negotiating. That is the bottom line. That is how simple it is. That is how to reduce a day of very complicated transactions into one line. Give us a balanced budget agreement or proposal scored by the neutral Congressional Budget Office and we will agree to open up the Government.

WORKING WITHOUT PAY AND BEING PAID NOT TO WORK

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in an extraordinary change of policy, my Republican colleagues have changed our policy with regard to payment of our Federal employees. For the last 3 weeks American workers who work for the Federal Government had been working without pay. For the next 3 weeks under the resolutions that we have adopted today, Americans who work for the Federal Government will be paid without working.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extraordinary change, and neither of the two sets of circumstances are desirable from the standpoint of any kind of common sense. My suggestion to my Republican colleagues is let us get together. Let us work the issues out. Let us have some honest discussion. Let us not play games. Let us do the business of the country. That is what we are here for.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my Republican colleagues, they are the majority, it is their duty to rule and to govern. It is their duty to run the place. To complain constantly about the President refusing to submit budgets ill becomes them, ill befits this institution, and does little except to bring all of us into a state of disrepute and degradation.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to function as a majority responsibly should.

NATIONAL COMMISSION TO STUDY IMPACT OF GAMBLING

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, what we did today was good and appropriate. It kept the commitment and the word that the leadership and others in Congress made, and that was that Federal employees would not lose any salary, and they have not lost any salary and they will return to work and that will be good. I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle that brought that about. We thank the leadership because it is very, very positive.

One other thing I want to announce, and hopefully we can work together on this, when we come back we will be bringing up legislation which will set up a national commission to investigate the impact that gambling is having in the country. Twenty years ago only two States had gambling. Now, 48 States have some sort of gambling and 24 have riverboat and casino gambling.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a national commission of nine men and women who have no bias on this issue, who will look to see what the impact of gambling has been on the country. Has it been good or bad? Has there been corruption involved in it? Has there been involvement with regard to political contributions? What has the impact been on other businesses? What has the impact been on addiction?

Hopefully, with what we did in the bipartisan manner today putting Federal employees back to work and paying them, we will pass this bill shortly when we come back.

CLOSING GOVERNMENT IS AN EMBARRASSMENT

(Mr. MINGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, we have been treated to an exercise in petty brinkmanship in this institution. It ill becomes the Congress of the United States of America and certainly has disappointed and embarrassed all of the residents of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in visiting with county commissioners in my home State, I certainly have become aware that they are keenly embarrassed. They say that if any county government had to shut its doors because the county commissioners could not agree on a budget, that they essentially would be forced to resign by the public pressure in that community.

□ 1945

What are we doing? We are sitting here in Washington. We are not resolving this problem. Instead we are engaging in party bickering, and we have one side that is refusing to let the other side even vote on a resolution to put the Government back to work. Instead we are bouncing continuing resolutions back and forth between the House and the Senate.

Let us get together, let us pass the resolution that was introduced on the Senate side and put America back to work.

PRIVATE SECTOR RISES TO OCCASION IN SHUTDOWN

(Mr. TORKILDSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, today we did an important thing. We allowed Federal employees to go back to work and provide services that the taxpayers have been paying for. But I want to point out something else. We have people in the private sector who have also risen to the occasion. Several banks in my district, Fleet Bank, Bank of Boston, were willing to extend no-interest loans to those employees who may not have been able to draw a paycheck.

I know our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], had arranged an agreement for five community banks in her district to do the same thing.

While there is a temptation to do a lot of blaming and a lot of name calling, I would ask everyone to resist and instead let us say thank you to those people in the private sector who stepped forward and said, ''Let us do what we can to help,'' whether it be offering a no-interest loan, whether it be delaying payments on bills that are owed, realizing that there is a crisis out there that was not of many people's making.

In the meantime, now that we have a pay bill for 3 weeks, let us all come together to work out a balanced budget, a truly balanced budget. It has been stated time and time again that is what the President wants. Now is his opportunity to bring one forward.

EXAMINING THE SPEAKER'S UPCOMING TRAVEL SCHEDULE

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, if we want to understand why in this country the richest people are becoming richer while most working people are seeing a decline in their standard of living, if we want to understand why the Contract With America provides for huge tax breaks for the wealthiest people and the largest corporations while it cuts back massively on programs for the elderly, working people, and low-income people, we might want to examine NEWT GINGRICH's travel schedule for the coming week.

Mr. GINGRICH will be in Seattle, WA, where he will have dinner with his colleagues and his friends for the Washington State Republican Party for $1,000 each. He will be in Dallas, TX, for a dinner for only $10,000 apiece. He will be in Dearborn, MI, for another private fireside reception at $10,000.

Who goes to these events? Most people that I know do not spend $1,000 for a dinner.

KINGSTON CRITICIZES EXCESSIVE TRAVEL OF ENERGY SECRETARY

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Member from the other side brought up travel. Let us talk about travel.

When the Speaker goes on a trip, he is paying for it with his own campaign money. But when your Democrat Secretary of Energy goes on a trip, for example, $660,000 to South Africa, $500,000 to Pakistan, $845,000 to China, $50,000 on the weekly shuttle to Vienna, Moscow, or Paris, or the low-discount rate

to India at a mere $729,000. You want to talk travel?

Why do we not start with the Secretary of Energy? Because I think it is timely when you are laying off Federal employees because your President will not sign a budget, he vetoes appropriations bills, when his Secretary of Energy could just about single-handedly balance the Federal budget by just cutting out her travel expenses for 1 month.

COOPERATION URGED IN BALANCING BUDGET

(Mr. BALDACCI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I think the important thing is that we still retain some civility and some comity and not allow ourselves to denigrate the situation, because the American public demands that we represent all the people. I think that we try to dig down deep and get inside and try to represent all the people, not just the Democrats or Republicans or Independents but to represent all the people.

I supported a balanced budget in 7 years that was scored by CBO but it did not have the tax breaks that were put forward by the majority because we decided to put the money back into Medicare, back into Medicaid, student loans, and the environment.

I would like to work together with the majority to fashion a balanced budget over 7 years scored by CBO so that we can all be proud of that and work together in that regard, and I think that we can do that.

I reach my hand out to do that with my friends on the other side.

FAILED SYSTEM RESULTS IN LITTLE GIRL'S DEATH

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, this participation may well seem out of order for all that we have done today and all the finger-pointing and accusations.

I rise to speak about a little girl who was killed by her own mother in New York City. Her name is Elisa Izquierdo. The fact is that the system failed and that we failed.

There is a paper that I would share with Members later, but it finally ends,

Elisa Izquierdo's mother killed only one child. The seemingly anesthetized behavior of the U.S. Congress may kill thousands. Now we are told we must get tougher with the poor. How much tougher can we get with children who already have so little? How cold is America prepared to be?

The paper referred to follows:

[From Time, Dec. 11, 1995]

SPARE US THE CHEAP GRACE

(By Jonathan Kozol)

It is hard to say what was more shocking about the death of Elisa Izquierdo—the endless savagery inflicted on her body and mind, or the stubborn inaction of the New York City agencies that were repeatedly informed of her peril. But while the murder of Elisa by her mother is appalling, it is hardly unexpected. In the death zones of America's postmodern ghetto, stripped of jobs and human services and sanitation, plagued by AIDS, tuberculosis, pediatric asthma and endemic clinical depression, largely abandoned by American physicians and devoid of the psychiatric services familiar in most middle-class communities, deaths like these are part of a predictable scenario.

After the headlines of recrimination and pretended shock wear off, we go back to our ordinary lives. Before long, we forget the victims' names. They weren't our children or the children of our neighbors. We do not need to mourn them for too long. But do we have the right to mourn at all? What does it mean when those whom we elect to public office cut back elemental services of life protection for poor children and then show up at the victim's funeral to pay condolence to the relatives and friends? At what point do those of us who have the power to prevent these deaths forfeit the entitlement of mourners?

It is not as if we do not know what might have saved some of these children's lives. We know that intervention programs work when well-trained social workers have a lot of time to dedicate to each and every child. We know that crisis hot lines work best when half of their employees do not burn out and quit each year, and that social workers do a better job when records are computerized instead of being piled up, lost and forgotten on the floor of a back room. We know that when a drug-addicted mother asks for help, as many mothers do, it is essential to provide the help she needs without delay, not after a waiting period of six months to a year, as is common in poor urban neighborhoods.

All these remedies are expensive, and we would demand them if our own children's lives were at stake. And yet we don't demand them for poor children. We wring our hands about the tabloid stories. We castigate the mother. We condemn the social worker. We churn out the familiar criticisms of ''bureaucracy'' but do not volunteer to use our cleverness to change it. Then the next time an election comes, we vote against the taxes that might make prevention programs possible, while favoring increased expenditures for prisons to incarcerate the children who survive the worst that we have done to them and grow up to be dangerous adults.

What makes this moral contradiction possible?

Can it be, despite our frequent protestations to the contrary, that our society does not particularly value the essential human worth of certain groups of children? Virtually all the victims we are speaking of are very poor black and Hispanic children. We have been told that our economy no longer has much need for people of their caste and color. Best-selling authors have, in recent years, assured us for their limited intelligence and low degree of ''civilizational development.'' As a woman in Arizona said in regard to immigrant kids from Mexico, ''I didn't breed them. I don't want to feed them''—a sentiment also heard in reference to Black children on talk-radio stations in New York and other cities. ''Put them over there,'' a Black teenager told me once, speaking of the way he felt that he and other blacks were viewed by our society. ''Pack them tight. Don't think about them. Keep your hands clean. Maybe they'll kill each other off.''

I do not know how many people in our nation would confess such contemplations, which offend the elemental mandates of our cultural beliefs and our religions. No matter how severely some among us may condemn the parents of the poor, it has been in axiom of faith in the U.S. that once a child is born, all condemnations are to be set aside. If we now have chosen to betray this faith, what consequences will this have for our collective spirit, for our soul as a society?

There is an agreeable illusion, evidenced in much of the commentary about Elisa, that those of us who witness the abuse of innocence—so long as we are standing at a certain distance—need not feel complicit in these tragedies. But this is the kind of ethical exemption that Dietrich Bonhoeffer called ''cheap grace.'' Knowledge carries with it certain theological imperatives. The more we know, the harder it becomes to grant ourselves exemption. ''Evil exists,'' a student in the South Bronx told me in the course of a long conversation about ethics and religion in the fall of 1993. ''Somebody has power. Pretending that they don't so they don't need to use it to help people—that is my idea of evil.''

Like most Americans, I do not tend to think of society that has been good to me and to my parents as ''evil.'' But when he said that ''somebody has power,'' it was difficult to disagree. It is possible that icy equanimity and a self-pacifying form of moral abdication by the powerful will take more lives in the long run than any single drug-addicted and disordered parent. Elisa Izquierdo's mother killed only one child. The seemingly anesthetized behavior of the U.S. Congress may kill thousands. Now we are told we must ''get tougher'' with the poor. How much tougher can we get with children who already have so little? How cold is America prepared to be?

AIYEE, KREPLACH

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing right now reminds me of the story of the little boy in Lithuania who hated kreplach. No matter how many times his mother made it, he just hated it.

Finally his mother decided that she would just take kreplach apart and show him that all the parts of it were not bad.

She took out the sausage and fed him the sausage. ''Don't you like sausage?'' He said yes.

She took out some onions and sliced them up. ''Don't you like onions?'' Yes.

She took out some carrots, gave him some carrots, he said ''yes.''

She gave him some broccoli, he ate the broccoli, not too bad.

Then she put it all together, stirred it together, put it on the plate, and the boy said, ''Aiyee, kreplach.''

So the Republicans start off the day and they say, ''We don't like the Government.''

We take it apart. We say, ''How about small business assistance?'' They say, ''We like that.''

''How about nursing home protection?''

''Well, we like that.''

''How about a little extra money for crime protection?''

''Well, we like that.''

''How about some money for NIH?''