

real stakes in this year's budget debate: Is the United States, for the first time since the 1920s, going to rein in the federal government, or not? This is the heart of the matter. The rest is political fog.

Republicans are close to putting on Mr. Clinton's desk a bill that does more or less what they promised to do last November. For the first time in decades, Congress would actually cut some spending. A few parts of Leviathan would even go out of business. The tax burden would ease. Welfare policy would be opened up to 50 state experiments. And so on.

Readers of these columns know we've criticized some parts of this GOP budget. We wish it cut more spending, especially on pet Congressional fiefs, and that it cut taxes in a way that better promoted economic growth. We wish a lot of things. But if this effort fails, the alternative isn't a better budget. The alternative is a victory for the Beltway status quo. That's why this budget fight really is a seminal moment in American politics.

Precisely because Bill Clinton knows this, he wants to delay or obfuscate the real choice. They very last thing he wants is to have to decide whether to sign or veto this budget. For months, ever since Dick Morris came back as his strategist, Mr. Clinton has had it both ways. He claims to be for all of the things the public wants—tax cuts, a balanced budget, welfare reform—but he hasn't had to do anything to prove it.

Meanwhile, his left wing has come down on him with a wrath usually reserved for Republicans. Marian Wright Edelman, Hillary Clinton's mentor and mother superior of the welfare state, wrote an open letter all but accusing Mr. Clinton of child abuse for endorsing a welfare bill that got 35 Democratic votes in the Senate.

So Mr. Clinton has, for now, dropped his compromise budget zig and adopted an opposition zag. His advisers are openly bragging that this will help him on the "character" issue. If he vetoes the budget, he'll lose his reputation for flip-flopping! At least, we suppose, until the Dec. 15 filing deadline for the New Hampshire primary, after which the left won't be able to field a challenger against him.

Which brings us back to the real issue of reining in government. On this score the GOP budget is hardly radical. Over seven years, it would shrink federal spending's share of the economy only slightly—to 18.5% of GDP in fiscal 2002, from 21.7% in 1995, says the Congressional Budget Office. Total federal spending would continue to rise.

We repeat: Total spending would rise—to \$1.844 trillion in 2002 from \$1.530 trillion.

Tax revenues would climb even faster—to \$1.853 trillion from \$1.355 trillion in 1995. As a share of the economy, taxes would fall only slightly—to 18.6% of GDP in 2002 from 19.3% this year. Taxation's share of GDP has stayed remarkably near 19% for 20 years now, so this is no great change either. Congress is merely bringing its spending into line with the maximum tax burden Americans seem willing to pay.

It's hard to know what Mr. Clinton means when he says this budget is "extreme." Does he want Congress to spend \$1.9 trillion a year, or \$2 trillion, or what? How much is enough?

The president has been most shameless on Medicare and Medicaid, which are growing by 10% a year. Under current law these and other entitlements plus interest are growing so fast they will consume all federal tax revenues by 2012. Every dime. There'll be nothing left for defense or education or anything else Mr. Clinton claims to value.

The logic of Mr. Clinton's demagoguery is that taxes will have to go up, sooner or later.

Medicare is financed in part by a payroll tax that in 1937 was 2% on incomes up to \$3,000. Today it is 15.3% on \$62,600 of income. How high does Mr. Clinton want the payroll tax to go if he doesn't want to accept Republican reforms? And by the way, where are the budget scolds (Warren Rudman, Pete Peterson, David Broder) who've griped for years that politicians lack the courage to tackle middle-class entitlements? When Republicans finally do it, they temporize.

These are the real stakes in this budget debate. They have been obscured by a president who wants to change the subject. And by a media class which decries political "bickering" while ignoring the substance of the debate. The shouting is so loud inside Washington this year precisely because this is the first budget in years that is not business as usual. Mr. President, it's time to choose.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEMPLE ISRAEL

HON. SUE MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following for the RECORD:

In the United States House of Representatives November 18, 1995.

Whereas Temple Israel in Charlotte, North Carolina is celebrating its 100th Anniversary; and

Whereas Temple Israel is the oldest and largest Conservative congregation in the Carolinas; existing to strengthen Judaism through worship, study, celebration and the promotion of human well-being; and

Whereas Temple Israel has been an integral part of the Jewish community in Charlotte and surrounding areas, and has given her congregants a warm environment in which to expand their minds, hearts, and souls; and

Now, Therefore I, Sue Myrick, Member of Congress for North Carolina's 9th District of Congress, do honor the congregation and of the Temple Israel as it celebrates 100 years of spiritual growth; and heartily congratulate the entire synagogue family. Best wishes for continued success, health and happiness; and

In Witness Whereof I have hereunto set my hand this Seventeenth day of November, Nineteen Hundred and Ninety-Five.

OUTRAGE OVER CONTINUING RESOLUTION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage over the continuing resolution shutdown of the Federal Government and the furlough of 800,000 Federal employees nationwide. No American is being left unaffected. The House leadership is holding the American people hostage to a radical philosophy that has little credibility. Some of the services that all Americans depend upon are now unavailable. An example of these services include the following:

The Social Security Administration can no longer accept any new applications for benefits.

The Veterans' Administration is unable to issue benefit payments for December 1, 1995. Individuals cannot receive passports.

Federal Home Administration cannot make housing loans.

National parks and the Smithsonian Institution are closed.

In Houston, 2,200 Federal employees at Johnson Space Center have been furloughed.

The House considered another continuing resolution today that eliminates some of the extraneous provisions such as the increase in Medicare part B premiums that caused the President to veto the second continuing resolution. I still have some concerns about this new continuing resolution because of some of the assumptions used in drafting the bill. It remains to be seen whether President Clinton will veto this resolution.

The ironic aspect of this shutdown is that the Federal Government is not saving any money. When a budget impasse occurred in 1990 and the Government shutdown over the Columbus Day weekend, it cost \$1.6 million. According to White House Budget Director Alice Rivlin, the Government incurs expenses to secure vacant Federal buildings, pay penalties on contracts that cannot be honored and expenses to reimburse furloughed Federal employees since those employees that are usually paid for the time away from the office.

I would like to remind my colleagues that Americans are closely watching these deliberations. A USA Today/CNN? Gallup poll taken yesterday indicated that 49 percent of those individuals survey blame the Republican leadership for the shutdown.

Moreover, 61 percent of those individuals are angry about the impasse. Forty-nine percent prefer the Democratic Party's approach to reducing the Federal deficit and maintaining critical Federal programs. Finally, 48 percent of the respondents approve of the President's handling of the budget negotiations whereas only 22 percent of the respondents agree with the manner in which the Speaker of the House has handled the negotiations.

Therefore, we must end the political posturing and end the disruption of the lives of millions of Americans. Another issue is the impending default by the Federal Government on its debt obligations. A major interest payment on the Federal debt is due today. We like to boast that we are a superpower and that the world should look to us for leadership. We are a poor example for the rest of the world if we allow the Federal Government to be in default. This is unacceptable to the American people. It should be unacceptable to every Member of the House of Representatives. We must pass legislation to extend the debt ceiling without delay. And we should pass a streamlined continuing resolution to get America working again.

MONTEREY BAY AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1995, I had the honor of introducing a resolution heralding the Monterey Language Capital of the World initiative.

H. Res. 266 commends the Monterey Bay public-private partnership for its recognition of the unique language resources that are located in the 17th Congressional District and its strong commitment to promoting language diversity.

Monterey is directly involved with 25 percent of the Nation's postsecondary learning in languages other than English. What Research Triangle Park is to applied academics, what Silicon Valley is to high technology, Monterey Bay will be to language learning.

California's central coast has a rich heritage of professional language resources, including: the Defense Language Institute, the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School, the AT&T Language Line Services, the Monterey Institute of International Studies, California State University at Monterey Bay, the University of California at Santa Cruz, Monterey Peninsula College, CTB McGraw-Hill, and American Global Studies Institute.

One of my earliest initiatives after being elected in 1993 was to convene a higher education summit in the district. The participants—CSUMB, USSC, Monterey Peninsula College, MIIS—all agreed to hammer out a language memorandum of understanding whereby the educational institutions agreed to share resources in language training.

In order to make the Defense Language Institute a participant in the Language MOU, I secured passage of a provision in the fiscal year 1994 defense bill which allows civilians to attend the DLI. With a faculty of 900 and a student body of 3,000, DLI is the largest language training institution in the world. It has been located in Monterey since 1946, and teaches foreign languages to other Federal agencies like the FBI, NASA, and the DEA. For instance, when an American astronaut participates in a joint United States-Russian space mission, he has been trained in Russian at the DLA so that he can talk to his mission counterpart.

The U.S. Naval Postgraduate School provides professional, service-oriented educational programs for the U.S. Armed Forces and foreign militaries, and has played host to students from more than 100 nations. While no foreign languages are taught at the NPGS, its students learn other languages at DLI and contribute to the multicultural fabric of Monterey.

The AT&T Language Line Services, the largest provider of telephone-based language services in the world, provides around the clock interpretation for business, emergency service providers, communities and institutions across the United States and Canada, and the United Kingdom in 140 languages.

It was created from the vision of a former San Jose police officer who saw the critical need for law enforcement officers to be able to communicate with the people they served.

AT&T bought the service in 1989. Eighty percent of major hospitals in the United States and more than 45 percent of all hospitals subscribe to the service, as do the INS, the U.S. Coast Guard, the SBA, and most major insurance companies and financial institutions throughout the United States. In fact, at my suggestion the attending physician of U.S. Congress subscribes to the service in order to be able to communicate with any foreign speaking tourists who may require medical treatment while visiting the U.S. Capital.

The Monterey Institute of International Studies has an extensive graduate school curricu-

lum that includes the only master's degree in translation and interpretation in the Western Hemisphere. It was established in 1955 to teach modern languages in their cultural context. The programs at the MIIS are designed to develop bilingual professionals, integrating advanced foreign language education into professional programs in business, public administration and policy studies.

California State University at Monterey Bay will house the new Center for Intensive Language and Culture and an Institute of Collaborative Human Services that will provide non-emergency telephone help, like 911, for non-English speakers.

Working with the AT&T Language Line Services for simultaneous translation, CSUMB, which just opened this fall, will expand its basic language programs for teaching students enrolled overseas. It is these types of innovative, collaborative partnerships that reinforce Monterey's foundation as the language capital of the world.

Monterey Peninsula College offers eight foreign languages, a significant number for a 2-year community college, including Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, and Russian. It is committed to maintaining a strong language department with emphasis on Pacific rim languages, in keeping with international economic trends for business and commerce.

What is unique about this public-private initiative is that all the language resources interface with each other to create a seamless language web. For example, graduates of the MIIS work at the AT&T Language Line and at the DLI. CSUMB will enjoy employ faculty from the DLI and MIIS to teach language classes. Some NPGS students may be assigned to the DLI for specific language training classes.

Moreover, there are very sound economic reasons to promote language diversity, particularly as they relate to the travel and tourism industry, the Nation's second largest employer which provides more than 13 million jobs.

For instance, did you know that: \$58 billion in Federal, State and local tax revenues were generated through travel and tourism in 1994; the typical American household spends \$3,900 per year on travel; the World Tourism Organization projects that in the year 2000, more than 661 million people will travel internationally; and international visitor spending now accounts for over 14 percent of all travel expenditures in the United States, compared to five percent in 1983.

What these statistics indicate to me is that we must compete aggressively for the international travel and tourism dollar and the international traveler—who is most likely multilingual. We can only do that by strengthening our commitment to language training and encourage language development in the citizenry of our own country.

I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H. Res. 266 and to support your local language resources to ensure continued U.S. global leadership and enhance U.S. economic competitiveness.

PARTIAL SHUTDOWN OF GOVERNMENT

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues this editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on Nov. 15, 1995.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Nov. 15, 1995]

PARTIAL SHUTDOWN OF GOVERNMENT RESULT OF DEMOCRATIC SCARE TACTICS

Government workers and the public were plunged into unnecessary inconvenience by a partial government shutdown Tuesday. The reason: President Clinton put politics ahead of the public.

Clinton vetoed a stopgap spending bill that would have temporarily kept the museums open, the passport office functioning and the national parks in full operation. The "continuing resolution" that would let the government go on spending was needed because the White House and Congress haven't passed a final budget for the fiscal year that began Oct. 1.

The president had been saying for days that he couldn't sign the stopgap spending bill because it contained an increase in the monthly premium paid by retirees for Medicare. Then, as Republican Sen. Pete Domenici offered a compromise on the Medicare premium issue, Clinton added that he also objected to decreases in some other spending programs, including his pet, Ameri-Corps. Of the Medicare change, he said that the price of signing the bill was too high "if America must close down access to . . . affordable health care for our seniors."

Of course the legislation would do nothing of the kind. Clinton's words were a reflection of a cynical and deceptive campaign that Democrats are waging. They try to scare retirees by saying that the Republicans are out to eliminate Social Security and Medicare. This cruel Democratic distortion deserves strong condemnation. In addition, as Republican Sen. Bob Dole pointed out, Clinton has been "playing the Medi-scare game all weekend. That wasn't their real problem. It was cutting spending."

Republicans are proposing a reasonable change. They want to cancel a 1990 Democratic-sponsored measure that, left alone, would have the unintended effect of reducing the monthly premium for Medicare. Without action, the monthly payment would drop from \$46.10 to \$42.50 as of Jan. 1. The GOP wants to raise the payment to \$53.50, thereby keeping the current recipient-funded portion of the program costs at 31.5 percent. Domenici came a long way around by offering to freeze premiums at \$46.10.

The increase to \$53.50 would prevent a larger burden from shifting to the taxpayers and prepare the way for the long-term adjustments that the public is going to have to make to keep Medicare solvent.

Taxpayers should applaud this responsible suggestion. General-fund expenditures must be cut wherever possible if the budget is ever going to be balanced. Certainly this is no time to be reducing the amount of money that retirees are asked to contribute to the insurance program from which they benefit.

Furthermore, the logical time to make the change is now. To leave it until Clinton and the GOP hammered out all their differences could mean that the rate would drop in January. That would make it even harder to raise it later.