

Now, many have accused those positions that come through the Houstons works program and come through funding through the Department of Labor as being baby-sitting positions.

Well, let me tell my colleagues what it does for high school students who have never been exposed to the work world. It gives them a challenge. It gives them income in many instances to provide for their parents who need to have extra income to make ends meet, it helps expose them to career opportunities, and yes, it sometimes provides them with the simple things like food, clothing, and the opportunity to go back to school in the fall. Yet, because of cuts in programs that have been constructive all over the Nation, job training programs and summer work programs, of which I am a product of, we will have a crisis in the summer of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, this crisis can be avoided if we take a moment to look at this budget reconciliation package and acknowledge that it is the absolutely wrong direction to take this country. We are remembering the 1981 tax cuts of which this \$270 billion will be used, and let me say to those who are making under \$50,000 and may have two or more children, you will not see any tax cut, for they have cut sizably the earned income tax credit.

Many of our citizens who consider themselves middle income and make \$28,000, they will not receive that benefit, and they have cut the earned income tax credit that has been really a support system and a reward system for those working individuals making under \$50,000. We will not get that with the \$270 billion in Medicare cuts that are supposed to be for tax cuts for those making over \$300,000.

So my point is, let us not hold this Nation, Americans, hostage on this issue of the debt ceiling. It is time to extend it so that we do not go into default, and that we acknowledge that we have a responsibility worldwide to keep this country's system, economic system stable, so that real discussions can be had: Do we want to cut student loans. I mean, frankly, do we want to do that. Do we not want to look reasonably at the Medicare cuts to ensure that Medicare is stable for those of you who are now working Americans, but yet not burden the elderly Americans who would have to pay the higher premiums, and do we want you today to have higher mortgage payments and car payments because we are not frankly dealing with the American people.

Lift the debt ceiling for a while, let us have a budget reconciliation package that really responds to the American public, all of us, some 73 percent who want this country to work.

AGREE TO DISAGREE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great things about this Nation is the fact that we can come here and agree to disagree, the fact that we are free to have a variety of different opinions.

The gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] who preceded me in the well has some very definite opinions that differ from mine, as is her right, and really, there is so much information that begs a response that I just think it is appropriate to point out a couple of things.

No. 1, with reference to first amendment rights of freedom of expression, this is what the Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech."

Nowhere in the Constitution of the United States does it state that the Congress will subsidize with American tax dollars someone's right to politically organize. Mr. Speaker, it is not really free speech when you and I are required with our tax dollars to pay for it, point No. 1.

Point No. 2, with reference to the comments of my friend from Indiana, I find it incredibly shocking that a public housing project would be involved in what amounts to a senior shake-down. The language needs to be repeated, because it needs to be amplified. All tenants are asked to become members of the National Council of Senior Citizens, NCSC. That in itself would not be so bad, a simple request. Of course, the American people need to know that over 95 percent of the funding for the NCSC comes from you and I and other taxpayers. But still, that money is not enough. There has to be more that comes from seniors.

There are many reasons for joining NCSC. First of all, you have the privilege of living in these beautiful buildings protected with security and free from financial worries of high rent and big raises which people are forced to pay in privately owned apartments. The NCSC is a well-known and powerful national organization with political clout in Washington. To carry on, the organization needs money for these worthwhile projects, such as lobbying and letter writing which takes paper, stamps, envelopes, and hard work. Dues are payable the first of June.

Now, certainly, Mr. Speaker, every organization has a right to ask for membership, but is it the role of the Federal Government of the United States to step in with taxpayer dollars and be a party to what in essence is a letter that I believe tries to intimidate seniors involved in the shakedown.

It was interesting, too, to listen to some of the rhetoric that is brought forth to the well of this House. My good friend from Texas just talked about cuts. Again, my friends on the liberal side of this House fail to understand simple mathematics. When expenditures are increased, there are no cuts. Average spending for a Medicare recipient will rise from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 in the year 2002. That is an increase of 45 percent per beneficiary.

Yet, in the twisted mathematics of Washington, replete with Orwellian news speak, people come to the floor of this House time and time again to talk about cuts.

The gentlewoman said we were holding the American people hostage with reference to making a decision to finally balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, if we do not face economic facts, we will continue to hold future generations of Americans hostage. If we fail to answer this clarion call to action, we will be acting without any responsibility or regard for the real work at hand. Make no mistake, this talk of cut is absolute fiction. This is absolutely false. We are restraining the rate of growth in government; we are not making cuts. That is patently true.

The fact is that we are moving now to save the very programs that folks claim are being sacrificed, to save the very programs that will work for this generation of seniors and to provide the framework to continue those programs on. That is the absolute fact in front of the American people.

In this debate, let people of goodwill with disagreements come to this floor and indeed, write their Congress people, but let them do it without tax dollars, without the largesse of the hard-working men and women of America, because face it, friends, one of the big truths is this: Money does not emanate from the government, it comes from you and me, from working and paying our tax dollars. That supplies the money, and we should be held accountable for the way in which that is spent.

Now, absolutely good people can disagree, and I would champion the right of my friend from Texas to disagree with me, as she often does. But let us level with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue this at a later time. The debate goes on.

HOLD THE CHILDREN HARMLESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pick up a bit where the gentlewoman from Texas left off, because we are going to hear so much about the budget and reconciliation and balancing the budget, and I do not know about anyone else, but when I talk about this at home, folks' eyes glaze over. They hate their own budgets, so why should they want to listen to what is going on here.

Let me talk just a bit about why there is so much passion, why there is not an agreement, and why we have certain Members willing to take the full faith and credit of this great Nation and hold it hostage, so that they can get their way on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, if we took a kitchen table in America and sat everyone

around it and you were trying to do a family budget, and let us assume you have to cut spending, as we have to cut it in this body. Here is the big difference between the two sides, here is the big difference: We do not want to take money from the children in Head Start education and college, we do not want to do that, and we do not want to take grandma and grandpa's money sitting at that table so we can send \$20,000 to the rich uncle who lives in Chicago that makes half a million dollars. That is what this budget fight is about.

Now, they are going to say, oh, but the rich uncle who lives in Chicago is the guy who creates the jobs, so he has to get the money. But that is bottom line what this is about.

We are saying, this is not the time to send a present to the rich uncle. I think at every kitchen table in America when times are tough you try to hold the children harmless so they can get their education, they can get their nutrition in the school lunch program, and they have a chance to go to college, because they are the future. You try as long as possible and as hard as possible to hold the seniors harmless, because they have not caused this. But this is just like your budget, only bigger, by a magnitude of gazillions of dollars, and the thing is, who pays?

The gentleman from New York is going to have a very eloquent session on this, talking about education. People do not know how badly we have hurt education. In my State alone, the estimate for the increase of 9th to 12th graders in the next few years is almost 28 percent. Twenty-eight percent more kids are going to be hitting those senior high schools. So the Federal Government is backing away from all sorts of programs, plus it zeroed out summer jobs for those kids, and it did all sorts of other things that is going to impact their future.

So this is what it is about. People know they cannot get enough votes here to override a veto, so they have to take this debt ceiling thing, the thing that guarantees our money, the thing that guarantees the bonds of this Nation, the thing that guarantees the full faith and credit of this Nation, and hold it hostage and say, we will not lift the ceiling unless you let us have our way so we can take money from the little kids and money from grandma and grandpa and send it to the rich uncle in Chicago. Hey, if you think that is a good plan, you have to be really happy, that is what is going on. But when you get behind everything else, that is exactly what is happening here. So try and keep that in mind.

I must also say, this being the 75th anniversary of women having had the right to vote, this has been a very hard week for me in this body. We have seen all sorts of things change, and you would wonder if women could vote at all.

We have seen charts being allowed on this floor that were not medically certified, that were inaccurate, that should never have been here and that

were never here before, but suddenly the rules are going to allow that. We have seen the rules expanded for the other side so that they can talk; we have seen women's health and women's lives being taken away as a reason for doctors to treat them. Is that not amazing?

So I really hope that the women of America start waking up, and the men too, that are really understanding this.

We heard the debate about whether the nonprofits should be able to lobby here. Well, I want to tell you, let me tell you who is lobbying here, and that is the military industrial complex. That is why you have \$8 billion worth of B-2 bombers that nobody wants and all sorts of add-ons to the defense bill. They can do it and they are doing it with 100 percent Federal money, because a lot of them work in companies where all their money is Federal money. Nobody wants to turn them off. But they are so afraid that the senior citizens may come in here and talk about Medicare cuts or the Girl Scouts might come and talk about what happens if they lose some of the money in jobs programs for the summer, or the schools and teachers come in and talk about Head Start or what happens if we cut back, that those people must be gagged.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can only entertain an even-handed request.

The gentleman from California has 3 minutes remaining of his time. If there is an extension of that time, the time must be equal on each side.

The gentleman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

□ 1530

So we gag them. But when I offer my amendment to say, OK, if you are going to gag them, we ought to gag the defense contractors, no, we do not do that.

These are not American priorities that I know unless this is a different America than the one I know. I hope we find some way to break through the clutter and noise and try to bring to people what these real issues are, and people get engaged in this.

Government is not the hokey-pokey. You cannot just put your hand in or your foot in. You have got to put your whole self in, understand the issues, and start working to make a difference or you are going to be awakened in a couple of years and wonder what happened.

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRESIDENT UNWILLING TO LEAD

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history Americans have looked to their President for leadership in meeting the challenges and crises we as a country have faced. George Washington led us through the birth of our Nation, Abraham Lincoln preserved the Union and freed the slaves, Franklin Roosevelt led us out of the Great Depression and into victory in World War II, and Ronald Reagan faced a challenge of double-digit interest rates and double-digit inflation and gave us the greatest peacetime economic expansion in history while bringing about the collapse of communism.

But today, as we face the challenge of finally getting America's fiscal house in order and balancing the budget for the first time in 26 years, we see a President who is not willing to lead. In fact, we see a President who has abdicated his responsibility to lead just when the value of personal responsibility is undergoing a revival in America. Instead of submitting a balanced budget of his own to offer as an alternative to the Republican budget, President Clinton proposed a phony budget that did not balance at all.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, the budget office that President Clinton said we should all go by, says the President's budget leaves us with a \$209 billion deficit in the year 2005, a bigger deficit than we have today. In fact, have a little chart that shows the budget deficit growing under the President's so-called balanced budget plan from \$196 billion today in fiscal year 1996 to \$209 billion in fiscal year 2005.

The President's so-called balanced budget is such a joke not a single Democrat would even vote for it. Indeed, when Republican Senators HATCH and SANTORUM offered the President's budget in the Senate, the Senate defeated it by a vote of 96 to 0.

Instead of submitting a plan to save Medicare, which his own Medicare trustees said would be bankrupt in 7 years, President Clinton has ignored the problem, refused to work with us in Congress, the majority party, anyway,