

Let me say a word about Federal employees today. I have not talked about them as much in past days. This is a home of the Federal Government. Of course, it follows that our largest employer is the Federal Government and, therefore, we have a disproportionate number of employers, about 60,000, who were forced to stay home on forced administrative leave. These are some of the most stable employees. We are trying hard to keep them.

Imagine what they might be thinking now: "At least if I lived in the suburbs, if they shut down the Federal Government, my vital services would still be available to me."

Please help us keep our tax-paying residents. If we have to shut down, give us an exception for D.C. employees. Let me say what has happened to these employees. The effect on them is simply intolerable. Because of the District's financial crisis, they have already given back 12 percent of their income to the city last year and took 6 furlough days. This year our unionized employees will give back 3 percent to the city and have 6 more furlough days. Would my colleagues like to tell folks like that that they might risk not getting their pay or that they probably will get their pay but they have to stay home and let backlogs of work build up?

What about my cops, the cops who are now working straight time, not overtime, on the weekends and at night? These sacrifices are being made by D.C. employees at a time when the American standard of living has been stable or going down for two decades. Front-line services, from trash collection to day-care centers that happen to be in libraries, were closed because libraries were closed.

There was a plethora of services that were closed for business, vital services, services that keep the residents alive and going. One of the most vital actions that was closed down, however, had to do with the multiyear plan which is due here in early February, the plan that is central to reviving the District. If we missed that deadline, there will be howls throughout this body.

Virtually all Members directly involved recognize that something has to be done, and I thank them all. I thank the Speaker for recognizing it and telling me that he thought something special should be done for the District if we shut down the Federal Government. I thank Mr. DAVIS for the hearing coming up and for his cosponsorship of my bill. The gentleman from New York, [Mr. WALSH], our subcommittee chairman, recognizes it as well. He is now with the President heading a bipartisan delegation, as he is in this House, Chair of Friends of Ireland. I applaud that. I have no objection to his going and applaud opportunities for Members to work together like this in a bipartisan line.

I hope he comes back not only as a friend of Ireland but as enough of a

friend of the District of Columbia so that we can guarantee that the city will not be closed down December 15.

BOSNIA POLICY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss our Bosnia policy. In the past 4 years, nearly 250,000 people have been killed in that war-torn region, 2 million people have become refugees. Atrocities have been committed that have truly shocked the world.

The region has been a tinder box for European instability for centuries. Thus the peace agreement agreed to by the Presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia in Dayton, OH is indeed an historic step toward bringing peace and ultimate stability to this region.

However, the deployment of over 20,000 United States troops to Bosnia to enforce the peace raises many questions. One lesson I have learned from history is that when Congress and the President are not at once with the American people, our Nation suffers. First, the Nation must be committed, and only then should we send troops. Sending troops to Bosnia without broader public consensus will prove to be a mistake.

The President's recent efforts to convince the American people fell short of achieving that public support. May I ask, why in this post-cold war era, when our U.S. citizenry has been clamoring for more defense-burden sharing by our allies, has the United States again been asked to assume the central role in resolving this situation, even convening the peace talks in Dayton, OH rather than on the European continent. The short-term cost of U.S. participation will equal \$2.6 billion.

This entire matter is a defining moment in U.S. foreign policy in that the United States is being asked to substitute for European resolve in this post-cold war era.

In the NATO nations of Europe, we have thousands of European trained, deployable troops that could be dispatched immediately to Bosnia in the event a final peace accord is signed in Paris. Let me read to you the list of European countries associated with NATO and the number of their combat ready troops. This does not even count their reserve forces:

In Belgium, 63,000 troops. In Denmark, 27,000 troops. In France, 409,000 troops. In Germany, 367,000 troops. In Greece, 159,300 troops. In Italy, 322,300 troops. In Luxembourg, 800 troops. In the Netherlands, 70,900 troops. In Norway, 33,500 troops. In Portugal, 50,700 troops. In Spain, 206,500 troops. In Turkey, 503,800 troops. In the United Kingdom, 254,300 troops, bringing the total NATO active forces to over 2½ million war-ready forces.

Identifying 20,000 ground troops from among these forces would represent

less than a 1-percent additional commitment for NATO's European partners to enforce the peace. Is that too much to ask of them? If the United States maintains our logistical and our air support.

The administration has stated that Europe, since 1914, has been unable to effectively maintain the peace and there was no other recourse but for the United States to assume the lead in bringing the warring factions to peaceful resolution. They have urged us not to become isolationists. The truth is, the long-term prospects for peace in this troubled region are very slim. Once the NATO troops withdraw, it will require 50 years of cooling off between the warring factions and maintenance of borders by external forces to give peace a chance. A 1-year quick fix is not going to do it.

Who will commit to that long-term maintenance of peace? And who will pay for it? Is it not time for NATO's European partners to measure up to their common defense? The United States, as a partner in NATO, has a role in logistical and air support, but we should not be sending ground troops to Bosnia. NATO in Europe is perfectly capable of doing that on its own, if it wished to.

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

[Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ON BOSNIA AND BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, although I am going to be speaking today primarily on the need to balance the budget for the American people, I would like to echo some of the sentiments that the gentlewoman from Ohio just stated before this House, all and all, to those that may be watching at home.

I just returned from a national security meeting where we had the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, coming and testifying before our committee one more time telling us why American troops need to be sent to Bosnia. Unfortunately, while we saw a lot of good charts and saw that General Shalikashvili obviously had done his homework and was going to try to carry this mission out in as impressive a way as possible, unfortunately, there was one question that was not answered over there. That question was,

why? Why are we sending young Americans to get involved in a 1,000-year-old civil war where everybody admits there will be bloodshed and young Americans will die? Why are we doing that?

□ 1545

Is there a vital American interest involved in the Bosnian civil war? Absolutely not, and that is something unfortunately that the administration has not been able to convey to the American people. They have not been able to make their case that getting involved in a three-way civil war halfway across the world is worth the death of young American men and young American women that would be sent to Bosnia.

The fact of the matter is that we in the post-Vietnam era have set up some basic requirements to make sure, to make sure, that before young Americans go to get involved in a war where there will be casualties, and everybody who has testified before the Committee on National Security admits there will be casualties in Bosnia, we set up a framework to make sure that we do not repeat the mistakes of Vietnam.

Remember what happened in Vietnam? The fighting did not just go on in the jungles of Vietnam halfway around the world. The fights went on in the streets of America, and the streets of the Capital, in the Halls of Congress, on college campuses across this country, and what did that do? That undercut American forces' ability to do what they needed to do to win the war in Vietnam. In fact, after the war North Vietnamese generals were quoted in the press as saying, "We knew we would never win the war militarily in Vietnam, we knew the Americans would continue to rout us in battle after battle after battle. But we knew one thing. If we kept fighting long enough, we would win the war on the streets of America and in the Halls of Congress."

So what happened? Young Americans, white and black, rich and poor, northern and southern, died in the jungles of Vietnam, and very little was accomplished when the Americans retreated and pulled out of Vietnam.

So in 1980, in the mid-1980's, we came up with a doctrine and said, "Before we send Americans, we're going to have a few requirements. The first requirement is that there is a vital American interest involved in that war." And that is important because, when you are the President of the United States, and you have to pick up the phone and tell a mother and a father that their 18-year-old boy or girl has just died on foreign soil, away from home and away from their country, you better have a good reason, you better be able to explain to them that their son or daughter died for the best interests of the United States of America, and that is that vital American interest that we are all clamoring about, that we are all asking for: What is the vital American interest?

Quite frankly there is none, and the administration in the beginning said that it was because it would look bad to our NATO allies. Mr. Speaker, that is no reason to send Americans off to die. The fact of the matter is the United States is and has been NATO for the past generation. We have protected our NATO allies from the threat of communism, we have provided them with troops, we have provided them with protection, we have gone beyond the call of duty to NATO. Just because we do not get involved in a European civil war that has been going on for almost a thousand years does not mean that we will be traitors to NATO and NATO will kick us out.

The fact of the matter is we are the lone superpower in this world, the lone superpower on the world stage. So that is the first straw man. Second straw man is that this war will somehow explode beyond the borders of Bosnia. Well, in all the testimony we have heard before the Committee on National Security that is also a straw man that has been set up and knocked down. It is just not the case, and a few weeks ago in Philadelphia the Secretary of Defense admitted that this may not be a war in which a vital American interest is at stake. But then they started backtracking, and Time magazine quoted several sources that started saying maybe we do not even need a vital American interest in this post-cold-war world, maybe we can go ahead and send our volunteer troops to die in Bosnia.

Let me tell you that is just—it is sickening to think that we have people here that are willing to allow young Americans to die abroad for an interest that is not even our own.

Certainly it is horrible to see what is going on in Bosnia. I was watching a newscast a few months back, and there was a 7-year-old boy that had literally been blown off his bicycle, and they had him on a stretcher, and he was screaming, "Please don't cut off my leg, please don't cut off my leg," and the news reporter came on and said they did not cut off the young boy's leg, but he died 2 hours later.

Now I have a 7-year-old boy myself, and that touched me, it tore me up, and I thought we have got to do something about it, we have got to stop the killing in Bosnia. There has to be something we can do. We need to send American troops over there.

But then I backed up and started thinking about it and started thinking about the fact that we had said the same thing in Somalia, and what happened? We sent troops over to Somalia, but it was not Somalians 2 months after we sent our troops in dying on TV screens. It was young American GI's who had been beaten, and tortured, and burned, and drug through the streets of Mogadishu.

And what happened? This same emotional impulse that pulled America into the civil war in Mogadishu pulled them back out, and the same emo-

tional response that this administration is feeling right now when we see Bosnians dying on the TV screen, that will cause American troops to be pulled over into the middle of that conflict, it will also pull them back because it would not be Bosnians that we see dying on our TV sets 2 months from now or 3 months from now, it will be Americans, and make no mistake of it. General Shalikashvili just today, 30 minutes ago, testified before our committee that we need to expect casualties, young Americans will die.

And let us personalize this because I have heard a lot of talk from a lot of people over these past few weeks saying, well, it is a volunteer force, it is a volunteer army, they signed up for it, they should not be afraid to go and fight. It is our military, we spend money on our military, they should be willing to go and fight.

Let us make no mistake about it. It is not just a faceless military man or woman that is going to die if we go to Bosnia. It is going to be somebody's son, it is going to be somebody's daughter, or it is going to be a father or mother or somebody. In the class of my 7-year-old boy, he has several friends whose fathers are in the military who are waiting to be called and may be going over to Bosnia, and on December 15 or December 16, when we are all planning for Christmas, and when hopefully I will be able to go home and be with my family, and we can prepare for Christmastime, they are going to be saying goodbye to their fathers, they are going to be saying goodbye to their mothers, they are going to be parents who are going to be crying and kissing their young men and women, their sons and daughters, going to be kissing them goodbye, knowing that they are not going to see them Christmas morning.

And the question we have to ask is why. What is the vital American interest that we have that is worth sending Americans to get involved in a three-way civil war that will certainly end in conflict and will end in Americans' deaths? And I am not saying that we, as Americans, need to be isolationists. I am not an isolationist. There are vital American interests that need to be protected across the globe. But in this case we are not going to be able to make a difference.

Fact of the matter is this civil war has been raging for centuries, and it was brought home in testimony before the Committee on National Security by a general of the United Nations who came to us and said, "I want you Americans to understand what you are about to get involved in." He said to us that he was a monitor for the human rights abuses that went on, and, monitoring those abuses, he said, one morning he had to go out and survey a situation where the Serbs had slaughtered young and old Muslims, and as he saw the young victims and the elderly victims in the ditches of Bosnia, he was surveying the scene and through how horrendous it was.

And a Serb came up to him, and he said, "It serves them right," and the general turned around and said, "It serves them right for what?"

And the Serb responded, "It serves them right for what they did to us 600 years ago."

Then the general paused, and he said to us, "And you Americans believes that you are going to be able to end a thousand-year-old civil war that you do not even understand in 1 year and with one division." He laughed. He said it was not doable.

And the fact of the matter is we have a bipartisan group in the U.S. Congress that is urging the President to please hold back and not send troops until he gets the support of this Congress. The last speaker that was just up was a Democrat. I would guess she votes with the President 80 to 90 percent of the time. But she and several others of her colleagues on the Democratic side realize that this is a war that we cannot win.

This is a situation where young Americans will be sacrificed, and when the press turns bad, and the body bags start coming home, and inside those body bags will be the sons and daughters of Americans, when those body bags start coming home, we will have an emotional response, and we will quickly yank those troops out, and for what? I say today for absolutely nothing. We know we cannot bring about a peace to a country that has been fighting a three-sided civil war for a thousand years, and it is sheer folly and idealism to believe today that we can do that.

Also another important thing we have to take into consideration is public support of a mission. You know then Secretary of Defense Cap Weinberger talked about how the lack of overwhelming public support torpedoed our efforts in Vietnam. It was about a 50-50 split, if I am not mistaken, over having troops in Vietnam. We are not even at 50 percent today. The overwhelming majority of Americans from some of the polls that I have seen recently oppose sending troops to Bosnia.

□ 1600

So what is going to happen? If they are already thinking that right now, what is going to happen a month from now, or 2 months from now, or 6 months from now, when young Americans are killed and taken, paraded through the streets of Bosnia and brought back in body bags? What is going to happen?

Chances are good that we will see what happened in Vietnam. Fighting will erupt in Congress, demonstrations will occur in the streets of America, and we will have a President responding once again based on emotion rather than based on solid, hard military principles.

I have to say again, following up from what the previous speaker said, we should not send troops to Bosnia until the President can convince the

overwhelming number of Americans from coast to coast that not only do we have a vital American interest getting involved in a 1,000-year-old civil war, but that interest is so essential to this country that it would damage America directly if we did not send those troops. Those are the questions that the President is going to have to answer.

Outside of Bosnia, we have other issues that are involved, issues that are every bit as important, and every bit as important to where we go as a country in the 21st century. For too long in this Congress we have had Members on both sides of the aisle willing to spend this country deeper and deeper and deeper into debt. Today we are \$4.9 trillion in debt.

I spoke of my two boys, my 7-year-old and my 4-year-old. The fact of the matter is both of those boys are \$20,000 in debt, as are all of you, and everybody who is watching owes \$20,000, if you divide the \$4.9 trillion that we owe. It also means that every child born today will have to pay \$175,000 in taxes over their lifetime just to pay the interest on the Federal debt, just to pay the interest, \$175,000.

When we talk about \$4.9 trillion, a lot of people's eyes glaze over. My eyes glaze over. We cannot really begin to fathom how much \$4.9 trillion is, but I want you to consider this. Think about this for a second. Starting with the day that Jesus Christ was crucified, if you made \$1 million a day from the day that Jesus hung on the cross to today, made \$1 million a day over those almost 2,000 years, you could not pay off the national debt that the United States of America now has. Can you fathom that? Do you know, you would have to go through seven more time periods making \$1 million a day over seven more time periods, just to pay off the national debt that we owe today?

That is absolutely incredible. Yet, we still have people in this Chamber and in the media and across the United States of America that say, "Maybe it does not matter whether we balance the budget sooner or later." That astounds me. That absolutely astounds me, because let me tell you what is going on here. Let us brush aside all the political rhetoric that you have heard, let us brush aside what the Republicans tell you, what the Democrats tell you, what independent demagogues tell you. Let us just look at the facts.

The fact of the matter is that this is how it works in Washington, DC. One year ago when I was a citizen sitting on my couch in Pensacola, FL, never being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives or to any other position, I had never run for office until a year ago, but the simple fact is this; this is what is happening in the House of Representatives and in the Senate and in the White House: We are stealing money from our children and our grandchildren's pockets to pay off special interests on this bill or that bill, paying out money that we as a Federal Government are not even constitutionally empowered to pay out.

Whatever happened to the words of Thomas Jefferson in our deliberations, where Jefferson said "that the government that governs least governs best?" Why have we forgotten the words of the 10th amendment that says:

All powers not specifically given to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the citizens?

And we certainly have forgotten the words of James Madison, one of the Framers of the Constitution, who said:

We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, control ourselves, and sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.

Yet, today we have a Federal Government that has ignored these pleas of our Founding Fathers on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue. They have continued to spend more, they have continued to overregulate, they have continued to punish people for daring to be productive. They have continued to let Federal bureaucracies explode.

This House has continued to allow the Federal Government to step in and tell us how to educate our children and how to protect our communities. It just makes absolutely no sense, but this Congress, after a generation, after 40 years of not being able to balance its budget, this Congress finally passed a Balanced Budget Act for the first time in a generation. What does it do? It makes sure that this Congress does exactly what Americans are required to do by law. That is, spend only as much money as we take in.

Right now, even though given the fact that we are \$4.9 trillion in debt, we as a government this past year spent \$4 for every \$3 that we take in. What happened at the White House when the real crisis came, and we refused to raise the debt ceiling in Congress until the White House committed to balancing the budget, where they simply went in and raided the trust funds of our Federal employees, simply decided that they would go in when it suited them to raid the trust fund of Social Security recipients and to raid the trust funds of Medicare?

Let me ask this, as a rhetorical question. If you were running a business and you were spending \$4 for every \$3 that your company took in, and you piled up such a massive debt that you decided to raid your employees' retirement funds, what would happen to you? You would be sent to jail. But what has happened in Washington, DC? We have reelected these people for years and years and years.

Up until 1994, when 72 freshmen who campaigned on balancing the budget came to Washington, and we told the Speaker of the House, we told the majority leader, we told the President of the United States, we told everybody who listened that we as a freshman class were going to draw a line in the sand and not allow this Federal Government to continue its runaway deficit spending, that we were going to say

no to higher debts, we were going to say no to higher taxes, we were going to say no to more regulation, we were going to say no for punishing people for daring to be productive, and that we were finally, as a principle, going to stop stealing money from our children and our grandchildren, and it has worked.

We passed the first Balanced Budget Act in a generation's time, but what have we heard? What have we heard from the media? You would think that all of America would rejoice, that the media would come out and say, "Good job, guys." Some have, but unfortunately two many have listened to the scare tactics from the liberals and have listened when they told them that we have massively cut all these programs.

You heard about the massive cuts in Medicare, you heard about the massive cuts in student loans, you heard about the massive cuts in the earned income tax credit, you heard about all these massive cuts in education and environment. I guess as a freshman I did not understand how it worked in Washington, DC, but I figured it out. I am not too good at math, but there is some new math going around in Washington, DC. You see, a spending increase is actually now called a spending cut. I say that because you hear how we are slashing all these programs. You have heard about the draconian cuts, but let us talk real numbers. If you want the budget, call your Congressman or Congresswoman and they will send it to you.

These are the real numbers. Under the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 that the Republicans passed, spending on the following programs will increase. In the school lunch program that we heard that we savaged, spending increases 37 percent, from \$4.5 billion to \$6.17 billion at the end of our plan.

Under the earned income tax credit, spending increases 28 percent.

In student loans, and how many of us have heard that student loans are going to be cut, in student loans spending increases 48.5 percent, and it increases from \$19.8 billion to \$25.4 billion in student loans.

Why is the White House angry? Why are the liberals angry? Because we actually want to keep the power in the communities, so students who want to go to college do not have to kowtow to a Federal bureaucracy in Washington, DC, to get student loans. That is what the Clinton administration wants.

They actually want, and they are arguing against history here, they actually wanted to consolidate power in Washington, DC, so if you are a student who wants a student loan you have to come to Washington, to the Department of Education bureaucracy here, and crawl on your hands and knees for a loan instead of getting it in your local community.

Despite the fact that we are spending about 50 percent more under our plan for student loans, they still characterize that as a cut.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I think in our effort to balance the budget, we see some honest differences on what money should be spent in education between the States and the Federal Government. I know, as a Member of Congress from Kansas, that our State constitution does have a requirement to educate the children in that State. We have a State board of education, and through State funding it provides 94 percent of the funding requirements and the needs of the children to get a public education for Kansas. So where does the authority come to override that constitution in the State of Kansas?

There are some things we could do, I think, as niceties, and providing student loans is one I advocate. I was able to go through college on student loans, as was my wife, and I am glad to see we are supporting student loans in a strong fashion. But to say that kids will not be educated if the Federal Government does not take that role is somewhat misleading. I think it is a violation of the 10th amendment; where States can provide that need, I think we should allow them to provide it.

In your home State of Florida, I know they have a magnificently large building that would house the Department of Education or whatever it is termed in Florida; and again, they have plenty of requirements there to meet the needs of the children in Florida.

So I guess what I am saying is that there is an honest difference when it comes to Federal spending for education that we have with the liberals. We think that the States have that responsibility through their constitutions, and I am unable to find that requirement in the Federal Constitution that I have sworn to uphold.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I would say to the gentleman, the fact of the matter is he mentioned the 10th amendment. All powers not specifically given to the Federal Government and in the Constitution are reserved to the States and the citizens. Read the Constitution of the United States. There is no mention of a Federal role in having an education bureaucracy to micromanage education at the State and local level.

Then read the constitutions of all 50 States. Did you know all 50 State constitutions have contained in them provisions for the States controlling education? That is why, as you know, I have introduced a bill that 120 people have cosponsored, including most of our leadership, I think all of our leadership, to abolish the Department of Education bureaucracy and send all those education dollars back home, send them back to the communities. So instead of a bureaucrat in Washington, DC, educating my children and your children, we will have parents, teach-

ers, principals, school boards, and communities empowered to make choices about education, because our Founding Fathers envisioned this country as being a nation of communities and a nation of families and a Nation of individuals who could be empowered to control their own life, and not have those decisions made by a highly centralized Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. TIAHRT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, going back to Kansas again, we do have recent legislation that addressed the concern that Kansas had that their students were not getting the quality of education that they would like. If they looked at test scores, there was a degradation in test scores, and they passed measures called quality performance accreditation, QPA. It has been very volatile, very controversial, but it was in fact duplicative of what is going on with American Goals 2000.

□ 1615

So now we have a Federal entity in the Department of Education, as I join with the gentleman to abolish, duplicating the effort of the State board of education in Kansas and duplicating paperwork, duplicating effort, duplicating, all under the guise of getting a world-class education for our students. So I think that we are struggling at the State level trying to provide the quality of education that we need, and we really do not need big brother Government looking over our shoulder asking for twice the amount of paperwork.

We have spent hundreds of millions, close to billions of dollars here in Washington, DC, in the Department of Education and not educated one child. I think it is a little unique that we have wasted so much money when our goal is to provide a world-class education for our students.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues some interesting facts that people do not understand about the Department of Education is that it was just recently created. A lot of people said to me, what in the world will we do without a Federal Department of Education bureaucracy? I said, we will do what we did for the first 203 years of this constitutional Republic. We will allow parents, teachers, principals, school boards, and communities to make decisions on how to best educate their children.

It was not until 1979, when Jimmy Carter struck a deal with the National Education Association, that we even had a Federal Department of Education bureaucracy. Since that time, spending has gone from \$14 billion to \$33 billion, while test scores have plummeted. That is \$33 billion in education money that is being drained, literally drained out of the education programs at the local level and brought up to Washington, DC, and for what?

The fact of the matter is the Department of Education only gives States 6 percent of their funding for education, and yet they give them over 55 percent of their paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my colleagues watch "Baywatch." I do not watch "Baywatch," but I know what it is about. Did you know that your money, your Department of Education money goes into an educational program to provide closed caption for the hearing impaired for "Baywatch"?

Did you also know that the Department of Education said that they had to slash \$100 million this year from the education budget in money that was to go to keep schools safe, to stop roofs from caving in, to make sure that children had a good learning environment and safe learning environment? While they slashed and chopped \$100 million from that upkeep, that building upkeep program, they added \$20 million to upgrade their own bureaucracy building here in Washington, DC.

So they are literally taking our education dollars, robbing money from our school children to build their bureaucracy here in Washington, DC, and that is not what people in my community think is a wise investment for education dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague that I did not realize that there was any educational or intrinsic educational value to "Baywatch." I have never seen the program myself. As you, I have heard that it is not worth watching.

Be that as it may, I think it is ironic that we spend this money here that has no educational value as far as fully teaching children, which is where the rubber meets the road. This goes back to the overall picture, why are we spending money in certain portions of our Government that have no constitutional authority, that have no apparent success, and there is no correlation between the spending of additional funding and the quality of education?

Much of what has occurred in the past in the educational realm has not been related. I mean, if you track it on a graph, how much money has increased, and test scores, as they have either held stable or increased or decreased, there has been no correlation between spending more money. So we have not really addressed the problem, the problem of seeing that our children have a better education.

So, again, we are going back to these attempts to balance the budget. Why should we waste money on funding areas that are not effective and that have no constitutional background?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. We need to ask that constitutional question. We need to hold everything that we pass up and see how it does in the light of the 10th amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let me in the remaining minutes that we have discuss some things about Medicare. Because, again, talking about the big lie that has been promulgated and all of these other issues that we are gutting funding for, all of these other things when, in fact,

we are increasing funding, the same thing occurs in Medicare where we hear the President saying that he is going to shut down the Federal Government because our plan cuts too much in Medicare.

Well, the fact of the matter is that the President of the United States himself came out with a report with the Medicare trustees, with three people in his own Cabinet telling us that Medicare was going bankrupt and we needed to reform it, and we dared to step forward and reform it. And yet, remember when the Government shut down, the President said, I will not allow them to slash Medicare benefits. Well, it ended up that it was a sham. His plan was just like ours.

If I could read a few quotes from The Washington Post. Now, mind you, the Washington Post has not been a Republican ally, but they have been very straightforward and fair, and this was written actually by Matthew Miller, who is a former administration budget official for Bill Clinton.

Mr. Miller wrote in the Washington Post last weekend:

Though many of the President's advisors think the Republican premium proposal plan on Medicare is sensible and that it differs very little from the President's own plan, the President fired sound bites from the Oval Office daily, taking the low road in ways that only Washington pundits can recast as standing tall.

Also on Medicare, the Washington Post wrote on November 15, 1995:

The Democrats have been prospecting harder for votes among the elderly and against the Republican proposal than they have for the savings to bring the deficit down.

Finally, on November 16, in what I believe is one of the most important editorials that has been written this year, the Washington Post wrote that "The budget deficit is a central problem of the Federal Government and one from which many difficult problems flow.

"Bill Clinton," again, this is the Washington Post, not me, "Bill Clinton and the congressional Democrats were handed an unusual chance this year to deal constructively with the effect of Medicare on the deficit, and they blew it. The chance came in the form of a congressional Republican plan to balance the budget over 7 years.

"Some other aspects of that plan deserve to be resisted, but the Republican proposal to get at the deficit, partly by confronting the cost of Medicare, deserved support. The Democrats, led by the President, chose instead to present themselves as Medicare's great protectors."

Again, this is the Washington Post. "They have shamelessly," and this is what they say, "They have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it, because they think that is where the votes are and the way to derail the Republican proposals generally.

"The President was still doing it this week. A Republican proposal to increase Medicare premiums was one of

the reasons the President alleged for the veto that shut down the government, but never mind the fact that the President himself, in his own budget, would count it as a similar increase.

"We have said it before, but it gets more serious. If the Democrats play the Medicare card and win, they will have set back for years, for the worst of political reasons, the very cause of rational government in behalf of which they profess to be behaving."

Again, I want to show my colleague, just so no one will think I wrote this, this is the Washington Post saying that Democrats have shamelessly demagogued on this issue and have tried to scare senior citizens into believing that the President is the protector, when his plan is just like our plan.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, Medicare, just in a short review of the 1960's BlueCross/BlueShield plan that was put in place 30 years ago, the medical industry has progressed some considerable amount, and yet BlueCross/Blue Shield in this Medicare Program has been stagnated, frozen in time. So what we are proposing to do is not cut Medicare at all. In fact, the average payment per beneficiary goes from \$4,800 per recipient this year to \$6,700 per recipient in the year 2000, with more recipients.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield, actually, they have redone the numbers, and it actually goes from \$6,700 up to \$7,100 per Medicare recipient. We go from spending \$900 billion on the program this year to \$1.7 trillion on Medicare in the year 2002. Now even in the schoolrooms that I went to that is considered a spending increase.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I think if we could talk to someone in elementary school and showed them a basket that had 47 baseballs in it and a basket that had 71 baseballs in it and ask them which one has more, everyone would realize that there is more in the basket with 71.

That is kind of a simplistic example, but there are no cuts to Medicare. There is a reduction in projected growth, but, good grief, it was growing at 11 percent per year. Medical inflation is growing at about 4 to 5 percent per year. Something needs to be done.

I think the plan that we have before us that the Republican Party has come forward with, the Republican Conference, is a good plan, because it not only preserves and protects Medicare, but it also gives options, it empowers individuals, seniors. They can choose alternate plans or they can stay in Medicare, as they choose. I think it is still within the realm of balancing the budget. We have been able to preserve and protect Medicare and provide some options.

I do not know how much time we have here, but I do want to say before we close, talk about some of the recent agreements that have been signed in a continuing resolution as far as making

a commitment to balance the budget by 2002.

Briefly, most of America knows that for a long, long time, a man or a woman's word was their bond. Well, my grandfather bought cattle and bought grain. His word was his bond. He would return some day later and pay cash for it. When my father purchased farm equipment, his word was his bond. My father-in-law taught me many lessons about honest and integrity. His word was his bond.

Yet we have just recently signed a agreement on November 20, 1995. The President signed a continuing resolution that said this:

The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002.

Now, the first session of the 104th Congress ends on December 31, so we do not have a whole lot of time to do this.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Does it say Congress and the President "shall" or "may"?

Mr. TIAHRT. It says the President and the Congress shall.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. So it is required by law. The President is required by law.

Mr. TIAHRT. Required by law to enact legislation to balance the budget by fiscal year 2002.

I want to quote something that was reported on the Fox Morning News on November 28. It was in the White House Bulletin on November 28 and in the Associated Press on November 28. This is quoting White House Secretary Mike McCurry when he was asked whether the White House would prefer to put off the larger budget debate until after next year's election and operate the Government on a continuing resolution, and here is what he said. "There are big differences between the President and Congress." That is a true statement.

He continues by saying, "and I suspect that those kinds of issues will have to be settled in November 1996. But, in the meantime, we can avert the crisis, avert the shutdown, get on with the orderly business and have our debate next year during the national election campaigns when we should, as Americans, have that kind of debate."

I would put to Mr. McCurry and the American public that this was a signed agreement. This is not something that is debatable. This has the power of law.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the next day Presidential Spokesman McCurry said, "I think they will get a compromise that everyone will agree needs to really be a placeholder until we have a national election. Pragmatically, that is what is going to happen anyhow."

So the gentleman is correct. It astounds me that this White House can waffle the way it does. Remember Leon Panetta saying the day after they signed this law, "The President and Congress shall by law enact a balanced

budget to save future generations in 7 years." The day after, 24 hours after that, Leon Panetta had the audacity to go on national TV, being smug, and say, "Well, maybe 7, maybe 8; we really do not know."

Now, this is the same Leon Panetta that said, Congress is holding a gun to the President's head. He called us terrorists right after the terrorist attack in Israel.

□ 1630

This is the same Leon Panetta who said we were being terrorists for attaching something to the continuing resolution requiring the President to balance the budget. This same Leon Panetta did the same exact thing when he was sitting on that side of the aisle in this House of Representatives and did it to two different Republican administrations.

These people feel so free to use the English language any way they want to use it to try to get around the fact that we must balance the budget for the sake of our children. And they think they are cute playing these semantics games.

Well, we are \$5 trillion in debt. My children and your children and their children are \$20,000 in debt apiece. My children and your children and their children will spend over \$150,000 in their lifetimes just to service interest on the debt.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Will the gentleman kindly yield?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. My children, your children and their children are the ones who this Congress has been stealing money from for the past 40 years and the past generation and the time has come to say enough is enough.

I see the gentleman from Hawaii is asking for time. We have to close right now. I will say this, though. I am looking forward to working with the gentleman from Hawaii who yesterday appeared to say that we did not go far enough and we actually needed to find another trillion dollars, and I would welcome the gentleman's help in figuring out a way to get Social Security off budget and find a way for us to go that final step, to find the additional trillion dollars to do what we need to do.

But I have got to tell you this: If we are \$1 trillion short, then the President of the United States is \$1.85 trillion short.

I look forward to working with the gentleman. I certainly look forward to working with the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DORNAN. Would the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Unfortunately I believe we are out of time.

Mr. DORNAN. I just wanted to say that I am going to do an hour special order later on Bosnia. I will not have to say it now.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. Unfortunately, we are going to have to wrap this up. I thank

the gentleman from Kansas for helping us out.

I ask Republicans and Democrats alike on both sides of the aisle to dare to make a difference.

Bobby Kennedy, a Democrat, said the future belongs to those who dare to make a difference.

I got a letter from a constituent in Pensacola, FL, thanking Congress for daring to make a difference and going where this Congress has failed to go for the past 40 years.

He said a South African missionary once wrote to David Livingstone, "Have you found a good road to where you are? We want to know how to send some men to join you."

The missionary wrote back, "If you have men who will come only if they know there is a good road, I don't want them. I want those who will come if there is no road."

For 40 years this Congress provided no road to balance the budget. For 40 years this Congress shamelessly stole money from future generations to pay off their political interests, and for 40 years this Congress did not have the guts to do what we have done as middle-class Americans for the past 40 years, and that is to balance our budget and to spend only as much money as we have.

Well, we have made the difference now. I ask people on both sides of the aisle to come forward and dare to make a difference, and stop trying to scare senior citizens. Follow what the Washington Post tells you to do: Save Medicare, balance the budget, pass true welfare reform, and ensure that our future generations will have a lifestyle in America that is even better than our own.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I will try not to use the entire 60 minutes, but I do appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues about the budget.

As I am sure that most of us can tell from listening to the debate on the House floor, the biggest issue right now is the budget which is being negotiated between the President, the White House, and Congress, both the Senate and the House, and over the next couple of weeks or so hopefully decisions will be made so that there can be a compromise worked out between the Republican leadership budget which passed the House and the Senate about a week ago and the priorities that have been articulated by President Clinton and most of the Democrats in Congress.

The chief concern of myself as well as most of the Democrats is the fact that the Republican budget as passed essentially cuts Medicare and Medicaid by