

Our resolution does two things: It reasserts Congress constitutional authority in regard to the purse strings of this Nation, and it also asks the Comptroller General of the United States to report back to the Congress within 7 days on how our tax dollars are being used.

Four men in this Congress and one in the White House do not a republic make. Our bipartisan resolution speaks on behalf of the vast majority of American taxpayers who have clearly said to us that they do not want their money put at risk to ensure a foreign nation nor its creditors.

We were told NAFTA would not result in a great sucking sound. Well, it has not only resulted in a sucking sound of jobs, but now also our taxpayer dollars. To the unilateral actions of the administration in concert with four men here in the Congress, the American people have been denied their just voice on such a consequential matter.

Our Government is not a monarchy. It is not a parliament. We are not here to approve what the Executive does. This legislative branch has equal powers in the law.

Let me read you two sections of the U.S. Constitution which pertain to the powers of Congress in this regard; under article I, section 9, the Constitution states, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." And under article I, section 8, the Constitution states, "Congress has the power," and I underline Congress, "to pay the debts and provide for the general welfare of the United States, to borrow money on the credit of the United States, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin."

As is evident in this reading, the administration's recent decision to extend United States taxpayer funds to the Mexican Government and its Wall Street creditors without a vote of Congress is a direct violation of the spirit and letter of our United States Constitution. Where in the Constitution does it say that the executive branch has the sole power to create new money and use that money to fund a multibillion-dollar back door foreign aid program for Mexico without the approval of this Congress? Where in the Constitution does it give the executive power to make U.S. taxpayers liable for the mistakes and machinations of a foreign government and its rich U.S. speculators from the United States who went south in search of quick profits?

Today vote for House Resolution 57. Reassert Congress' proper duty and obligation.

□ 1015

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET DOA,
DEVOID OF ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, when Democrats controlled this Chamber and Republicans were in the White House, the budgets submitted by Republican Presidents were always considered DOA, dead on arrival.

Well, we Republicans who are now in the majority will not follow that tradition. We will take a good, hard look at what the President proposes, and where we find common ground, we will work with him. But it is clear that the President's budget is not nearly as aggressive as it should be in reducing the size and the power of the Federal Government.

The few cuts that are there are half-hearted, and spending is still going up too rapidly. In fact, this budget calls for a \$50 billion increase in spending from the current budget.

So much for leadership. The Wall Street Journal reported that the budget "makes little further progress in reducing the deficit." So much for leadership.

The paper reports that the President's game plan is to let Republicans make the hard decisions. This is not Presidential leadership; it is Presidential abdication.

You know, come to think of it, maybe the President's budget is DOA. But that is not dead on arrival, that is devoid of accountability.

THE \$50,000 TAX DEDUCTIBLE
DINNERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well to speak about something that troubles me a lot. I spent 3 years of my life, and I must say they were miserable years, studying the Tax Code when I was in law school. And the one thing that was very clear in our Tax Code was you did not get a charitable deduction for political donations. If you gave to charity, fine, you got a charitable deduction. But if you gave to politics, you did not get one.

I think most of us as Americans think that that is the way it should be. But we are in interesting times, very interesting times. We have a new Speaker who has found ways to stretch these things, and tonight we have a very interesting occasion going on, showing how these bright lines are being blurred more and more.

If you saw the Chicago Tribune today, they are mentioning the Speak-

er's dinner tonight, which will cost \$50,000 a plate—\$50,000 a plate. But unlike a normal political contribution, \$19,800 will be tax deductible.

Now, what is this dinner about and how do you get the tax deduction? Well, you get the tax deduction because they are saying it goes to a non-profit organization. But that organization happens to be the Speaker's television network called National Empowerment Television. And what is it? It does not even pretend to have balance. It does not even pretend to present both sides. It presents NEWT's views 24 hours a day. I do not think NEWT's views qualifies as news all the time, and I do not think that is what the Tax Code was meant to back.

So you see, now really an indirect taxpayer subsidy is going to this television thing that is absolutely nothing but broadcasts of whatever they want to put on. That looks terribly political, and I think is terribly political.

At the very same time you see them taking on public television, which is a different kind of direct subsidy which does attempt to be balanced and does let everybody on.

Now, is it not interesting? While you hear they don't want taxpayer subsidies of that, they are perfectly willing to craft these dinners that only let in people from a certain strata of society. Believe me, to pay \$50,000 for a dinner you have got to come from a lot wealthier background than I do in my district. You get a House for \$50,000. Nobody would ever think of paying \$50,000 for a dinner.

Also think about if you are an average tipper like I am and you did a 20-percent tip. A tip on that \$50,000 dinner would equal what the average minimum wage earner earns in a year. Just think, one tip on one dinner, one night, equals what a minimum wage earner makes for a year.

I mean, what is going on here? This is one of the things that many of us on this side are very troubled about. I was pleased to see that Time magazine is also getting troubled about it. Time magazine has an excellent article this week called "Newt, Inc." I hope everybody reads it, because it lays out many of the interesting ways the Speaker has been able to spread his tentacles out to control all these different ways of access to public information, shut off those who are not with him, find novel ways for people to be able to deduct it, and really march forward.

That does not look like the democracy I knew. The democracy I knew was one where everybody had an equal weighted voice and everybody's vote counted equally. I just do not see why we should be doing taxpayer subsidies of this type of occasion, and I do not see how in the world you can ever pretend that everybody's voice is going to be weighted equally, if you cannot get access to the TV stations that the taxpayers indirectly subsidize, nor can you buy the ticket to the dinner which