

paid their taxes, and they expect the services that the Government renders to them as citizens. This is not fair. There is no reason. I challenge anybody on the other side of the aisle to come and give me a valid reason why we cannot put the Federal employees back to work and continue the negotiations down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Now, what I say today, is it worth inconveniencing millions of Americans to get at the President of the United States? Is it worth that to my colleagues? This is just plain wrong. It is not the American way. Let us put these people back to work and make America work like it is supposed to work, and work out our differences like we always have over the past years in honest negotiations on legitimate differences in philosophy.

IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY STATUS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as this debate has proceeded, I have been listening to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle talk about who is responsible for the shutdown, and I will go into that in a moment. But in the course of the debate it was interesting to hear people refer to various symbols of patriotism in our country: the American flag, the eagle, Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam, he is a symbol of the Federal Government, but he has now become our dead-beat uncle, because across the country as we all sat down to our Christmas dinners and the start of a new year, many Federal workers were deprived of their pay, even those who were working.

Even further than that, many people who depend on the Federal Government to function not only now experience a tightening of the belt, but a closing down of their businesses, whether it is a sandwich shop near a Federal building or a tourist bed-and-breakfast near Yosemite National Park or some other national park throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, as we convene this second session of this Congress, we should all be ashamed of the disrespect with which Congress is treating hundreds of thousands of our valued Federal employees, public servants who want to work, many who are working now, and who perform important services for the people of our Nation.

Federal workers have been caught in the middle, against their will, held hostage to the machinations of the 104th Congress. This is a personal loss for many, and it is also a loss to the American taxpayer who has invested in Federal performance. It is time to end the Federal Government shutdown and to allow 260,000 Federal workers to return to their jobs. It is self-evident, I think, Mr. Speaker, that people who work should get paid for their work. Why should that be a mystery? Why is that even an issue here?

But do not take my word for it. I think it would be important to hear the voices of some Federal employees who yesterday rallied across the country. Their cry was: We will no longer be sacrificial lambs. Some of their individual stories are so definitive, so clear about why we should end this shutdown, that I want to share some of their words with you.

Pete, who files papers in the U.S. attorney's office, told the crowd of co-workers that she brought her two children to work yesterday because she could not afford child care after her paycheck stopped. Her children are at work with her as she changes diapers while she does work for the Federal Government.

Howard exclaimed, "If you do work, you should get paid. This is a type of 20th century slavery. We're responsible for our rent and board. Nobody else is going to be paying for it. We cannot file for unemployment," this particular group could not. "We cannot file for food stamps. What can we do?"

And finally, Eula said that she can now barely afford the gas money to get her from home to work. She has a commute between Antioch and Richmond, CA. Lajuana Brown had to cancel her 2-week Christmas vacation to work, and then had to ask her mother to take care of her children because she could not afford day care.

Mr. Speaker, the stories go on and on and on. In the course of the debate, our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have made various comments as to where the blame lay for this shutdown. It is interesting to hear them talk, because some of the comments seem to be contradictory, if the Parliamentarian would allow such a word.

First of all, they talk about if the President had not vetoed these bills. Thank God the President vetoed these totally unacceptable bills. They contend that they support a line-item veto, except not for this President. How inconsistent of them to argue about a President vetoing a bill, supporting a line-item veto, and not giving it to President Clinton.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Does my memory fail me? Did we not pass the line-item veto in the last session of Congress?

Ms. PELOSI. We did, in fact. It was one of the provisions of the contract, but not to apply to President Clinton.

Mr. HEFNER. That was not specified, that it would not apply to the President. They just have not given it to him yet.

Ms. PELOSI. They just have not given it to President Clinton, because of the delay.

They also talk about compassion. How many times have we heard our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle say neither party has a monopoly on compassion? Well, I say to them, my Republican colleagues, that

compassion without a positive initiative for change and for action is an empty emotion.

Sure, we are all compassionate, but what does that mean unless it translates into action to meet the needs of America's families, and certainly not to send them to work without paying them?

They talk about the capital gains tax and say, "Oh, President Clinton says he will support a capital gains tax." President Clinton said he would be open to some capital gains tax, not the giveaway to the rich for any turnover of any asset that our Republican colleagues are advocating.

Last of all, because I do not have any more time, I want to say the other contradiction that I hear is that they say that Congress should obey the rules that other people do. If that is the case, then Congress should not be receiving a paycheck at a time when other Federal workers are not. I call upon the Republican leadership to bring legislation to the floor to effect that. It has been proposed by our Democratic colleagues. So much to say, so little time.

PAINTED INTO A CORNER BY GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, here we are, American people, at the 4th day of January, 1996, almost 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and what are we doing? We are talking.

Mr. Speaker, in November a year ago the American people put the Republicans in charge of the U.S. Congress. They have a majority in the House and the Senate. They set the agenda. We cannot bring anything up unless they bring it up. They are meeting at 7 o'clock tonight to try figure out how to get themselves out of the predicament, how to get themselves out of corner that they painted themselves into in this ridiculous exercise.

One of the reasons I think the American people put the Republicans in charge is they thought that they could run this place like a business. Well, that turned out to be a joke. What business have we ever heard of that got mad, could not make a decision, sent its employees home and said, "Stay home, but I will pay you anyway, except the essential ones, you keep working but I am not going to pay you for the work that you have done"? I have never heard of an American business that is run that way; certainly not in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, then there is all this argument about the balanced budget. Well, I do not know anybody that is not for a balanced budget in this whole House of Representatives or in this whole Congress. The question is who is going to pay the cost of the balanced budget? Who is going to bear the burden of the balanced budget?

Well, the Republicans have picked out their victims. Their victims are the sick, old and young sick, the aged, the working poor, and a portion of the middle class to bear the burden. And at the same time they have granted to their rich contributors substantial tax breaks, people who do not need the tax breaks, who really have not asked for the tax breaks. I know a lot of them; they have never asked me for one. And this is the silliest way I have ever seen to run a government.

Now that covers a lot. I have been around here for 33 years and in legislative bodies for a total of 43 years, so I have seen some silly things done. But the mismanagement of NEWT GINGRICH and company, the mismanagement of our Republican colleagues of the time and of the energy and of the money of this country and of the resources of this country is a shame.

Here in January 1996, we should be making substantial plans as to how the budget will be balanced, making equitable changes. Now, this balanced budget is not a lot different than other attempts that we have made. The amount of dollars are about the same as amount of dollars that we did 4 years ago and 2 years ago, the undertakings that we are taking. But most of the balance in this so-called balanced budget operation does not come at the beginning; it comes in the year 2001 and the year 2002.

Now, we all know what is going to happen then. By that time there will be a whole new group of people in charge in this country, and most of the silly things that are being said here today will have been forgotten and most of the savings that we are talking about will have been forgotten.

I talk a lot to the elderly. I guess they picked me out for conversation because they think I am about their age and I have got some comity with them. They are worried to death about being forced into managed care where they will get a gatekeeper for their medical care instead of a physician when they call on the phone for a doctor's appointment. They are scared that managed care will mean that the insurance companies will decide whether they get a treatment or not, not their doctor.

Most of us go to a doctor because we think we need to go to a doctor. But I would rather go to a doctor that is going to be rewarded by being paid for what he does for me, not being rewarded by what he does not do for me. These are the kind of things that worry Americans.

□ 1700

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, as we meet here on the eve of a new year, as

we begin 1996 with the budget still unresolved, I think it is important to speak of the situation in historical context. In the 15½ years that I have been in Congress, I only experienced about 9 months of Government that was not divided where the House and the Senate and the White House were controlled by the same party. For most of that time, we have enjoyed or suffered through divided Government in America. The White House was controlled by one party, and the Congress was generally controlled by the other party. We are in that same situation today, only a little differently.

In most of those 15 years, the Republican Party controlled the White House and the Democratic Party controlled the Congress. In the course of that 15-year period, we have had Government shutdowns. This is, I think, the fifth one we have experienced in the course of those 15 years. Most of them have been rather brief. They have been total shutdowns over a weekend or a few days, and eventually things were worked out. Unfortunately, the way things were worked out was typically business as usual. There were compromises made; there was gives and takes. There were deals cut. There was a sentiment that, well, it is better to take a bad deal and go home than to duke it out and see if we cannot resolve our budget problems and somehow eventually balance the U.S. budget.

The product of business as usual over those 15 years of budget battles that led to temporary shutdowns and eventually continuing resolutions was a deepening and a worsening U.S. public debt. It has reached a point today, now, where every young person today is likely to spend as much as 80 to 90 percent of their income in taxes to some government, State, local or Federal, during their lifetime. That is what economists tell us the debt is doing to us.

It has reached a point today where a young child born today will spend \$187,000 just paying interest on the debt we have accumulated. It has reached the point today where if we do not begin solving the Medicare crisis in this country, we will have two choices 7 years from now. We will face a Medicare system completely bankrupt and we will either have no Medicare system for our elderly, or we will have to double payroll taxes on working Americans. That will be the choice 7 years from now if we do not stick around and resolve this budget debate in this, the early days of January, or, if necessary, through 1996 until we reach election day and let the voters decide who is right or wrong.

At some point Americans are going to have to make a decision. Do they really like business as usual, where deals are cut at the end of every fiscal year and we go deeper and deeper into debt or would they rather some President at some time design a balanced budget amendment based on honest numbers within a reasonable period of

time that will end this fiscal insanity both for ourselves and for our children?

If you are conservative, you certainly want that done. If you are liberal and you see every year more and more of the Federal budget spent on interest on the debt instead of on programs for Americans, you ought to also want that done. We ought to agree upon that.

And so during the course of the last few months and the year, we offered an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Congress do that. We were met with objections here in the House. We succeeded in passing it in the House. We were met with objections in the other body. They did not pass it in the other body.

The objections generally ran like this. We do not need the Constitution to tell Congress to balance the budget. We can do it ourselves and we ought to do it now. That was the objection of the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We do not need a constitutional amendment. We can do it and we ought to do it now.

Well, why not now? Why not a budget agreement that balances the budget in 7 years on honest numbers right now?

That is what this historic fight is all about. That is why we are in this awful period of partial Government shutdown, why we have this awful debate on our hands were sometimes it gets acrimonious and personal, and it should never get to that point, but that is why we stand here in the course of these early days in January struggling with the notion of how do we negotiate eventually to a position of a balanced budget in 7 years using honest numbers without doing business as usual, without caving in to all those who want to keep on taxing and spending as we have done for generations to the point that our children now are deeply in debt and will remain in debt for the duration of their lives. How do we resolve it. We resolve it by agreeing now to a balanced budget plan.

THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it may well be that in the 20th day of this crisis we are too close to it, have been too immersed in it to think clearly our way out of it. It is actually 25 days, if you consider the 5 days of the previous shutdown.

Let us look at what we say we are doing. The other side honestly admits that its purpose is to bring leverage on the President. Examining that proposition, it is clear that the other side has succeeded in bringing leverage as much as they are ever going to do.

Let me explain why. The fact is that the President has now signed on to a 7-year balanced budget. He had not done that before. Having done that, it would