period of time, at which time, by December 15, the President of the United States was to have submitted a 7-year balanced budget, which he did not on December 15.

So what has happened is there are a lot of Members who feel somewhat, "burned once, and it is your fault; burned twice, it is my fault." I am not going to be burned twice.

That is their concern. What would be different now? The President did not do it then. It was a public agreement to do a Congressional Budget Office 7-year balanced budget, which he did not submit.

The other thing I wanted to say is that we are arguing numbers here. We think we should spend \$12 trillion over the next 7 years, and the President wants to spend \$13 trillion over the next 7 years. But beyond that we are also arguing policy. We have to have some policy changes. For example, give our senior citizens more choices to preserve and protect their Medicare program by allowing, for example, a medical savings account, which takes a change in the tax law. If you do not have that tied into the balanced budget, then, unfortunately, this President is not going to do that. He is not going to sign that and give our seniors a choice.

So there is a policy reason, and then there is a strategic reason along with the reasons that Mr. CAMPBELL had pointed out.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, there is one thing that undergirds this, and that is a moral imperative for generations yet unborn and for our children, my son age 2, who will pay in excess of \$185,000 in interest on our debt if we do nothing.

With that, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If we can just with the Members who are here, if we can actually, it might be easier logistically, when you yield, whoever you yield to controls the time for 3 minutes. We cannot go through you.

Mr. HAYWORTH. We will try to make sure we control that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I would inform the Members that the gentleman from Arizona controls the time. If you want to have an informal agreement that you can operate among yourselves, that is fine. But from the standpoint of the House rules, the gentleman from Arizona controls the time.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Informally, because we are trying to get debate in front of what we are saying. If I could take 15 seconds, I know my colleagues wanted to respond to this, because we are at the heart of the dialog.

What I would suggest to the gentleman from California are two very specific things: In a continuing resolution, you have the ability to focus in not business as usual, which is something I would agree with the gentleman about. You have the ability to pick numbers which are the lowest numbers of the House or Senate. You have the ability to constrain Government spending, to get toward your targeted goals. And you also have the ability to do it for 30 days, or less, but 30 days.

If you look at what is happening to our country today in terms of the suf-

fering, and just again the waste, the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars of waste on a macro effect. We know this is hurting our economy. For 30 days to pass a CR, and again I know there are some people on the other side of the aisle who feel the President was not truthful to them but I think there are others who feel maybe he was truthful and maybe there was just a misinterpretation.

Mr. HAYWORTH. What I would suggest is what is the big deal about giving us 30 days?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me answer the question. If you have 30 days, and I am not one who says no CR. I am very concerned about these out-of-work employees. But my concern is that if we gave you 30 days, would you and your colleagues here tonight have a 7-year balanced budget plan that, regardless of what your leadership says or does, that you, the three of you, to put you on the spot, would say here is our plan, we are going to end up, because I think what it takes at this point is it is going to take rank and file assertiveness to come forward and say "I am tired of waiting on the President, I am tired of waiting for our folks."

Mr. DEUTSCH. I will take the time back. I would say to you, you know for a fact that a large number of Democratic colleagues did exactly that. They had a budget that was voted on this House floor that was a balanced budget, that used CBO numbers, the so-called coalition budget. It is still out there on the table. So there are a large number of Democrats on this side of the aisle that did exactly that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Are you saying then the only thing we are arguing is the coalition budget versus the Republican budget? If we can establish that, I bet we could wind this thing up.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Let me yield to the gentlewoman from New York for a comment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you so much. This is a very helpful discussion and I want to thank my good friend on the Committee on Appropriations from Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, for yielding, for you both yielding to me.

I think there really is a difference in priorities, and that is a healthy debate, as we said before. We can talk about Medicare, and you mentioned medical savings accounts. Some of us feel it should be done differently. We can talk about Medicaid. We can talk about education, the environment. You and I may differ on the depth of the cuts in the environment. But I do believe that we can agree that there should be a balanced budget. In my judgment, the President, Democrats, and Republicans for the most part, have agreed there should be a balanced budget.

This kind of a debate is healthy. We do not have to hold all the Federal employees hostage while we are debating very serious questions in this country. I do not have a national park in my district. But when a national park closes, it is not just the visitors who

are on Christmas vacation that could not get into the national park. In the United States of America, seeing a closed sign to me is outrageous, but it is all the small businesses around that national park that are being deprived of their livelihood. People who want to get mortgages from the FHA cannot get those mortgages. People at veterans hospitals are not getting the services. Meals on Wheels, Head Start.

Why can we not agree to open up the Government, like adults, and then continue our serious discussion. I would respectfully disagree with my colleague, my distinguished colleague from California, that we can have this discussion in an adult atmosphere. Why do we have to hold these Federal employees hostage. That seems very wrong to me.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming the time, and I appreciate the gentlewoman's restrained tones and very sober assessment, and indeed this is refreshing compared to some of the things I have heard in this Chamber and elsewhere. But I think here is the fundamental problem. In all sincerity, I would say to the gentlewoman from New York, it is extremely distressing in a free society when the parameters of debate are agreed to, to have one party—no, I do not mean Republican and Democrat—but I mean one party to the agreement seem to be perhaps either confused or deliberately disingenuous as to the parameters or the terms of debate. That is what I feel is so difficult.

Certainly the gentlewoman offered, in a very, I think, understated way, a very appealing argument in some ways. The one that is fundamentally flawed, because it fails to acknowledge the culpability, or let me rephrase that, the responsibility of the executive branch to recognize that yes, there is a new majority, and though there may be disagreements, there is also a responsibility for the Executive to sign appropriation bills to keep people at work. The problem at which we are at loggerheads comes from the fact that we just do not seem to get a consistent answer from the executive branch.

Again, as my friend from Georgia pointed out, fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. And it is difficult to abandon that, because it is more than an obstruction. It is the very crux of the problem we face. If the Executive will agree in good faith to the parameters, if my friend from Florida and my friend from New York, my friend from New Jersey now embrace the budget offered by the minority within the minority, then fine, let us move forward and have that discussion. But not to be able to get the debate on the table because of the shifts that come almost by the nanosecond in the executive branch is extremely, extremely distressing.

Mr. PALLONE. I again appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Arizona has yielded us the time, but I am extremely frustrated, and I listened to

the gentleman from California, who has been here in previous sessions with me, and the problem that I have with what the gentleman has laid out and what some of my colleagues on the other side have laid out is that they are acknowledging in essence that what they are doing is having the Government shut down, the Government if you will, being held hostage to what they want to accomplish.

I say this, I am trying to say this in a calm fashion. The reality is that historically here procedurally, the procedure has been that the Congress passes the appropriations bills or the budget and they send them to the President, he vetoes them or he approves them. If he vetoes them, he sends back a message which he did in each case with each appropriation bill and each budget, and also with the budget bill, and then the opportunity exists to either sit down with the White House and work out an agreement or to bring up another appropriations bill or budget bill that reflects in some measure what the President has said, so that a compromise can be reached.

□ 2115

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Let me finish, if I could. Historically, while that process went on, there were continuing resolutions passed so that the Government could continue to operate.

As the gentleman from Florida stated, those continuing resolutions, even the ones we passed for a brief time in November or December, were at a much lesser amount than the current operations of the Government. So one would make a very legitimate argument to say that there was significantly less money that was being spent. And if, in fact, we were to continue operating the Government for the rest of the year at those lesser amounts, we would probably be saving a tremendous amount of money.

I do not see any argument other than this hostage theory; this theory that if we pass a continuing resolution, if we let the Government continue to operate, even at a lesser amount, which meets the budget demands or the budget parameters, that the problem with that is that the Government will continue to operate and we will not be able to come to an ultimate agreement over a balanced budget.

So, basically, what we are saying is, we do not want the CR, we do not want the Government to operate because we want this leverage with the President.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, and I will be happy to yield to my friend from Kentucky and my friend from California in just one moment, and I appreciate the measured tones that my friend from New Jersey is employing, but to suggest that it is this new majority that holds this Government hostage is again to ignore the fact that the President, within his constitutional bounds, as the gentleman

points out, chose to pick up a veto bill because it was more important to him, for whatever reason, to veto those appropriations than to work with this majority to keep the Government in business.

So to a certain degree it may be the chicken or the egg argument, but I feel compelled to protest, in measured tones, the use of that word. Because good people and people of good will should be able to disagree.

And with that, let me yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. I think that argument could be used in the other direction that the President is holding us hostage to send him appropriation bills that he would sign. It works in the same way.

Are we supposed to, in the House and the Senate, pass legislation that will fit the desires of the President? And if he does not get those, then he is going to hold the Government hostage, the Government workers. It works the same way. He vetoed those bills. He promised that he would work with the Republican Congress to come up with a balanced budget before the end of the year. Before the end of the year.

He signed it and said he would do it, and he did not do it. And he vetoed three bills, Commerce, Interior, VA-HUD. If he would have signed those, the Government would be in operation for the most part.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time to yield 1 moment to my friend from California, and then, of course, I will be happy to hear from my friends from the minority.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman from Arizona, and, Mr. Speaker, in response to the point raised by my good friend from New Jersey there are these differences, putting aside entirely the leverage argument. I want to do that just for a moment.

The difficulty with the continuing resolution are the following: First of all, nothing structural can or will be done in a continuing resolution. This is a given. In order to get to a balanced budget in 7 years, both sides acknowledges that there has to be structural reform, principally on the entitlement side.

Second, whereas the gentleman from New Jersey is quite right in suggesting that a continuing resolution could be at a 75-percent, or 25-percent, for that matter, expenditure level, the reality from history, and here I refer to the Presidency of Ronald Reagan, so a member of my own party, was that the continuing resolution that lasted longer than the 10 days, any CR that lasts longer than a very short time period, in order to have the approval of the House and the other body, is a continuation of present expenditure levels.

I would put this proposition in a straightforward manner. If there were a series of CR's, if there were a series of CR's at 75 percent of the expenditure level from now for the next 7 years, we would indeed balance the Federal budget.

The last point I would make is the gentleman from New Jersey, I believe, or it might have been the gentleman from Florida, drew our attention to the coalition budget. Mr. Speaker, I would have been thrilled if the President of the United States had put the coalition budget on the table, and I would have voted in favor of a CR if he had done so.

The leadership shown by the members of the minority party and the majority party, those who worked on the coalition budget, was admirable, and if the President had put that forward, I would vote for a CR. The President has still to fulfill his part of the obligation to put a package on the table.

So those are the structural reasons why a CR will not do what needs to be done, and the historical record is, in the first 3 years of the Reagan administration, when we were governed largely by the CR, there was no structural change, nor could we expect there to be substantial cuts.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I believe my friend from Georgia wants to ask a question of our friends on the minority.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, the gentleman from New Jersey is about to burst in thought here, so I want to yield to him for a question.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would gladly yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for his rejoinder and then we will return to our friend from Georgia.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to use a brief amount of time. First of all, I would point out, and, again, I will not use the word "hostage" anymore this evening, although I feel that way, but I will not use it.

I would point out, first of all, that the coalition has on many occasions tried to bring their budget before this House. They have tried it on a privileged measure, they have tried many times.

I have seen the gentleman from Mississippi, GENE TAYLOR, and the gentleman from Texas, CHARLIE STENHOLM, and I have seen many others over the last week or so before the Christmas break try to bring the coalition budget to the floor. So the suggestion that somehow the coalition budget is not on the table, the only reason it has not been brought up again is because the leadership, the Republican leadership, has not allowed it to be brought up. I think one of the reasons for that is because it may very well be it would get enough votes to pass.

Let me say one more thing, and then I will not talk for a while. I am listening to the debate tonight. I think it is very, very instructive and very helpful, but the bottom line is that right now the Government is shut down, and if tomorrow we bring up this motion and we allow the Speaker to have recess authority and the Government is shut down for another 2 or 3 weeks, I do not believe that the leverage that it seems that your side is trying to use to bring the President to do certain things is going to work.

In other words, we have been at this now for several weeks. This is the 19th day. The whole notion that somehow shutting down the Government is going to exercise some leverage over the President or over the Democrats is just not happening.

So I guess I am wondering, how long is this going to go on? Will this go on for another 2 or 3 weeks or another month, another 6 months, or whatever? At some point there has to be a recognition of the fact that this effort to leverage, if you will, the Government shutdown, is not accomplishing its goal, and that the budget negotiations, which actually are happening between the President and the Republican leadership, does seem to have some positive value. They are meeting every day. They are talking. Both sides claim that it has been very positive. So what is the point?

The only people, it seems to me, that are suffering are the Government employees and the American taxpayers who are not getting the services. So even if we buy the leverage theory, I do not think it is working and everybody is meeting now and talking about the budget anyway.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's heartfelt sentiments. Perhaps I am guilty too, sometimes, of verbosity. I know he had a lot to say there and challenged to do it in a brief period of time.

Again, before I yield to my friend from Georgia, let me respectfully suggest to my friend from New Jersey, again, as has been stated by my colleagues, this is not about leverage, this is about the future. It is about a free society, people of goodwill from opposite points of view agreeing to broad parameters, in terms of debate, upon which disagreements may be resolved.

What is especially disturbing is that this pattern portends something that is less than the common good, because, in the words of columnist Robert J. Samuelson in the Washington Post 2 months ago, "When one side continues to repeatedly distort the facts and the evidence, then the purpose is not to debate, it is to destroy."

With that, I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to ask my colleagues this question, and I want them to think about it in the context of the debate in the last couple of weeks. Is the issue the Government shutdown or is the issue balancing the budget?

It would appear to me, as I have listened to the debate over the last couple of weeks, that the issue is the shutdown. We are concentrating so much on it, I am wondering if, for some Members, it is not a red herring. Because if it is not the issue, and the issue really is a balanced budget, then should your Members not join our Members in being absolutely outraged that the President, during that 3-week grace period, did not offer a balanced budget

scored by the Congressional Budget Office?

And, as my colleagues pointed out, it seems all three of you support the coalition budget, or you are close to it. Why not put that on the table? The second he does that, the Government is reopened.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time briefly. Let me just ask my colleagues, did all three of you vote for the coalition budget when it appeared on this floor?

Mr. PALLONE. No. But again, if I could—

Mrs. LOWEY. No, but I would be happy—

Mr. DEUTSCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. So the gentleman from New Jersey did not; the gentleman from New York did not, and the gentleman from Florida did.

Mr. DEUTSCH. That's right.

Mr. HAYWORTH. So, again, a majority of the minority here tonight did not support that budget when it was brought to the floor.

Mrs. LOWEY. No, but I would be very pleased if the gentleman would yield for a response to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I asked that question because I just want you to really think about this. Should we not all, as a body, be outraged that the President, during that 3-week grace period, under the agreed handshake of, yes, I will put a 7-year balanced budget on the table by December 15, should we not all be outraged that he did not; rather than outraged at NEWT GINGRICH because the Government is closed down, when, in fact, the President of the United States has as much to do with it, if not more?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Let me yield to the gentlewoman from New York and then the gentleman from Florida.

Mrs. LOWEY. Just briefly I would like to respond to my good friend from Georgia, because he asks a very key question: Should we not be focused on the balanced budget rather than the shutdown. And I think that is what my colleagues and I are saying this evening. Let us open the Government. Let us make sure these people go back to work. Let us make sure that the Head Start centers and the Meals on Wheels and the nutrition sites and the parks and the businesses continue operating and let us focus together on the balanced budget.

I think many of us would have differences of opinion if we took the Republican budget and talked about specific parts of it, I do not think that is what we are doing tonight, or talked about the President's budget, talked about his forecast for the next 7 years or the next 6 years, or 5 years. In fact, there was an outstanding article in the Wall Street Journal, I believe most of us have read it, talking about the Republican budget and how its predictions are questionable, and what happens after the 7th year, and does the deficit rise, and should a tax cut of that magnitude be put in place.

There are some real questions that I think we could debate in a healthy, open way. So I would like to just say to my good friend from Georgia, let us just focus on the balanced budget. Let us have a healthy debate about Medicare, Medicaid. The President wants to preserve Medicare, Medicaid. He may want to change it differently from my colleagues, from myself, or others of us, but let us open the Government.

And, in fact, is it not strange that the leading contender for President on the Republican side wants to have a continuing resolution, agrees with the President, but that in our body we cannot get that done?

I think that is the best way to focus on a balanced budget. Open the Government and let us focus all our discussion on the balanced budget.

□ 2130

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for her observation and would yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS] and then I promise, I will yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. With all due respect, why now are we hearing from the other side that we need to focus on the balanced budget, get a continuing resolution, move away from the government shutdown, when we did not hear anything from the other side about a balanced budget until just recently this last year?

What we heard from the very beginning of the 104th Congress was a lot of rhetoric, a lot of words like "extremists," "mean-spirited," that we were "cutting," "slashing," going to "destroy Medicare," we were going to "starve children to death." I did not hear any proposals from the other side about a balanced budget, about saving Medicare, about reforming welfare, about all the things that now we seem to want to focus on.

Just this very evening, I sat up here in the House and listened to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] say that we disliked Federal workers and even the military. I heard a lot of individuals talking about how extreme and how terrible we really are because we want a balanced budget.

The question I have tonight: How can we trust, how can we trust the President when he has told us so many times that he is going to do this, and he is going to do that, and he does not follow through? How can we trust individuals that want to use that type of rhetoric and not get to a real debate, and then talk about how that we should keep our words and our conduct within the parameters of civility?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming the time to allow my friend from Florida a chance to answer those questions.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I do not want to focus on what the President said and what the President did not say. But I read the signature and the agreement on the continuing resolution, and I guess what I have heard now several times this

evening is the President committing to a specific submission of a 7-year CBO. That is what he agreed would happen, but he did not agree that he was going to submit it.

And to say that they are outraged that the President lied to you, I mean, he did not say that, at least as far as I am aware. I think it is a fundamental question.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, it is a fair question that I would like to answer. When the Chief Executive vetoes the balanced budget offered by this House and the other body, when the Chief Executive does that, then he puts upon his shoulders, if you will, he foists upon himself and his branch of government the responsibility for offering an alternative.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman would yield, I am glad you cleared that up, because in the sort of English language that I understand, that is a lot different than a flat-out lie or a flat-out mistake. If that is what you are going to say is the statement of the President, that he did not do it because he did not come back to you, that is a little bit different than being so disingenuous with us, about lying to you.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Florida. I think certainly the President purposely led the Members of Congress to believe, and remember I believe there were 68 Democrats who voted with the Republicans to reopen the Government in November under the clear understanding that the President would offer a balanced budget within that 3-week period. I thought, as a naive, fairly new comer here that we would have this thing wound up by December 15 and, if not, operate under continuing resolutions.

But let me emphasize, even now, if the President, and I will not call him the porcelain President, although that has been suggested, but if he would make one sign of good faith negotiation, just offer the coalition budget or coalition modified or anything that is 7-years, Congressional Budget Office, then we reopen the government tomorrow.

Let me reemphasize, I am not one who belongs to the caucus within the Congress of saying "Do not reopen until it is finally done," because I am very concerned about these folks. I see a lot of gray area in here. But what I do not see any gray area in is in good faith bargaining.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. My response to the gentleman from Georgia, and the distinguished gentleman is not just a Member of this body, but a practicing attorney before he came here and a very wise attorney and a very excellent attorney, you want to look for good faith. Look over the last week when if we add up the number of hours that the President has been personally engaged

in discussions with the Speaker and the majority leader in the Senate, adding up to scores of hours at this point in time.

Again, I would go back to your question. Now the gentleman is deciding, as one of 435 Members of this institution, this is what the President has to do before we open up the Government. What I guess I am really hearing, and sort of seeing things as you see them, I am sure if I sat where you sat I would probably see them a little differently in terms of the President's behavior. But still you can look at it from where I am. There is still enough good faith. All of us have a sworn constitutional duty to protect and defend the Constitution and the people of this country. Then why not give the President the benefit of the doubt for another 30 days?

Mr. HAYWORTH. To reclaim my time before I yield to my friend from New Jersey, "History does not repeat itself, it rhymes." I am fond of that statement from Mark Twain. Our most recent history provided a continuing resolution. People may disagree as to the emphasis or the subtleties that I do not see appearing in that document. But when we have a situation, the gentleman used the term "disingenuous", when there is that situation and that unfortunate suspicion, it is very difficult, because it completely changes the parameters and fails to have common terms of agreement for debate in conflict resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, let me just say this first of all. I guess I am somewhat amazed and trying to contain myself because I have never seen anyone as a Chief Executive who has been more willing to sit down and negotiate and spend time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time briefly for this question, where was he for the first 3 weeks after the public law was signed? Where was the negotiation for those 3 weeks?

Mr. PALLONE. The bottom line is, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. PALLONE. The American people, whether it is public opinion polls or just my own talking to people, my own constituents believe very strongly that the President is the last person who is not trying to come to an agreement and not trying to negotiate in good faith. He is the one who constantly says, "Let us negotiate. Let us sit down."

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, we certainly all come from very different districts across the width and breadth of this continent.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to respond to the gentleman from New Jersey and since the gentleman is about to control the time, may I go ahead?

Mr. PALLONE. What I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Georgia, for whom I have the utmost respect, I have

a basic disagreement with many of my colleagues on the other side because I believe the differences over this budget between Democrats and Republican, even if you compare the coalition budget to the budget that the Republican majority passed, the differences are significant. They are going to take weeks to work out. This is not something that can be worked out at the stroke of a pen.

There are differences over entitlement status of Medicaid; over standards that are going to be applied for Medicaid for nursing homes; difference over environmental protection. I think in many ways it is sort of naive to suggest that somehow this can be worked out in 48 hours or 72 hours or a week or even 2 weeks.

So, as these negotiations go on, and we eventually reach an agreement that both sides can live with, it makes sense to keep the Government open. There is no way this is going to happen overnight.

BALANCED BUDGET AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON]. I have a stopwatch on my wrist that counts down in 5 minutes, so what I would like to do is yield the gentleman 5 minutes and he will control that 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Has that been CBO scored?

Mr. DEUTSCH. It is my cheap little plastic watch.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up on the discussion of the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Arizona. I think it is relevant.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the Democrats are fond of saying, and, Mr. LOWEY, I hear it said all the time, is that we are behind on the appropriation process. I would say that is accurate, but I would also say it is a lot more difficult when we are trying to reduce and consolidate government than when we are spending or renewing "as is" with a 10-percent increase.

But let us say the Committee on Appropriations is very much guilty as charged. Why are you not as equally outraged then that the President of the United States is not guilty of not submitting a balanced budget when on June 4, 1992, he said, "I will have a budget balanced in 4 years"? And we had all kinds of speeches where he said: I am going to support a balanced budget. I am or not. But he has not.

One thing about these freshmen who get kicked so much is that they came here with a contract, albeit not everyone may have liked it on the other side of the aisle. But they said what they

were going to do and they did it. They made it clear they were going to balance the budget. When did we first pass it? October? Where is the President? Where is his budget.

Mrs. LOWEY. If my good friend from Georgia would yield, I think we can go back, you and I are on the Committee on Appropriations and we can talk about the \$7 billion increase in the military budget that the Pentagon did not ask for. We could talk about the cut in afterschool jobs and heating assistance for the elderly.

Let us talk about where we are today. It seems to me from all accounts, from personal accounts and talking to my colleagues, from reading the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, and Democrats and Republicans both, I do not know that we all respect it but we certainly read it, the President is very engaged in the process, as my good colleague from New Jersey said.

Mr. KINGSTON. But where is his budget?

Mrs. LOWEY. Let me finish this. What we are saying is that there are real differences of opinion in how to resolve Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, among other issues. There are real differences of opinion.

So, why can we not continue this debate? And the President is involved. He is involved in the discussion. He has been there all day, I understand, working around the clock, and this has been going on for more than a week. Why can we not open the Government?

My good friend from Georgia, one other point. I still cannot understand why we cannot continue this debate, talk about how we reform Medicare, and the gentleman mentioned welfare. I had a welfare reform bill that I worked on 2 years ago, because I understand welfare is not working. I want to shake up the system, but I do not want to close down the Government and put all these people out of work, hurt our economy irreparably.

These businessmen who have contracts are not going to get these contracts back to make up for all the lost opportunities they have and the damages to their business. I hope they can stay in business. So why can we not open the government up, continue our discussion about welfare, Medicaid, education, and the environment?

We may still differ, but that is the democratic way. Why should we have a constitutional crisis where some people are saying, "If you cannot do it my way, it is no way"? That does not make sense to me, and I know my good friend and I could sit down and iron out our differences. Let us all do that together. Open up the government and let us continue this discussion.

Mr. KINGSTON. If I could have 10 seconds, I want to say one thing, just to nitpick. The President was on a golfing junket over New Year's at Hilton Head. He was not negotiating.

Mrs. LOWEY. President DOLE was campaigning.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I would say that is very optimistic thinking by the gentleman, and we welcome her to our side.

Mr. DEUTSCH. The gentleman from Georgia still controls 1 minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate both gentlemen for yielding. There were a couple of points that I think needs to be closed on and then we could move to what we could do if we were negotiating the budget ourselves to present to the American people potential consensus.

But the first and most fundamental point is why can we not do this while the government continues? That would be under a continuing resolution, and there is nothing to prohibit a continuing resolution to last an entire year.

If my colleagues remember, I do not know if they were here for that moment, but President Reagan brought to the table when he gave a State of the Union address a continuing resolution and he slammed it down and he said, "Do not send me any more of these."

□ 2145

That was after the Government had run for almost a year under continuing resolutions. So the flaw in the gentleman's argument is this: If we give a continuing resolution this week for another week, it could easily run to 52 weeks, and it is not made up because we have precedent from the Reagan Administration that it does run that long, and that means we postpone by 1 year, frankly, until the presidential election what needs to be done within 7. That is a substantial reason why the gentleman's suggestion is not, in my judgment, practicable.

Mrs. LOWERY. If I could respond to the distinguished gentleman from California, what I perceive as a flaw in your argument, if we believe that there are serious differences in how to reform Medicare, how to reform Medicaid, how deep a cut there should be in environmental programs, what are EPA's responsibilities, what we should be doing with the Department of Education, these are serious issues which we have discussed in Appropriations. We have discussed in the authorizing committees.

If we cannot resolve these differences within the next month or the next 2 months, and the President has made it very clear that he is determined to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, then we may have to continue this debate into the next election. I would hope that we can resolve it before, but it may not be possible to resolve it. Then the American people may have to decide.

But I just do not understand the view of the gentleman from California that we should keep the Government closed and we will not use the word hostage, keep the government closed while we are having a very serious debate about our priorities.