

goal of a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOKE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing about CBO and OMB, and they are all projections. No one for a certainty can say what the accurate final result would be. But I would like to inject into the discussion the name of Sister Rosa. He tells the future by reading cards. I think she could do better than OMB and CBO.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, she is a lady that does that back in my district.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that maybe Sister Rosa do a better job than CBO or OMB. But the fact remains that the President did not agree in a piece of legislation that he signed into law to take the projections of Sister Rosa. He did not agree to take the projections of the OMB. He agreed to use the projections of the CBO, and then yesterday he acts as though it is a completely novel idea and he says: Gosh, maybe it will be possible to reach that goal. I think maybe we will do that. This is something new. I had not thought about that. I think we can put it all together.

Well, for heaven's sakes, Mr. Speaker, that is what he agreed to 29 years ago. It seems to me that what is really going on here is a stalling tactic. It is an amazing thing. The President thinks that for his own political good that he will do better by putting this off longer and longer and longer and longer.

We see the same thing going on right now with respect to the subpoena on the Whitewater papers in the Committee on the Judiciary or the Whitewater committee over in the Senate. What the President has done is that he has said: I am invoking an attorney-client privilege. He knows there is no good attorney-client privilege on this matter, but he has invoked the attorney-client privilege, knowing that he will spin that one through.

Mr. Speaker, that will take some time, and then he will go to an Executive privilege that he will call up and ask to spin that one through, all the while, delaying, delaying, delaying.

The President seems to think that time is on his side, but the fact is that he did agree to and we will insist on and we will come up with a balanced budget using honest numbers.

#### BUDGET IMPASSE REQUIRES COMPROMISE

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding brief-

ly to me. The previous speaker, I guess, inadvertently mentioned that the President said that 29 years ago, and he meant 29 days. But the one that introduced a balanced budget amendment 31 years ago was this gentleman from Texas. So it is not new. Everyone is climbing on board now. I did it 31 years ago.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] should be commended for that. We appreciate it and we appreciate his support working for a balanced budget now. But the fact remains, we have got this agreement and the President should honor his word. That is all we are saying.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to bring Sister Rosa into the picture. She has got better figures than OMB and CBO.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I enjoy the fact that we can sit here particularly with the Members of the freshman and sophomore class, and participate in this open discussion. It is worthwhile for those individuals across America who may be bored with Christmas shopping and watching C-SPAN, or perhaps going through some therapy that they are undergoing trying to understand what is going on down here in the asylum.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that probably for the first time in the history of the United States, we have extreme polarization of positions on the passage of the budget. A lot of people who are not necessarily informed with the process may think that we are indeed insane, or that what the House of Representatives of the Congress or the entire Federal Government is going through right now is a form of insanity, but in reality we all know that it is a very serious thing and it has to do with very honest and real differences of my friends on the Republican side and our side.

Mr. Speaker, if I could just address for a few moments what those differences are and maybe encourage some of my friends on the other side to talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker talked about some contract. Having been a lawyer, particularly having dealt with Philadelphia lawyers, although not claiming to be a Philadelphia lawyer myself, there is a great deal of respect paid to contracts; that supposedly any time we have a contract, that says something that in reality will take place in accordance with the word of the contract, or that that has some superforce above and beyond anything else.

Well, there are several ways to interpret contracts and I think we have to accept that as a given. Very clearly in the situation of the President and whatever contract is interpreted by the majority party of the House, there is a definitely wide distinction as to how they interpret the meaning of what was agreed to some 29 days ago.

Second, just because we have the Contract for America, or on America, I

am never sure, but just because we have that, that does not pass the value of the Constitution and how we interpret that, nor does it pass good sense for what we do this year, next year, for the next 7 years of this Republic, and for as long as this Republic endures under this Constitution.

The one certainly that we have is that government in a democracy is very expensive; it takes a great deal of time; it is very inefficient, because there is the necessity that if 250 million people are to exist in this world with different thoughts and philosophies, different political positions, different social positions, and coming from different cultural backgrounds, it takes a requirement of that ugly word which some of my younger friends on the other side of the aisle seem to find a great deal of distaste for and that is the word called "compromise."

I have heard the Speaker talk much earlier, I think maybe as long as 6 months ago, that with the new revolution that occurred in the House of Representatives, that there would be cooperation but not compromise. If my colleagues have extreme views, I do not know how we get to a final solution without compromise.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about what those extreme views are. We can all write a budget that will balance in 7 years, which is a projection of time with no certainty, all dependent on variables that are so complicated and uncertain in their nature that at best it is a guesstimation. We could arrive at a balanced budget in 7 years under the numbers scored by the CBO, the Office of Management and Budget, Morgan and Stanley, the Harvard Business School, the Wharton School, we could find any number of people who would be willing to score it and we could agree that it should be CBO.

#### FEDERAL WORKERS UNFAIRLY BURDENED BY BUDGET IMPASSE

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] to finish his point.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, our point is that we could all come up with this type of budget. We could have 435 different budgets taking into consideration various conditions. Right now we have what is called the coalition budget that has no tax cut in it and that does balance the budget, so clearly the Democratic side or the President could put that budget on the table or some various of that, which the Senate seems to have put together on their side.

It requires, however, a decision as to whether or not we are going to have a tax cut, a smaller proportional tax cut,

or no tax cut at all to arrive at that balance. That is what we call in common political parlance, and legal parlance, compromise.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. It is the time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, let me state, the problem is not compromising between Republicans, even freshman Republicans and some conservative to moderate Democrats. We have the numbers to pass a balanced budget right now through this House if the administration would just get on board.

The votes last night, where not one person supported the President's budget. The vote two nights ago, where an overwhelming number of Democrats supported 7-year CBO showed that we could work together. We are willing to put everything on the table, but it has to be in the President's best interest to pass a balanced budget before he gets engaged in this.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I have to reclaim my time. If I have time, I will yield for a question. Let me say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I do not know if it is extreme polarization on the budget. Clearly, among 435 Members, we have all kinds of opinions.

Some Members do not feel that we ought to balance the budget. Some want to balance the budget their way or no way, and we have some of that. We cannot all stand completely on principle, or we would never get anything out of here. We have to compromise, and I recognize that.

The difficulty that we have on our side of the aisle is that the President whether he was campaigning in 1992, said he was not balancing the budget in 5 years. In 1993, he got up here at the State of the Union and said CBO numbers were the most reliable numbers. Now we come up with CBO 7-years and we have yet to see a plan from him that balance in 7 years, and that has caused us some confusion.

Mr. Speaker, when we see that plan, I think it is going to be easier to compare the President's vision with numbers that balance and our plan.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would say but, you realize that 5 years, 7 years, all depends what you want to do. Look, I can give you a budget today, and you can too, that balance the budget in year.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I recognize that, but I think it is key if we could get in that box of 7 years, with honestly scored numbers, then we are all talking off the same song sheet. Right now we are not there.

Ours has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. We know what it does. If my Democrat colleagues do not like the values or what it does to peo-

ple, that is fine. But how would my friend do it within the same box?

Let me make a couple of other points. Federal employees have really, during this whole debate, been an unintended victim of this debate. Over the last several years they have seen the Federal Government downsized and many Federal employees have been losing their jobs and having to go elsewhere.

We have seen their benefits cut. We saw them cut in the last Congress. This time, there were resolutions up here to have them give up another 2½ percent of their pay to put in their retirement. We saw an effort to bring their retirement down so that their standards would not be the high 3 years, but the high 5 years. That would basically reduce their retirement.

We saw some proposals up here that would cap the Federal payment for the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, which would mean they would be paying more for their health insurance. We saw another proposal here that would charge Federal employees for parking, even in buildings where nobody else was paying a parking fee. We were able to defeat most of those as we were moving ahead, but the unsettling thing is that working for the Federal Government is not what it used to be.

We used to say, "Give me your best and your brightest." Now it is come work for us; we will cut your benefits, we will downsize you, we will furlough you. Now they are experiencing furloughs and it is the Christmas time. Today is December 20. Many Federal employees would have received their paychecks today, but because of the shutdown in some agencies, that is not going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, the good news today, and I would like to ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD a letter to Senator JOHN WARNER, to myself, to the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. MORELLA, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, my colleague from Virginia, a letter from Speaker NEWT GINGRICH and Senate Majority Leader BOB DOLE, where they say in here that, and I will put the whole letter in the RECORD, but they basically assure Federal employees that when this is over, they will be paid retroactively.

Mr. Speaker, this has always been done before; this will be done this time. Having the House leadership on board, and the Senate leadership on board at this time, is very important.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the news that the Federal employees are going to be paid, but they are not going to be working.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
December 20, 1995.

Hon. JOHN WARNER,  
U.S. Senate.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF  
Hon. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA  
Hon. TOM DAVIS  
U.S. House of Representatives.

Dear Colleagues:

Because of your interest in the ongoing budget negotiations and your strong support for federal employees, we wanted to take this opportunity to reaffirm our letter of November 10, 1995, in which we made clear that employees furloughed through no fault of their own should not be punished.

It is unfortunate that President Clinton has chosen to veto appropriations bills that would have funded the salaries of federal employees at the Departments of Justice, State, Commerce, Veterans Affairs, and Housing and Urban Development, as well as independent agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency. Similarly, procedural objections by Democrats have prevented the funding of salaries at the Departments of Labor, HHS and Education.

The direct result of those actions is that furloughed federal employees at those particular agencies cannot be paid. However, we would like to reaffirm our commitment to restoring any lost wages for federal employees in a subsequent funding bill.

Thank you for your continued and strong leadership on behalf of federal workers.

NEWT GINGRICH,

*Speaker of the House.*

BOB DOLE,

*Senate Majority Leader.*

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION IS CONGRESS' RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised and disappointed today to learn that negotiations to get the Government operating again have been broken off. I just want to make sure that my constituents in the State of Washington know that I believe that this impasse is not justified; that it is, I believe, time for the senior Members of the House, both on the Democratic side, and the Republican side, to come together and to insist that we get a continuing resolution enacted which can only be done by this House and by this Congress.

It is not the President of the United States's fault that the Republican Congress has refused to enact a continuing resolution. They have precipitated this crisis. As we remember, Speaker GINGRICH said many months ago that he intended to do this very thing in order to try to get the President to capitulate and to accept his budget priorities which clearly are not acceptable to the American people.

□ 1730

I feel very strongly as someone who has served in this body for 19 years that we have a responsibility as Members of this institution to keep this Government running. We have veterans who may possibly not get their checks in the next few days unless we get a