

Third District. I am a freshman, and I campaigned with a promise to the people of my district and the people of America that I would work with my colleagues to balance the budget.

I had to come to the floor when I hear some of these scare tactics of not meeting our obligations as a government and letting this Government default. That is such an outrageous statement, and the people in my district do not believe that.

I am a little bit tired, from Medicare to default, that we are going to let the Government default, we are not going to take care of our senior citizens.

I want to make just a couple of comments. My father served in the U.S. Congress for 26 years. He was a Member of the other side, a Democrat, and many times we would talk about in the late 1980's why the Congress did not balance the budget. And several times he would make the statement to me, "Well, WALTER, you know, we could have chaos if we do. Programs would be cut. People would feel threatened." I would say to my father, "Father, I don't understand if we don't balance the budget, we also are going to have economic chaos," and that is what this debate is all about.

When we know the General Accounting Office, the GAO, says that in 17 years without a balanced budget, working people will pay 80 cents out of a dollar. People are not going to stand for that. We have got to deal with these problems now, and putting our heads in the sand is not going to solve these problems. We have got to deal with the problems now.

I just could not sit in the office and hear this debate go any further.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from North Carolina. I listened with great interest. I am sure the gentleman from Florida did as well to hear our friend from New Jersey kind of rhetorically gloss over the actions taken by the Treasury Secretary.

Quoting my friend from New Jersey now: Secretary Rubin has been "doing some things" to keep this Government in business.

Mr. Speaker, what the Secretary has been doing is raiding the pension funds. What the Secretary has done, and this is the fundamental part of this debate, are we so in love with government that we fail to live up to our responsibility? For, as my friend from North Carolina points out, the ultimate economic disaster, what unleashes chaos on the world markets is runaway spending of the type we have seen for the past 4 decades.

The real question is not doing some things, like raiding the pension funds and using that as really the epitome of the examples of what has gone on here for the last 40 years. The key is to change things now.

How? With positive economic initiatives for the future that deal with growth, growth that emphasizes the

freedom of the marketplace; that is the essence of the debate, not to be in love with government, but to love every generation, our seniors and generations yet unborn, to end business as usual, end this runaway spending, restore true fiscal integrity.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This really does concern me, because it is again another scare tactic. We saw the scare tactic with Medicare, the comments about Medicare dying on the vine.

In fact, the President's own commission said that this program was going to die on the vine if we did not do anything. God forbid we should give seniors another choice. You just take this is full of waste, fraud and abuse, and everybody is dipping their bucket into it and profiting from it except the seniors it is to serve. So here again we are scaring the seniors that we are not going to be able to pay their checks, using them as pawns, giving them only one choice, but in fact we, the President and this administration, will make a choice, and the choice is also in these budget figures. They want to pay illegal aliens. They want to pay people not to work.

Now this has not worked. We have seen the mess it has created in our society, and it is related to crime, it is related to our juvenile problem, it is related to teenage pregnancies, and you can do all you want, put them in uniforms or do whatever you want to do, I am telling you, unless you make people responsible and people to work; they want to pay people not to work, but they do not want to pay the senior citizens when this bill comes due. They do not want to pay our veterans; they would rather pay volunteers in a volunteer program with better perks and benefits than pay our seniors and our veterans.

So this is what this debate is all about, really. We have got to get a grip in this Congress.

We came here as the new majority. We said we were going to do things. We cut a quarter of a billion dollars out of our legislative appropriations. They talked about cutting here. They talked about congressional accountability. We passed it. We live under the same laws. We passed gift ban, lobbying reforms, things they talked about and dreamed about for years and never did a darn thing about.

THE MEANING OF OUR CURRENT DEBATE

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, we just had an election in Oregon, and we saw what happened. The Democrat won a seat that had been held by a Republican for a very long period of time.

And so today all the pundits and prognosticators have been asking what does that election mean. Why did it happen?

Well, anyone who listened to the debate in the last 10 minutes, in the last half hour, on this floor knows exactly why it happened. It happened because a group of extremists have taken over this House.

I would admit and say that in 1994, Republicans appeared to be the more centrist party. Democrats appeared to be too far over to the left, and Republicans won. And in a short span of a year, folks, you have ceded the center ground to us by doing all sorts of things that most people regard as lunatic, and probably at the top of the list is the idea of letting us default.

But I would say one other thing about Oregon. Oregon is going to be the predecessor of what is going to happen in the 1996 elections. Oregon foretells the 1996 elections.

Yes, the Republicans had, the Republicans had much more money. Many would argue he was more attractive, better looking, smoother and suaver, but you know what, the voters of Oregon said no more of this extremism, no more of sending people who are so far to the right that they are not where the American people are, to this body.

And if anything shows how crazy things have become here, it is their idea that we should default. I have heard the other side talk on and on about balancing the budget. Well, guess what, President Clinton has submitted a balanced budget. He has done it in 7 years. He has done it with CBO numbers.

First, the Republicans said we want him to submit a balanced budget. He did. Then they said no, that is not good enough, 7 years. He did. Then they said that is not good enough, CBO numbers.

You know what the dirty little secret is here, there is a group of 80 or 100 extremists on that side of the aisle who really do not want a balanced budget. They just want as deep a tax cut as possible. And so they say President Clinton is not telling the truth, but everyone knows that is that he submitted a balanced budget. It just does not have as much tax cuts as you guys want, and you gals want.

Well, ask the American people. They want it. But that is not the point here today. They want fewer tax cuts and fewer cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. But nobody wants America to default.

It is interesting, I see all of my colleagues here, they do not talk about what default is. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] got up, and he said we will never default. And then the next guy gets up and says, oh no, we will never default if the President submits to our balanced budget. That is blackmail. That is blackmail. You know that, the gentleman from Arizona, you want him to say, "I will go for a balanced budget that you attach what you want." You do not want to negotiate with him.

□ 1245

You want to say balanced budget plus ABC, Mr. President; take it or leave it, or we will cause disaster to the American people.

Well, gentlemen, learn your lesson. Your great theory was let the Government shut down, and that would bring the White House to its knees and you would get what you want by bullying tactics. It failed. You looked miserable. You had to retreat with your tail between your legs. And what do you do now? You come up with even a more ludicrous theory, and that is that we should let the Government default.

You know, I believe each of you does not think the Government will default, because maybe he will back off. Maybe you will back off. Well, when I was a teenager there was this game that certain people played called chicken. They each get in cars at one end of the highway, and they would rev up the engines to *x* miles per hour, and whoever swerved first was the chicken. And you know what? If no one swerved, there was a big crash. And that crash will mean nothing compared to the crash that will occur if no one swerves here.

So you are playing with fire, and you should have learned your lesson. What I would do, since my words are rather strong and maybe we can get a debate going again, I would yield to the gentleman from Arizona, but only please for 30 seconds, so I might have the chance to answer.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am so grateful to my friend from New York for yielding. There goes the time right there, so your noble experiment has failed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Let the RECORD show I did not know my time was about to expire.

COMPROMISE ON BUDGET NEEDED NOW

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think our goals are all similar, having a balanced budget. We are pleased to hear the President in his State of the Union Message adopt the call for a balanced budget and challenge the Congress to make certain we have a balanced budget.

None of us wants to put the Government in default. We want to have a good debt measure. We want to have a good balanced budget adopted before we leave the Congress for any recess period. But we do need cooperation. People are willing to negotiate across the table. Too often in the process it has been finger pointing and one party or another walking out of the negotiating area.

I think the American public wants to see us get down to work, develop a balanced budget, and develop a clean debt ceiling measure, and I think most of us in the House would like to see that

happen. But that means good intentions by all parties and the willingness to stop the finger pointing, and an intense desire to bring these problems to a halt by finding a proper solution.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I thank the gentleman very much. I think we should all really tone down our rhetoric, if we could. I have to say, I use a lot of descriptions of my friends, but let me say to my friend from New York, telling us that we are a bunch of extremists and you now are centrists, does not further the debate. You must have used the word "extremist" five or six times. We will let the American people determine who is in the extreme and who is in the center and who most closely reflects their point of view.

I do not accept the notion that we Republicans closed down the Government. I heard that this morning as well. I believe it was the President of the United States and his refusal to act that resulted in the shutdown of the Federal Government. In fact, if we indeed were putting pressure on the President to do certain things, you might say that we came to the point where we had to put him in a position of shutting down the Government himself before he would come forward with even a semblance of a balanced budget plan. If you remember, the President did not feel compelled even to put a balanced budget plan on the table.

So what we are talking about, all of these things, whether you are talking about default or closing the Federal Government, all these things, I do not believe we are doing. We are doing what is responsible and putting the President in the position of saying he will have to make the decision in terms of default or shutting down the Federal Government.

One last point. In order to achieve his objective, his objective is opposite from what he ran on. He ran on a balanced budget, he ran on changing welfare as we know it, but now he is willing to shut down the Government, he is willing to default, rather than come forward with an honest discussion and negotiation of how we get to a balanced budget.

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from New York, and thank him for coming to this floor and responding in measured tones to some of the shrill rhetoric we heard this morning. I have one comment in particular about blackmail. The record will show in our discussions with the White House, the new majority has moved some \$400 billion in the direction of the White House, and the White House has responded with only incremental efforts to reach some sort of consensus.

Therein lies the rub here, because, again, in the wake of the rhetoric, I would simply make this statement: The only thing extreme on this floor is

the extreme good sense the new majority is showing in trying to put our fiscal house in order. As my friend who chairs the committee so vital to international relations understands, it is fiscal responsibility, not only in our own financial markets, but internationally, that builds and expands the full faith and credit of the United States. And after almost a half century of runaway deficit spending, now trying to put our house in order should be paramount.

So let the record reflect that this new majority has moved in the direction of trying to reach some sort of consensus. But as everyone in any business knows, a bad deal is not the answer. No deal may be better than a bad deal.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for reflecting on how important our economic status is, not only domestically, but internationally.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE WORKING ON SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES, NOT DISCUSSING GOVERNMENT DEFAULT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I visited with some high school students in Rynek high school and we were talking about the Endangered Species Act. They wanted to know what the Congress was doing. They wanted to know how the debate was proceeding.

I also visited with students in another school to talk about education and what the Federal Government was doing or could do. It is hard for me to believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is almost 5 minutes to 1 in the afternoon. We are not working on the Clean Water Act or education, the Endangered Species Act or Head Start. We are here on the House floor because the Republican leadership cannot get their act together, and we are debating whether we should shut the Government down or not, whether we should allow a default of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, a default of the Federal Government should be unheard of. It should not even be discussed, to even put in question the credit of the United States, to even think that we would talk about adjourning to just before the brink of March 1 when the Government could default.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the effort to be bipartisan, and I do so hope we could. Look, I think it is a fair debate to talk about the programs, to talk about what is efficient, what is not. That is what AL GORE's reinventing government was all about. In fact, the Government is 200,000 positions smaller because of President Clinton and AL GORE's reinventing government program. We have already reduced the deficit because of courage in 1993 by \$500 billion. We have already done that.