

country and around the world will occur because of a significant breakdown in the world money markets and the world currency markets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the Republican side, if they are going to play with fire, to burn only themselves, but be careful of what they do.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have been listening to some of the debate that is going on over here, and it is really amazing to me that we have adults here masquerading as Congressmen that will not accept the responsibility for their own actions.

I can remember back when my children were young. One of the things that I tried to teach them was if they take an action, do something, to accept the responsibility for what has been done. But what we find here among the Republican majority is that they will not accept the responsibility at all for shutting down the Government. They want to blame it on somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, I have known of people that way. They do things and they think of all kinds of reasons to blame somebody else for what has happened to them instead of accepting responsibility for their own shortcomings.

Come March 15, I want to see the President continue this Government in those areas that expire by March 15. There is only one group that can do that, and that is the majority in the House. Senator DOLE cannot even do it on a continuing resolution. It is an appropriation that has to originate in the House. Only the Republicans can originate a bill of appropriations. If they do not do it, like they did not do it in December, they did not do it, and, for not doing it, the Government shut down. The same thing happened in November. When they did not do it, the Government shut down.

That is all it amounts to, folks, and now they tell us that all this big fight is over a balanced budget, that the President has not submitted a balanced budget. But the President has. And not only the President, the Democratic Coalition submitted a balanced budget that is a lot better than the Republican balanced budget.

The Congressional Budget Office tells us that the Democratic Coalition budget, by the year 2002, that Federal debt is \$66 billion less under the Democratic Coalition budget than under the Newt Gingrich Budget. No, they will not take that.

Know why? I will say why, Mr. Speaker. Because it does not have a tax cut for the wealthy in it. It does not have a tax cut at all. Some of us believe that we should not be cutting taxes until we see a balanced budget. All I am doing and my colleagues are doing in these balanced budget resolutions is estimating that by the year 2002 there is going to be a balanced budget.

There is not one person in this world that can guarantee that there is going to be a balanced budget. So let us wait

until we get to a balanced budget, then we will do tax cuts. They say: Oh, no. We want the tax cut now. We want the tax cut now.

What that tells me is that they really want a tax cut more than they want a balanced budget. That is what it tells me. They are more interested in seeing a tax cut. Let us wait and see the debt limit. I hear talk now that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is going to put some of those tax cuts on the debt limit. That tells me something. That tells me that that tax cut is really important, more important than the credit of the United States.

That is what my colleagues are taking a risk with doing, by doing that. It is more important than the balanced budget. It is the most important thing of all among the whole area, this whole year, is the tax cuts. That is what the Republican majority really wants.

Mr. Speaker, it is not really the balanced budget. If they wanted that, they could have had that a long time ago. We gave that to them, the Democratic Coalition. CBO says, yes, it just does not have the tax cut. And if they really want a debt limit increase, I suggest that they pass a clean one. Once they do not, the Senate will add all kinds of amendments. If my colleagues add some, the Senate will add a bunch more, and we will not have it done.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD REAGAN

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

CONGRESS MUST WORK TOGETHER TO END DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we were to use this time for a special occasion that appears on the calendar in a few days, and we will get to that in a few minutes. But after hearing the rhetoric bandied about this floor this morning and on into the afternoon, I think it is important to make several points.

First and foremost, when we talk about credit and credit ratings, when we talk about abdication of responsibility, Mr. Speaker, the problem is this: For too long those who have come to this Chamber have always found a reason to say yes; have always found a reason to spend more and more of the American taxpayers' money.

For almost a half century, it has been fact in this city, in this Chamber, that it is always easier to say yes. It is always easier to say, oh, gee, we should be able to find some money for that. To that extent, we have now spent ourselves to almost \$5 trillion of debt.

No, Mr. Speaker, the ultimate abdication of responsibility is not facing up to this problem and saying, let us work together to change these ways. The ultimate abdication of responsibility would be to continue to heap debt upon debt upon those who have no voice in

this Chamber, for they are generations yet unborn.

We have heard a lot about bipartisanship. Let me congratulate the President and his budgeteers for something they did a couple of years ago, something called generational accounting, where the President asked his budgeteers to take a look at Government as it exists today and extrapolate what it would cost the average American taxpayer if nothing changed. The President's own budgeteers said, if nothing changes, the average American 25 years from now will surrender 82 percent of his or her income in taxation to some level of government, to some governmental entity.

Today the American taxpayer, the average American family pays more in taxes than on food, shelter, and clothing combined. Yet, our friends would come here and say, gee, if you want to make the Government work, we will just take more or hang on to more of people's hard-earned money, and we will get our act together.

Yet the inescapable fact is, for every dollar raised in taxes for years, this Congress has spent \$1.59. Now it is supposed to be different. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, quoted Mark Twain. Mark Twain also said this: "History does not repeat itself, but it rhymes."

Yes, momentous decisions await us in this Chamber. Yes, the American people deserve the best. Yes, the American people deserve a Government that will allow pro-growth policies by letting people hang on to more of their hard-earned money and at the same time deliver a one-two punch, not only allowing Americans to hang on to more of their money but, yes, curtailing the levels of spending.

It is only extreme in the sense that it makes extremely good sense.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to realize that, when we say 80 percent of people's income will have to be taken from them in taxes in the future in order to pay for government if we leave the situation the way it is, let us remember what that 80 percent will mean. That 80 percent will not be providing those future generations with services. What we are talking about is leaving future generations to pay a majority of their income simply to pay for the interest on the debt that we have left them.

Mr. Speaker, we are basically condemning future generations of Americans to slavery. Our fellow Americans should take a look and see what we are talking about here. One is not a free person if one has to work half of one's life simply to pay the interest on the debt that someone else has given. That is what the young people of our country have to look forward to unless we are responsible.

Our country will not be a prosperous country in a situation like that, and our people will not be a free people. It

is the freedom of our fellow Americans in the future that we are talking about. It is the freedom of our children and our children's children; not only their prosperity but their freedom as well.

Let us note this: that we have heard a lot of talk today and a lot of names called. I heard one of our colleagues suggest that we are "masquerading as Congressmen." I heard another colleague say that we are just a "bunch of extremists." This type of name calling should raise the red flag in American homes and say, wait a minute, what is going on here? Why do people have to call these types of names? What about the basic argument at hand?

I think we should look at some of the basic things. We have been told today, for example, that 200,000 Federal employees have been cut by this administration. Well, we know almost all of those are a result of a reduction in our military forces. Is that being forthright with the American people, to claim that we have reduced the size of Government when in reality all we have done is reduced the size of the American military?

Then we heard about the \$500 billion cut in our deficit. Does anyone believe that in the last 2 years we have seen a reduction of \$500 billion in our deficit? That is absolutely ludicrous, to say that over these last 2 years we have seen a \$500 billion cut in the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, what reduction there has been in the deficit, however, might be attributed simply to, No. 1, the good economy that this President inherited, and, No. 2, the fact that the President passed, immediately upon entering office, one of the largest tax increases in American history. Before that has its chance to wreak havoc upon our economy, there seems to be a little bit more revenue coming in because of tax increases.

□ 1315

It is absolutely ludicrous to suggest that this cut in the deficit has anything to do with a reduction in the size of Government or Vice President GORE's plan to reinvent Government. This is not an honest debate when we move forward like this. The American people should understand that what we have today and the reason we are in a budget confrontation, the reason people are talking about default, the reason the Federal Government was closed down is, there is a philosophical struggle going on in Washington, DC. And the democratic process is playing it out, just as our Founding Fathers intended this democratic process to work.

The fact is that one group of people is demanding more and more Federal spending and an ever-increasing Government versus a shrinking proportion of take-home pay for the American people.

On the other side, we Republicans believe that a free society means that people have a chance to take home

some of their hard-earned dollars and make choices for themselves, how they will educate their children, how they will spend the money that they have earned, how they will allocate these limited resources. It is not a free society, as I say, if a greater and greater portion is taken away from someone who has earned that money. We are condemning our children to a future of virtual slavery unless we change that pattern.

But changing the pattern is exactly what this is about. This President and the minority, who by the way had a chance to do anything they wanted to do for the last 2 years, they had the Presidency and both Houses of Congress, but the other side is so committed to bigger Government, to taking resources away from the people and giving them to bureaucrats and officials in Washington, who are bestowed, I guess, with some benevolence in that they understand how to use those resources, have a greater understanding than the people themselves who earned them. This is what they would like to do, and they want to do that so much, they are so committed to a bigger and bigger Government that they are willing to shut down the Federal Government. We hear time and time again of all of the consequences of the short shutdown that we faced with the Federal Government. The fact is, I understand that. You understand that. The majority understands that.

We did our job. The reason the Government was shut down was that the President of the United States did not do his job because he was committed to bigger Government and higher taxes and more controls and more regulation and Washington, DC, the omnipotent Washington DC, rather than committed to the freedom and prosperity of the people.

That is what is going on here. That is what is playing out. When you hear talk of default, the Republicans are forcing no default, just as the Republicans did not force the closing down of the Government. What we are doing, we are doing our very best to turn around a situation where if the United States continues to go in the direction that it is that we will be sacrificing the freedom and prosperity of young Americans and future generations.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from California, again, for expounding on some of the rhetoric we heard this morning.

One who preceded us in America's public affairs said it this way, Mr. Speaker:

This is the issue, whether we believe in our capacity for self-government or whether we abandon the American Revolution and confess that a little intellectual elite in a far distant capital can plan our lives for us better than we can plan them ourselves.

The truth of those words rings true. And it is in that spirit that we move today to our reason for taking this time, as Members of the majority, to commemorate the fact that on Feb-

ruary 6, the great communicator, indeed one of the greatest Presidents ever to serve in the Oval Office, Ronald Wilson Reagan, will turn 85 years of age. There are so many inspiring factors, when one looks at the life of Ronald Reagan and his life in public service, but I look to his earlier years. Indeed, many, to offer this personal note, have looked at my career, those pundits and would-be potentates of the fourth estate inside this beltway, as some have written of my stewardship in this Congress, my heavens, he is a sportscaster.

Well, let the record show that Ronald Reagan began his working career on the air in radio, first at WOC Davenport and then WHO Des Moines and indeed, the bulk of his duties entailed sportscasting.

Now, I will be the first to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am certainly no Ronald Reagan, but we are joined today in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, by those who have served President Reagan and those who continue to serve former President Reagan. I would be happy to yield some time again to my good friend from California, one of the surfing Congressmen, indeed, one of the surfing speechwriters who worked in the Reagan White House, who was present at the Reagan revolution, my good friend, Mr. ROHRABACHER.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentleman very much. I was blessed to be born in California and to have lived in California at the time when Ronald Reagan was Governor of that State. In fact, I worked on his very first campaign.

I was the Los Angeles County high school chairman of Youth for Reagan. And one little anecdote that might give people a better sense of who we are talking about is that after that campaign, it was a very hard-fought campaign, Ronald Reagan was always told during his entire career that he would lose the election that he was in because he was an extremist. And we have heard that word bandied about here today.

Ronald Reagan was always called an extremist and was always told that the American people would never elect him and that he could not win, that was always the argument against him in the Republican primaries.

It was a hard-fought primary and Reagan won handily. During that primary in the youth group, in the youth movement that we had there working for Ronald Reagan, there was a conflict between the Young Republicans and the Young Americans for Freedom. And it was a very brutal conflict, even though we had a great man to work for. Everybody was fighting each other and some of us tried to just walk the precincts and pay attention to the job, but everybody seemed to get sucked into this battle.

What happened was, the senior staff of the Reagan campaign determined after the primary that what they would do is eliminate Youth for Reagan and

then they would just put all the young people into the organization that was based for everybody, for the adult volunteers of the campaign. I just felt terrible about this. I just did not know what to do.

I had walked about 20 precincts myself. I had 120 kids in my area that had just worked their hearts out for Ronald Reagan and Youth for Reagan, and I was crestfallen. What was this going to mean? There would be no Youth for Reagan.

I decided to talk to Ronald Reagan himself about this problem. And there I was, 17, I guess I was more like 18 years old. I got up one morning and went to Ronald Reagan's home at 2 or 3 in the morning. And I walked up this narrow driveway, and this shows you how different things are, there was not even a guard on the outside of the house. And I went to the backyard and camped out in the backyard. And I had a little sign.

And the next morning about 7 in the morning, Nancy stuck her head out of the door and said, Who are you? I had this little sign and it said, Ronald Reagan, please speak to me. And she explained, she said, Now, look, my husband cannot come out; otherwise I know him, he will miss his breakfast or he will be late for the rest of the day.

How can you argue with a wife who is concerned about her husband? And so she said, If you will go down and if you will leave now, I will make sure that you get an appointment with one of the top campaign people. You can discuss your problem with him.

So OK, I started walking down that long driveway. And then behind me I heard a thump, thump, thump. And it was Ronald Reagan. His shirt was half off. There was shaving cream on his face. He said, Wait a minute, wait a minute. He said, If you can camp out on my back lawn all night, I can at least spend a couple minutes with you.

Sure enough, he spent 5 minutes with me. And I would like to think that that was the 5 minutes that saved Youth for Reagan, because the adult organization did not take over. But this is just the type of man Ronald Reagan was. He had a wonderful heart. He thought about young people.

We have just been discussing what will happen if we do not set our country on the right path. It will be our young people that suffer. Ronald Reagan knew this. Ronald Reagan's whole goal, when he became President of the United States, was to make sure that we passed onto our children a country that was more prosperous and a world that was more free and a world that was more likely to be at peace than the one that we inherited.

President Clinton, by the way, has had an easy job of this. I know that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not accept this, but the fact is, President Clinton inherited a great economy, an economy that was growing, an economy that had almost no inflation. And in fact, he also inherited a

world in which the United States was the supreme power and that the cold war was a memory, the cold war was over.

For the first half of Mr. Clinton's Presidency, he had control of both Houses of Congress. His party could have done anything they wanted. This is so different than when Ronald Reagan took over as President. Ronald Reagan inherited a disaster. Our economy, I remember that, because I was a journalist at the time. I remember that in the 2 years prior to Ronald Reagan becoming President, my income was reduced by 25 percent due to inflation.

All those people who were not getting raises found out that with an inflation rate of 13 percent and 12 percent a year, that their income was going down, that they could not afford to live. In fact, one of the greatest drops in the economic well-being of minority Americans and less affluent Americans happened in the 2 years just prior to Ronald Reagan taking over as President.

And when Reagan came to office, we faced this incredible economic catastrophe. We also faced an enemy intent on destroying the United States of America, an enemy that had been arming itself to the teeth for years, and a situation in which our own Armed Forces had been neglected out of some ideological commitment by the left. I guess the left at that time felt that a strong United States was an enemy of peace and not a friend of peace.

Ronald Reagan had to turn that situation around or we would have been at war. He had to turn the situation around or our young people would never have had any chance of prosperity or the economic lives that we lived even in this generation would have continued to decline.

On top of that, the Democrats had control of this body, of the House of Representatives, during his entire time as President. In fact, the Democrats did everything they could to undermine President Reagan. I know there is a lot of revisionist history going on these days about the cold war, but I will tell you this right now, that when Ronald Reagan tried to confront Soviet aggression, tried to rebuild America's strength, tried to do what he could to confront this bully that threatened all of mankind, we did not have the liberal wing of the Democratic Party on our side. In fact, they were doing everything they possibly could to undermine our effort.

In fact, at the time in the domestic area, when Ronald Reagan proposed cuts, today we hear him blamed for the great deficit increase that happened during his years.

□ 1330

I remember very well what happened during those years. What happened was Ronald Reagan was personally attacked. He was vilified, not for spending too much, not for creating a bigger deficit. The very same people who

today call him those names and blame him for the deficit were the ones in charge of this House who were attacking Ronald Reagan for not spending enough money. They were the ones who pushed Ronald Reagan to the wall in order to get more money put into the budget, not less. It is funny now that we hear the revisionist history about Ronald Reagan being the one responsible for the deficit by the very same people who demanded more and more spending, and vilified Ronald Reagan for fighting it.

Worse than that, however, When Ronald Reagan tried to confront the Soviet Union, in our efforts, for example, before Ronald Reagan became President, there was a movement by the Soviets to dominate Europe with a buildup of intermediate range missiles. Immediately thereafter, after the Soviet Union expanded its military might, it called for what they call a nuclear freeze, which would have frozen them into a military superiority which would not put them in domination of Europe, and would have put them in a situation where the cold war would never have ended, because they would have been a dominant force on this planet.

Ronald Reagan countered that with a proposal saying, "Look, if we are going to limit nuclear weapons, and we are talking about intermediate range nuclear weapons, let us bring down the levels of nuclear weapons in Europe to zero, so both sides will be able to decrease their spending on the military, and you will not have to have any missiles in Europe on either side."

The proposal was considered seriously in the Soviet Union. Where it is not considered seriously was by the liberal wing of the Democratic Party who attacked Ronald Reagan publicly for offering this, saying that they knew that the Soviet Union would never seriously consider this, and that Ronald Reagan was just hiding his true intent, which was wasting money on the military.

In fact, 5 years later the Soviet Union agreed to that arms control proposal, the zero option, and it was signed by President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev into an agreement, a historic agreement, that signaled a change in the cold war. But that was not, that was not due to bipartisan, as we hear now, bipartisan support from the other side of the aisle. It was due despite the nitpicking and the public disagreement and the public undermining of the President's position.

I well remember sitting in the White House when we were discussing having arms control negotiations and what was going on in the arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union, when we had demanded that they live up to their past treaty obligations. The Soviet Union had built a huge radar facility, in total violation of one of its treaty obligations to the United States, but yet, people, liberal Democrats on the other side of the aisle, came forward in this body to defend the Soviet

position, and to suggest that it was really the belligerence of Ronald Reagan and we extremists, which we hear all the time, extremists, which was at the heart of the cold war.

Liberal Democrats were proclaiming that there was a moral equivalency between the United States and the Soviet Union. This was not the bipartisan support that we hear time and time again, now that the cold war is over. The fact is that there was not bipartisan support. There was some bipartisan support, because there were some Democrats that come over, but by and large, Ronald Reagan had a two-front war to fight in order to end the cold war.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California, for his unique perspective. Now we know it will be in the history books one day, and perhaps in the archives of those who follow American political endeavors, that our good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], camped out on the back lawn of Ronald Reagan.

A couple of points and then I will yield to the gentlewoman who has the distinction of having the former President as a constituent, at least part of the time. It is this notion of optimism. Dwight Eisenhower said that a great leader should always be optimistic; not a cockeyed optimist, to be sure, but one who believed in the basic goodness of people, and one who would defend the notions and the ideas he put forth.

President Reagan said it this way. Before he ever became a candidate for office, quoting him now, "They say the world has become too complex for simple answers. They are wrong. There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers. We must have the courage to do what we know is morally right."

As the gentleman from California outlined, facing considerable odds here at home domestically, facing the pundits and those who would fail to acknowledge the common sense of his policies, Ronald Reagan was willing to see a policy through. Because of his efforts, it has been said by our friend from Great Britain, the former Prime Minister, Mrs. Thatcher, if there is one individual responsible for the victory of the free world in the cold war, his name is Ronald Wilson Reagan.

With that, I am happy to yield to my good friend and fellow freshman, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND]

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor to pay tribute to Ronald Reagan, and it is an honor that we do it here on the House floor. The gentleman from California talked about this involvement in trying to get the President elected. I have the unique pleasure to say, I go way back when, and I can remember stuffing those envelopes in the local headquarters for Ronald Reagan when he was running for Governor of California, and all the wonderful stories that, when we sit here and mull these things over and think about it, it is an honor, again, as

I said to be here, and go way back when.

Today, as the Republican Congress moves our agenda of fiscal responsibility and bureaucratic downsizing through the House of Representatives, we are reminded of the first revolution—the Reagan revolution—that swept through Washington during the 1980's. Many of the things President Reagan championed throughout his Presidency have found a home and a new life in the Republican Congress. Welfare reform, real spending cuts, the balanced budget amendment, giving more flexibility to the States, and the line-item veto were all regular features of the Reagan program stifled by the Democrat Congress.

President Reagan's list of accomplishments seems unending. On the economic front, Reaganomics—as it was derided by his opponents—produced the longest peacetime economic expansion since World War II and blew holes right through the traditional and current Democrat appeals to class warfare. The Reagan tax cuts reduced the top marginal income tax rate from 70 to 28 percent and took many low-income people off the tax rolls altogether. The double-digit inflation and soaring interest rates of the Carter years crumbled to record lows. As Mr. Reagan himself has pointed out on many occasions, his only regret was an inability to get Congress to cut spending.

In foreign policy, Mr. Reagan's steadfast commitment to peace through strength sent an important signal to the world that United States would no longer stand back and watch an expansionist Soviet Union roll up more territory. From Afghanistan to Angola to Nicaragua, the Reagan Doctrine put the United States firmly behind the freedom fighters who sought to throw off the oppressive communists.

President Reagan was truly the man of the decade during the 1980's. There was no single figure more responsible for ending the cold war than Ronald Reagan. One sterling example was the 1986 Reykjavik summit. For 2 days the United States and the Soviets negotiated the most comprehensive arms reduction treaty in history only to have Mikhail Gorbachev throw a big curve at the end—the United States would have to give up the Strategic Defense Initiative. Ronald Reagan stood before Gorbachev and the world, held his ground, and said no deal. More than any single moment of his Presidency that was the nail right through the heart of the Soviet empire. As Gorbachev himself later admitted, when the Soviets realized that Reagan could not be bowled over, the game had changed and they did not have the resources to keep up.

President Reagan's policy of peace through strength was a hands down winner. It was a winner in spite of his critics. All during his Presidency Ronald Reagan withstood a vigorous assault from the left. But, through it all,

he remained committed to restoring our Nation's defenses. There would be no further fears of a hollow army, and no lack of morale on the part of American serviceman. Having lived through four major wars in his lifetime, President Reagan was determined to make sure that our Armed Forces—those who would be asked to defend American interests at home and abroad at a moment's notice—had the resources, the respect, and the commitment from their government to do the job. As he so passionately and eloquently stated in perhaps his finest speech, the 40th anniversary of the Allied invasion at Normandy: "We will always remember. We will always be proud. We will always be prepared, so we may always be free."

It was a great honor for me to introduce legislation earlier this year that has since been enacted into law, legislation naming the newest constructed Federal building located on the last undeveloped stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue—America's Main Street—the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center.

Ronald Reagan spoke of "Main Street America" as the "millions who work so hard to support their families and keep our country together." He often talked of the rising tide of optimism in Main Street America and that is why it is fitting that we named this Federal building after him.

The structure is designed by James Ingo Freed of Pei Cobb Freed & Partners; I.M. Pei designed the east wing of the National Gallery of Art and Freed designed the Holocaust Museum on 14th street and will be the centerpiece of downtown Washington. The building will dedicate 500,000 square feet for an international trade center and will attract additional business and tourism to our Nation's Capital. It seems fitting that this building that will feature free trade should bear Ronald Reagan's name.

Despite the arguments put forth by revisionist thinkers, President Reagan's place in history is secure. He stands next to the giants, Presidents like Roosevelt and Lincoln, who arrived at a time when the Nation desperately needed the passion and the leadership of a true believer. As he fights with courage, conviction, and that famous Reagan optimism against his current physical ailment, let us remember and pay tribute to a man who embodies the American Dream.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California, and reclaiming my time, I would ask if during the course of her busy day if she still has time to pause with us and reflect on those personal glimpses of President Reagan, she is more than welcome during the remainder of our time to do so.

My good friend, the gentleman from California, reflecting and offering yet more personal glimpses, as well as policy analysis of those years, the Reagan years in the White House and those

years before, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is such a pleasure to be here with the gentleman, and celebrating the birthday of this great American, who has done so much for my life personally and also for the lives of every American.

People would like to know what kind of man Ronald Reagan was. I think I will make this a little personal as well as oriented towards his policy. I worked with him on his campaign in 1976 when he ran for President against Gerald Ford and lost. I remember one day when the President was speaking before a rally at a parking lot in North Carolina, where a young lady grabbed me by the arm and said, "I am here with a group of blind children. They cannot see. They cannot really get up into this crowd to hear as much as they should be able to, so I have had to keep them back here on the side. I was wondering if it was possible for," and they called him Governor Reagan at that time, because he was not elected President yet, "for Governor Reagan to come here and to shake hands with these young people."

As the rally was over, the press were getting into their buses, and I mentioned this to Mike Deaver, and Ronald Reagan was in earshot and heard me talking about these young blind children. He said "Look, I don't want anybody in the press to come over there, because I don't want these young people to think that I'm trying to exploit young people, or blind children, for my candidacy, so do not tell the press anything. Let them get on the bus, and then I will go over there and meet with these young people and talk to them for a moment."

Sure enough, we jogged over to the side of the parking lot and there were about five children, probably 11 or 12 years old, that were blind. Ronald Reagan was speaking to them.

□ 1345

As he spoke to them, he said, would you like to touch my face? I will never forget that, because it would not have dawned on me to say that. It was not a thought that came to my mind. But he was so understanding and so sensitive that he knew that they could not see him unless they touched his face.

Of course, they all wanted to touch his face. As they were there, these five blind children touching his face in the corner of that parking lot, I thought to myself, what politician in this country would not give millions of dollars to have his picture on the front of Time magazine or Newsweek magazine to have all of these children touching his face. It was such a heartfelt picture, it would have been a Pulitzer Prize. But, instead, Ronald Reagan knew that this was a private moment, and that he was talking to these young people, and if he was going to keep faith with them, he did not want them ever to have the

thought that he was exploiting them for those purposes.

I guess that is what our basic challenge was when we were working for Ronald Reagan as President. Before people could really see him, they had to feel Ronald Reagan, and the American people got a feel of Ronald Reagan. During his presidency, they knew that he was a good and decent man. Even though during his entire presidency, and during his campaigns he was maligned over and over again, as if trying to be responsible, trying to say that we cannot spend everything for everybody, that that in some way makes you a malicious person.

Reagan was attacked over and over and over again, as if he did not have a good heart. But the American people saw that he had a good heart. They felt that. They knew that about him, just like those little blind children, when they touched his face, knew what this man looked like.

Well, the American people knew what Ronald Reagan looked like on the inside. That is why they trusted him. To the degree that he was successful, it had a lot to do with the trust that the American people put in him. He spoke to them.

I was Ronald Reagan's speech writer for 7 years. I had never written a speech for anyone else before I wrote a speech for Ronald Reagan as President of the United States. He was the one who taught me how to write. A lot of people, again maligning Ronald Reagan, tried to say that he was some sort of puppet and that he could not do anything without his cards.

Well, the fact is, Ronald Reagan was an excellent writer. I always said that if he had not been president, he was a good enough writer to be a presidential speech writer. He taught us that.

He was, as you had mentioned, an expert in communication, and that served him well, it served the country well. When Ronald Reagan took over the country, it was in a funk. The country and the American people had been told to lower their expectations. They had been told that all of the problems of the world dealt with our own faults as Americans. They were told that we could not succeed, that we were in a malaise, and Ronald Reagan, with his buoyant optimism and with his great sense of the people themselves and his ability to communicate, turned the American spirit around.

People complained that the deficit expanded during Reagan's years. Again, he tried to cut it and the Congress would not do it. But on top of that, just figure out where our country would have been had the same policies been in place that the Democrats had in place before Reagan was elected and those same economic trends would have continued. Our deficit would have been twice as big, and our inflation rate would have destroyed the economic well-being and the standard of living of all of our people. So Ronald Reagan was successful at that.

But perhaps what I am most proud of, through it all, Ronald Reagan was called a warmonger, called a militarist. He was portrayed as someone who wanted to spend money on all of these weapons. But in fact, Ronald Reagan was a champion of freedom and liberty, and in doing so, he was a champion of peace in the world. We have a more peaceful world today because of what he did, the stands he took.

I remember when Ronald Reagan was castigated; and this side of the aisle, the Democrats who controlled the Congress at the time, did everything they could to undermine his policy of supporting freedom fighters in the various parts of the world who were fighting Soviet aggression. I mean, it made every sense to me that we should arm local people to defend themselves rather than send Americans all over the world to have to fight; and in fact, we drained the Soviet Empire of its military capabilities by forcing them to fight for their gains rather than just giving it to them and letting people surrender without a fight.

In Nicaragua, where the Soviet Union was perched and ready to roll up Central America right into Mexico and to the borders of the United States, before Reagan was elected, in Nicaragua, the Communists were ready. The Soviet Union pumped billions of dollars of military aid into that country, and the Democrats on that side of the aisle undermined Reagan's effort over and over and over again to try to give the Nicaraguan people the right to fight for their own freedom.

I have no understanding of why that happened, but in today's revisionist history, we are told that a bipartisan effort ended the cold war. There would have been no end to the cold war had there been a major Soviet offensive in Latin America that was victorious, and that would have happened had not Ronald Reagan come in and supported those who were struggling for freedom.

Finally, let us not forget that it was Ronald Reagan's speeches and his ability to communicate to the world, his ability to champion the cause of freedom and to condemn communism. Ronald Reagan was the first President of the United States not just to condemn Soviet actions, but to condemn communism as an evil, tyrannical force on the planet. Let us not forget that those words, along with his policies, are what brought an end to the Soviet imperial empire that threatened our freedom and threatened the peace of the world.

I will leave you with one last story of Ronald Reagan, because Reagan was called, he was called names, too, about his rhetoric. I have heard speeches over and over again about how he was a warmonger and his speeches were going to get us into trouble. But I remember very well the incident when Ronald Reagan was going to go to Berlin, and Reagan, one of his speech writers went to Berlin before him, and we came back.

Ronald Reagan had mentioned that he thought that this was the place to

talk about the tearing down of the Berlin Wall. And we speech writers did our job; we gave him text.

He approved it, and all of a sudden volcanoes began to erupt all over the world. Diplomats, foreign policy experts, George Shultz, our Secretary of State, you name it, everybody, the National Security Advisor to the President himself, they were just—they were screaming at the top of their lungs, do not do it. Do not tell Mr. Gorbachev to tear down the Wall, because it will be an insult to Gorbachev. He is our only hope.

It was said by many that Gorbachev was the man who was making the world more peaceful, which is what we hear from the liberal side, and not Reagan and a commitment to freedom that was changing the world. Reagan in fact was told just the day before he gave the speech in Berlin by his own National Security Advisor to take out of his speech that reference to tearing down the Berlin Wall. He was handed another speech draft and told, Mr. President, you should use this draft instead of the one you have. And Ronald Reagan, being the leader that he was said, well, no, I think I will use the one I have.

He went to Berlin, and he pointed to the Wall and he said, Mr. Gorbachev, if you believe in democracy and peace, tear down this wall. That strength of purpose and that commitment to freedom sent a shock wave around the world which unnerved the last vestiges of power in the Soviet Union and brought about the end of the cold war.

Ronald Reagan made that decision on his own, against the advice of the experts, because he knew in his heart that saying and demanding the tearing down of the Berlin Wall made everything that he had done and everything America stood for real, not only to the people of the world, but to the leaders of the Soviet Union; and within a few days the CIA told us that Gorbachev had had a meeting and had been seriously discussing with his advisors how to move forward in bringing down the Berlin Wall as a symbol of peace. What a magnificent, magnificent victory.

Then, one moment, I am going to tell you about my best day at the White House. I remember when Nathan Sharansky came to the White House. Many people do not know who Nathan Sharansky is. He used to be called Anatoly Sharansky and was a true hero of the cause of human liberty. He was a Jewish dissident in Russia, Soviet Russia, and he was thrown into the slammer, thrown into the gulag and told, all you have to do is sign a slip of paper saying that the Soviet Union is really a democracy and does not persecute Jews, and we will let you out of the gulag; and Sharansky refused to do so.

When the word of this heroic stand of this individual got around the world, he became one of our heroes. He became in the 1980's not just a Jewish hero; he was a hero to all people who believed in liberty, especially to Ronald Reagan's speech writers.

Well, when he was let loose from the gulag, it was because we traded a spy

for him, a Russian spy. We got a heroic champion of freedom and they got some low-life spy who was trying to help Soviet tyranny. Boy, did we get the better part of that deal.

Sharansky ended up coming to the White House to visit Ronald Reagan, and he told Ronald Reagan, he said, Mr. President, whatever you do, do not tone down your speeches, because apparently when he was at the bottom of despair, in the dark and damp dungeon of a gulag, he was slipped a small piece of paper and on that paper was written, President Reagan has called it an "evil empire." And he said that is what gave him hope. That is what gave the world a reason to resist Soviet tyranny.

Not only did Sharansky prevail, but all of the freedom-loving people prevailed, because Ronald Reagan had the courage to speak about the values and the principles of this country at a time of great adversity.

So today, I am very pleased to join you and my other colleagues in saying "happy birthday" to my old boss, a man who may now have lost his memory, but will never be forgotten. Thank you.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend from California for that heartfelt tribute, and for his willingness to share the very personal side of history, a history of this Nation, a history of this world, in which our former President, Ronald Reagan, served as a catalyst; a man who had the courage to point out the world as it was and the conviction to help change the world to the place it ought to be.

I look here in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and I see another of our good friends who has joined us in this effort to continue the battle, to restore the notion of freedom and constitutional government to this great constitutional Republic, and for his perspectives on the service and stewardship of President Reagan. I am happy to yield time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. After listening to Mr. ROHRABACHER from California, particularly that close, it is really very difficult to speak, because we all have our own personal recollections and memories.

I had never been to Washington, I do not think, during the Reagan administration; I had never been to Washington until the Bush administration, so my memory is somewhat different.

I appreciate your having this Special Order. We have heard a lot today about President Reagan as the great communicator. Sometimes we forget, and we remember the tremendous speeches that he gave and some of the powerful things that he said. But it is easy to forget that communication is always a two-way street.

It seems to me that one of the parts that is forgotten about President Reagan is that he had a tremendous listening ear. He understood. He had an empathy for the American people that sometimes is forgotten.

One of his favorite expressions, and I have stolen a lot of things from the

President; one of his expressions that he used frequently, and I subsequently found out he got from John Adams, but I use it a lot. He said, facts are stubborn things. You know, we can ignore the facts, we can deny the facts, but ultimately facts are facts. And he deeply believed that.

He also believed that ideas matter, that words have meaning, and that actions have consequences. As Mr. ROHRABACHER talked about earlier, when he went to Berlin and he said, Mr. Gorbachev, if you mean what you say, then tear down this wall.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is good that we are here this morning in vigorous debate, and hearing my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, who serves as the chair of a 130-person panel from the Republican Conference, it is interesting that he would say that we on this side of the aisle are frivolously representing to the American people that this is not a crisis.

□ 1400

Those words were barely even reported here in Washington and in the western press. It was passed along and does not appear anywhere in the lists of famous quotations, so that expression was almost forgotten here in the West. But those words had meaning, and they rolled across Eastern Europe all the way to Moscow, and ultimately the reverberation of those words brought that wall down.

I will always remember, and I have got to be brief because I have to run, but again I appreciate so much the gentleman having this special order today. But I remember the day that Ronald Reagan was sworn in as our President in his first inaugural address. I remember I was traveling in central Minnesota and I pulled the car off the side of the road to listen to that speech. It was one of the most powerful and most moving speeches I have ever heard.

In fact I was in New Ulm, MN when I heard the speech, and I will always remember. In fact I do not have it in front of me and I cannot do it word for word, but I will paraphrase only slightly the last paragraph of that speech.

Some may remember he talked about a young man from Wisconsin who during World War I had written on his diary that he was going to work and he was going to fight and he was going to serve as if the entire outcome of that long and bloody war depended upon him and him alone. President Reagan closed his inaugural address with these words.

He said,

Our problems do not require that kind of sacrifice. They do, however, require our best effort and our willingness to believe in ourselves, to believe in our capacity to perform great deeds, that together, with God's help, we can resolve the problems which confront us now. And, after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans.

Those words were powerful then; they are powerful today. I think the most important thing about that sentence is that he believed in us, he believed in the American people, he believed in those deep core values that

made this country work, and he talked about them often. He talked about the values of faith, of family, of freedom, of work and personal responsibility, and he believed deeply that Government policy ought to reinforce those values and that liberal programs, no matter how well intentioned, have had the net practical effect of undermining those values.

I remember, too, the day that he left office. It was a poignant moment for me, because I was watching when President Bush was sworn in, and at the end of the ceremony he and Mrs. Reagan walked out on the east side of this building. They turned around and he saluted to President Bush. Then he got up on the stairs to get on the helicopter which was to take him to the airport to take him back to California.

I will never forget, I was watching this, my wife and I, who are both big Ronald Reagan fans, and I turned to my wife Mary and I said, "You know, he was a long time coming, he'll be a long time gone." It will be a long time before we see a President like President Reagan who could communicate so clearly to the American people, and indeed to the world. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for having this special order.

I want to thank you, Mr. President, for all that you did for me, all that you did for the American people, and all that you did for all the freedom-loving people of the world. You will always be a blessing to us and you will always be that symbol that speaks to the best in the American people, that appeals to our best hopes, not our worst fears. I thank you, Mr. President. I wish you a happy birthday, and may God bless you.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his perspective. It is worth noting, as the gentleman from Minnesota points out, Mr. Speaker, that President Reagan's observations still make the point today. Indeed, in a speech delivered about a year ago the President said these words, and I think they still pertain to our situation today:

After watching the State of the Union address the other night, I'm reminded of the old adage that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Only in this case it's not flattery but grand larceny, the intellectual theft of ideas that you and I recognize as our own. Speech delivery counts for little on the world stage unless you have the convictions and, yes, the vision to see beyond the front row seats.

How important that is, Mr. Speaker. My friend from Minnesota was absolutely correct. Words do mean something. Promises must be made but, more importantly, promises must be kept. It is the vision that President Reagan spoke of in his inaugural address, on that day in January of 1981, that made the point so well:

It is not my intention to do away with government. It is, rather, to make it work, work with us, not over us, stand by our side, not ride on our back. Government can and must

provide opportunity, not smother it; foster productivity, not stifle it.

Indeed as the words are bandied about on this floor, as the epithets are hurled, remarks of blackmail and extortion and extremist, let us remember the observation of Mark Twain, that history does not repeat itself but it rhymes. And as President Reagan embraced the vision of Abraham Lincoln, that the American people once fully informed would make the right decision, let us dedicate our work and our labors in this legislative branch of Government to that same endeavor, recognizing that good people can disagree, recognizing that in a free society debate leads to decision, and also recognizing the contributions of a great American.

Mr. Speaker, let us wish the happiest of birthdays to Ronald Wilson Reagan as he approaches his 85th, and let us remember his example and do all that we can to ensure that his vision of America, a vision that harkens back to our founders, is remembered, not for its novelty, not for cutting back, to seem to embrace antiquity, but because it embraces the basic goodness of the American people and an undying optimism that is uniquely American. Happy birthday, Ronald Reagan.

ONGOING BUDGET DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, after the last hour we would like to talk a little bit about what is happening with the budget. The gentleman from Arizona is going to join me for a while and I believe one of my freshman colleagues from Idaho is going to join us in a little bit.

I know that the gentleman from Arizona, I do not believe he had a chance to join us in Baltimore over the weekend, but I think we should maybe take a few minutes to talk about, because I know the press has talked a lot about what has happened in the budget negotiations of recent and that somehow, I know that within the course of just a couple of weeks, in referring to the freshmen, we have been described as being mean spirited, and then last week we were being described as being dispirited. I think the only thing I can honestly say is, we are still spirited as freshmen, are we not?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend for yielding. Yes, I was unable to be at the freshman advance—note, Mr. Speaker, we do not use the word "retreat" in any way, shape, or form—with the freshman advance, and I was interested to read the comments in one East Coast newspaper, "Humbled Freshmen Regroup," or words to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Minnesota shares the same sense of

honor and awe that comes with serving in this House. Indeed, as old man eloquent John Quincy Adams said upon his election, after serving as President, upon his election to the House of Representatives, there is no higher honor than service in the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, and to my friend from Minnesota, I think what confounds the fourth estate is that though we are honored and awed to serve here, we understand that we were sent here to change business as usual, and the spirit remains and the almost, you could see it coming a mile off, from my days in the media, we were bound to get a story at the halfway point that, gee, some folks have grown, that is, they have accepted the ways of Washington; some people have matured, that is, they have been willing to accept compromises in certain ways, and that somehow reasonableness, the Washington definition, higher spending, higher taxes, more big Government, and an abandonment of campaign promises, that type of reasonableness had infected our ranks.

Well, Mr. Speaker and to my colleague from Minnesota—I am sure he will join me on this—we do not for a minute accept the Washington definition of what is reasonable. Our mission is to serve our constituents and the American public who have the ultimate wisdom, who understand what is reasonable, who know what it is like to sit around a kitchen table and try to make ends meet, who know what it is to try and pay the tax man, who understand the notion not only of trying to pay the tax man and trying to take care of their many obligations but also who look for unlimited economic growth, who try time and again to deal with the impediments that this Government has placed upon them in trying to start a business, in trying to create jobs, people who are willing to see this economy grow if only the shackles are taken off and truly a free market is embraced.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. This sort of goes back to the discussion we were having in the last hour. While they continue to try and belittle Reaganomics, the facts are stubborn things. The economy grew at an unbelievable rate during the 1980's, in part because there was a commitment to lower taxes, to less regulation, and to smaller Government.

It was not complete, but we have the opportunity now to complete that revolution and really free up the free enterprise system, to free up the American people, because the Government does not create jobs, the Government does not create wealth. Businesses do. People do. We have got to allow them to have more control over their futures. That is what this is about.

I think it is important that we have this discussion, because I think there is a view out there perhaps that now we have been tempered now after a year, and that our basic goals and our basic mission and our basic visions of what ought to happen in Washington have