schooling at the University of Minnesota, until World War I interrupted.

Three years of ROTC there gave him a leg up on a lieutenant's bars. In France, he was an artilleryman. His job was to ride a wicker basket under a rough, hydrogen-filled balloon, held by a cable and linked by a primitive telephone to the gun batteries, overlooking the battlefield. There, he observed the fall of the artillery shells his battery mates were firing and tell them how to adjust their fire to bring it on target.

Of course, such balloons like his were sitting ducks, even for the primitive planes of the time.

When the war ended, the army found his ability to speak German useful and kept him in Europe. He remained overseas for 18 months in all, much of the time interpreting for others or dealing directly with the local German population. He also knew Paris, Berlin, other German cities, and visited England and Ireland. In Rome, the ambassador asked him to join his staff, but Ev was homesick for Pekin.

Thus, young Lt. Dirksen returned to Pekin and Bohnchefiddle at age 24, with an extraordinary range of experiences. He was now a college man, a combat veteran and an ex-officer who had traveled, often in very sophisticated circles, in postwar Europe.

Back home, he married a Pekin girl and launched his remarkable political career as the youngest person ever elected to the Pekin City Council.

As city councilman, he was a young man dealing with a rapidly changing world. Streets needed to be paved for the growing number of those new motor cars. The fire department needed trucks to replace the horse-drawn rigs. The aging streetcar, one car running back and forth on a single track, needed replacement with bus service.

Power plant were under construction bringing electricity. The Edison resolution was on, and radio was waiting in the wings. These were not hypothetical or abstract problems to be solved abstractly for the young councilman. He was intimately involved with the reality of finance for technology and the even tougher reality of the effects and demands new technology and dramatic change made on the city workers and the public.

When he grappled with these problems as a councilman, he also worked delivering his brothers' bread to 50 small groceries scattered about town. Everybody knew his route, and at many a stop he confronted people with problems to take to their councilman. Before he went to the national macrocosm, this man had a thorough and heavy dose of the microcosm.

Thus, the nature of the man was well-founded long before he became one of that city's best-loved figures, before he crafted the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 and brought over the votes to pass it with him, before he won a Grammy for recording ''Gallant Men,'' before he was the confidante of presidents both Republican and Democrat, and before he became a darling of the once-skeptical Washington press corps.

He brought to Washington the prestige of being the Congress' best orator, a skill founded and practiced in Pekin and which largely won for him his original seat in the House of Representatives in the first place.

He also brought the attention to detail, the realism, of Bohnchefiddle, and was, undoubtedly, the most skilled parliamentarian in the Senate of his time. He knew how the system worked in every detail, and he knew who was the person that counted, the person to talk to, not only in the Senate, but in every department of the national administration.

Finally, he made many friends and no enemies in the best tradition of the small town where he grew up, and where some of his local political foes were also lifelong personal friends.

When Everett Dirksen died, the President of the United States gave the eulogy—proclaiming that Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen had more impact on history than many presidents.

That he was, and he didn't learn that in Washington. That was the boy from Bohnchefiddle.

SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET PLAN

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations. Observation No. 1 is that I believe that the struggle we are in is a very significant and fundamental one. This is not a testosterone test. It is not an ego test. It is a fundamental struggle.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the 7-year balanced budget plan offered by my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it contains three significant features.

No. 1, they significantly change the function, nature, and role of the Federal Government in the lives of people in this country. Nothing can be more fundamental than redefining the nature and the role of the Federal Government. I would argue that when we put down the Articles of Confederation and moved to a constitutional government, that brilliant minds thought that it was an important function, the role of the Federal Government in people's lives. To redefine that is very fundamental.

Second, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to significantly reduce the size of the Federal Government and, third, significantly reduce the revenues designed to carry out the business of Federal governance.

Nothing can be more fundamental than that struggle. The give and take that is necessary to resolve those fundamental problems, in this gentleman's humble opinion, cannot be dealt with in the context of an artificial crisis that wreaks havoc and brings pain and creates peril in the lives of people who offer the services and people who receive the services of the Federal Government.

We ought to dignify the significance of this fundamental struggle by moving beyond this crisis, and I would echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues who suggested we ought to pass a continuing resolution, and yet with all due respect, I think my colleagues are going in the wrong direction.

The first factor that contributed to the deficit was the $260 some odd billion tax cut to the wealthy during the Reagan era. But rather than pass a simplified progressive tax based on the notion that the people most able to pay, pay the most, what we see here is a bill that passed the House that originally had a tax cut of $305 billion. Now we are talking about a tax cut of $245 billion to the wealthy. Been there. Done that. That is a mistake.

No. 2, the rapid rise in the military budget during the Reagan era that took us from $170-some-odd-billion climbed up over $300 billion and leveled out for the 10 years of the decade of the 1980's. We find ourselves in the context of a post-cost war world where we ought to be downsizing the military budget, but what does this budget do? It added $7 billion over and above the President's request, and it adds to the military budget during a period when the United States and its allies outspend the rest of the world 4 to 1. It seems to me that that is going in the wrong direction.

The third contributing factor to the deficit was the rapid rise in health care costs. But rather than us embrace a national health care policy based upon the principles of comprehensiveness and universality, what we see here is a challenge to Medicare, a challenge to Medicaid, and no effort to bring this country to the 21st century with a coherent, rational and comprehensive approach to national health care.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a major contributing factor to the deficit is high unemployment. Depending upon which economist we subscribe to, for each point we reduce the unemployment rate, we reduce the budget deficit by $25 to $55 billion each point we drop, but rather than embrace a policy of full employment, we embrace a policy of restricting employment, and I would suggest that jobs are not created in a vacuum, Mr. Speaker.

A society generates employment to the extent to which we are prepared to come together to solve other social problems. We address the problems of transportation in this country; you generate employment in the field of transportation. We address the issue of education in this country; we generate employment. My point is that to the extent to which we are prepared to spend resources to solve the social problems of this country, we solve that problem and we generate employment. The 7-year budget plan in my opinion goes in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying the process is flawed. We have created an incredible crisis here and, No. 2, on substance we are going down the wrong road that does not take us toward reduction of the deficit. Ultimately, I think it is going to contribute to it.

MR. PRESIDENT, IT IS TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I came down out of my apartment this morning and picked up the Washington Post on the front porch and, as I looked through it, I turned finally to page A–

11 and in the Washington Post was this article. It says, ''On Balance, Budget Deal Could Offer a $1,000 Bonus'' to each family in America.

Then a few minutes ago, frankly, I had not read it, but a few minutes ago I heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] talking about the effect of the balanced budget, the effect that it would have on our families by relieving a payment that they would have to make to the Federal Government each and every year to pay the interest on the national debt.

I went back and read this and it says something different, and I will tell my colleagues about it in a minute, but I think it is very important to put this in the context of what the gentleman was talking about.

See, the national debt has risen to approximately $5 trillion. Now, that for me and my colleagues, for me at least, that is an incomprehensible figure. I do not know, I cannot put $5 trillion into context. But when you look at it, as the gentleman from Michigan was, what he was saying is that if you take the $5 trillion national debt and figure out what each of our share of that is; in other words, divide $5 trillion by 260 million people which represents the number of people that live in our country, we find out that each of our share of the national debt is about $18,000.

Now, to bring that just a little closer to home, we can all relate to this. If we went down to the bank, if we went to our hometown bank and we said ''I need for some purpose to borrow $18,000,'' the banker would say, fill out the application, and we need to make you aware, because the State and Federal laws provide that we disclose to you, that it is going to cost you an annual sum, an interest payment. And if on your $18,000 we charge you 7 percent interest, 7 percent of 18,000, if I am doing my math right, is close to $1,200 a year.

Mr. Speaker, what that means is that for each of our individual shares of the national debt, which is $18,000, just like we would have to pay the bank interest, we have to pay our share of the interest on the national debt. So, when we make out our income tax checks on April 15 of each year, somewhere between $1,100 and $1,200, which the gentleman from Michigan pointed out correctly, goes out of each of our pockets to pay the interest on this debt that we have further accumulated.

On to this article, ''On Balance, the Budget Deal Could Offer a $1,000 Bonus.'' This is alluding to the fact that there are other savings which families will be able to reap. For example, because of lower national debt, each family will save an average of $500 a year by the year 2002.

In addition to that, because interest rates will drop according to most economists by about 2 percent, according to most estimates, that the economy will begin to grow, and economists project that additional income will be earned by families of somewhere between $400 and $600 a year. Take the lower figure. Just take the $400. Then they say in addition to that, because interest rates will be lower, our mortgages, our mortgage payments will be lower; our car payments will be lower; our student loan payments will be lower. That would amount to, on average, another $100.

So, if we add $500 in savings to $400 in savings to another $100 in savings, in addition to the check we would no longer have to write to the Federal Government of $1,100 or $1,200 a year, this article says that we would get an additional bonus of about, on average, $1,000 per family.

Mr. Speaker, this begins to make a real difference to the middle-class families that I represent. An additional couple of thousand dollars of savings a year amounts to real money. It is our job. This is what this debate has really been all about for all of these months for the last year. We have been trying to arrive at a consensus between Republicans and Democrats as to how we can balance the budget to save American families these moneys.

So, I commend this article to everyone's reading. It is on page A–11 of today's Washington Post written by Steven Pearlstein and it is news analysis. I think it is very accurate and I think it is something that we should be able to relate to on an individual basis, dealing with the national debt, how it affects each and every one of the families that I represent and that my colleagues represent.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us proceed together. We have bickered long enough about this subject. It is too important. The President knows it. He has committed to balancing the budget in 7 years using what we here in Washington call real numbers, what my constituents call numbers without smoke and mirrors, and we have also agreed to that on, I think, both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, let us proceed to do it so that American families can actually realize the bonus that is pointed out in this article.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following newspaper article for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1996]

ON BALANCE, BUDGET DEAL COULD OFFER A $1,000 BONUS

(By Steven Pearlstein)

With the budget crisis slowly suffocating Washington and mystifying the rest of the country, it may be easy to overlook the payoff if President Clinton and leaders of the Republican Congress agree on a plan that balances the budget.

The benefits could total roughly $1,000 a year for every American family, according to economists and budget analysts.

The math goes something like this: Balancing the budget stems the flow of income that now runs from future generations to our own.

At today's interest rates, the $1 trillion in government debt that would be avoided by gradually eliminating the deficit over the next seven years would save taxpayers $60 billion in interest payments every year. That works out to an average of $500 a year for every household beginning in 2002—money that could be used to reduce taxes or increase the government services they receive.

Balancing the budget also should generate extra economic growth from lower interest rates and a higher national savings rate. Even if the effect is just an additional 0.1 percent in output each year, as the Congressional Budget Office predicts, it would boost national income by one percentage point by the end of a decade—$400 for the average household.

Additionally, the CBO calculates that balancing the budget will reduce prevailing interest rates by about 1.5 percent. Some of that reduction already is reflected in market rates, but with average household indebtedness now running around $45,000, including mortgages, lower rates eventually could reduce interest payments by $675 a year per family.

But not all of those savings will make their way to our bank accounts. That's because the flip side of interest savings for borrowers is a corresponding reduction in interest income for savers. Over the course of a lifetime savers and borrowers turn out to be many of the same Americans. But even so, it's pretty safe to figure about another $100 annual bonus per family for balancing the budget.

All told, it's worth about $1,000 a year to our children and grandchildren for us to cut back on our consumption of government subsidies and services. ''From an economic standpoint, everything else about this budget debate is insignificant,'' says William Niskanen, President Reagan's economic adviser and now chairman of the Cato Institute.

But while the future payoff is fairly clear, the process of getting there is not without pain. Nobody has yet invented a way to suck a trillion dollars out of the economy over seven years without anyone noticing. Indeed, some economists predict if spending is cut too fast, it could tip the economy into recession.

Even if the economy can withstand the shock of sharply reduced government spending, there are two groups of people for whom this budget debate has serious consequences: the poor and the elderly.

The big nut to be cracked is health care costs, which effectively represent half of the policy dispute between the president and the Republican Congress. What they're really wrestling with is how to ration medical care for the 60 million Americans who rely on government to pay for it.

Although rationing is a dirty work in politics, it goes on every day all over the United States, where more than half the working population is now enrolled in some form of managed health care plan.

The key feature of these plans is that a group of doctors and hospitals agrees to provide all medically necessary services for a fixed fee per person per year. This fixed-fee concept has helped slow the medical inflation rate to its present 4 percent. But the government's two big health care programs, Medicare and Medicaid, continue to operate largely on the blank check philosophy of health insurance, giving the poor and elderly free reign to consume whatever health services they think they need and reimbursing doctors and hospitals according to a fee schedule.

Both Clinton and Congress have effectively embraced the idea of extending the managed-care concept to Medicare and Medicaid. What the fuss is all about is how—and how fast.

The other big sticking point concerns the rest of the government's social safety net. While just about everyone concedes that welfare programs have largely failed to end poverty, few can point to alternative programs

that work much better. Any reform, then, is something of a leap into the unknown, and at the heart of the budget battle is the question of exactly how big a leap to take.

It was candidate Clinton who first promised to end welfare as we know it, and now the Republican Congress has gone him one better. Its proposal would fold welfare, food stamps and a panoply of other federal programs into one, consolidated grant to be sent off to each statehouse. The Republican plan is exquisitely precise on how and when welfare mothers will be forced off the dole, but considerably more vague on exactly how these people will find jobs or how they will pay for day care and health care even if they do.

''What concerns me in all this is the treatment of the poor,'' says Charles Schultze of the Brookings Institution, the top economic adviser to President Carter. ''For them this represents a terribly risky roll of the dice—one that I think is likely to come out wrong.''

It is not only economists with Democratic leanings who worry about the budgetary impact on the poor. Listen to Herbert Stein, an analyst at the American Enterprise Institute and an economic adviser to President Nixon:

''If you cut Medicaid and welfare and food stamps, will these people descend into misery or straighten up, fly right, get a job and wind up with an apartment on Park Avenue? Frankly, I think it's a risky strategy for the very poorest people. I think many won't be able to adjust successfully.''

But if doing something is risky, so is doing nothing. Even the supposedly harsh measures proposed by the Republicans will keep the federal budget in balance only for the first decade or so of the 21st century. After that, demographic forces will once again overwhelm the Treasury as the giant baby boom generation moves into its retirement years, expecting the same level of pensions and health care as the generation that preceded it. Without further increases in taxes or reductions in Social Security and Medicare benefits, the government is now projected to once again find itself drowning in red ink.

''Even if we can balance the budget in the next few years, it is really only the first step,'' warns Stanford University's Michael Boskin, top economist in the Bush White House. ''What lies beyond the year 2002 simply dwarfs what we are dealing with here.''

Put another way, if you think this budget battle is tough, wait till next time.

COUNTERING THE REPUBLICAN SPIN ON THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, today is day 20 of the Government shutdown and the spin coming from the Republican side goes something like this: Well, you know, it is not really our shutdown. It is President Clinton's shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear to the American people that nothing could be further from the truth. The President does not have the power to end this shutdown. He can take no unilateral action, because if he could, he would. But he can take no unilateral action that will end this shutdown. It is not his shutdown.

The only way he can shut it down is toe acquiesce to the Republicans' demands. It is in fact the shutdown of the Gingrich Republicans, because they have the power by virtue of being in the majority and by virtue of having the votes to pass a clean continuing resolution which could put Government employees back to work. Let there be no mistake. This is a Gingrich Republican shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, the second spin we hear is in reality it is just bickering and really both sides are at fault. That is not true. We have 198 votes to put Federal employees back to work, to pay contractors for work that they do for our country. But it is not just Democrats. In the Senate, Mr. DOLE says enough is enough. So, on the Senate side both Democrats and Republicans are willing to put Federal workers back to work, and House Democrats are ready to put Federal employees back to work.

It seems to me it is clear that this is not a matter of more partisan bickering.

□ 1900

So what is it? It is an attempt by a few self-styled Republican revolutionary hard-liners and extremists to dictate the terms of the budget debate. They are essentially saying, ''If the President does not accept our budget terms, then we will keep the Government shut with all the attendant harms that go along with that.''

Let me digress for a minute, because one of these revolutionaries got on the floor and talked about, ''Well, gee, it is not a problem because the banks are going to provide emergency mortgage relief.''

No. 1, that acknowledges that there is in fact an emergency but, No. 2, that is not what banks are for. In this country banks are supposed to enhance our economic vitality. The money they are giving out to Federal employees because of their emergency could more better be spent expanding our economy, providing small business loans, or helping new home buyers, instead of bailing out people that the Republican hard-liners put in trouble.

But let us go to the meat of the issue, the balanced budget. Again, the Republican revolutionaries get on the floor and say, ''This sacrifice is worth it, because ultimately we are going to fundamentally change the way business is done in this country.'' That is right. More for the wealthy, less for the seniors, less for the poor, less for children.

The specifics of the budget break down this way, and this is why the President does not like it and I do not like it, either. They want to give $245 billion of tax breaks to the wealthy. They say, ''Oh, no, that's not true, we just want to send money back home to the people.''

Well, here are the facts. According to the Treasury Department, half of the $245 billion would go to people making over $100,000 a year. So some $120 billion plus is going to people making over $100,000 a year.

Folks, that comes to about 4 percent of the population. So it breaks down like this: 4 percent of the population is going to get half of the tax breaks in their so-called balanced budget, which amounts to about $100 billion. That is not fair.

On the other side of the coin, they want to take $270 billion out of Medicare, the program for the seniors, and about $160 billion out of Medicaid, the program for the poor and the disabled. Let us think about it. If we did not have to give the big tax break to the wealthy 4 percent, we would have to take a lot less money out of the pockets of the seniors and the poor and the disabled.

That is the meat of this debate, and this is why the President says their budget is unacceptable. If they would give up some of the tax breaks, we could have a balanced budget. There are many of us on this side of the aisle who want a balanced budget in 7 years using the so-called real numbers. We can do that. We do not need to shut down the Government and we do not need to give a big tax break to the wealthy.

Who is being cheated in all this? The taxpayer. Remember, these are not President Clinton's employees, these are not the Democrats' employees. There are our employees, they are the taxpayers' employees, and quite frankly these people are not at work, they are not doing the taxpayers' business. They are not providing Federal home loan assistance; 2,500 applications are not being processed. They are not providing renewals of vouchers for moderately priced homes.

They are not providing services to small businesses. Two hundred and sixty small business applications a day are not being processed through the SBA. Ninety small businesses a day are not being able to bid for contracts because of this Government shutdown. And on and on its goes.

Ladies and gentlemen, the balanced budget is a real issue, but the Government shutdown is a false issue created by so-called revolutionaries who somehow believe that the ends justify the means, and they do not care who is harmed in the process.

REPUBLICANS WANT A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Wyoming [Mrs. CUBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland who just preceded me said that this impasse has occurred because of the Republican Party, the majority in Congress, wants to give tax breaks to the wealthy. That is simply not the truth.

The truth is this impasse has occurred because the majority of this Congress, both the House and the Senate, want a balanced budget in 7 years.