

No search was conducted for any skull fragments. When you blow the top of your head out with a .38 caliber bullet, there are skull fragments and bone fragments all about where the head was. There was none of this, no blood and no brain particles.

No search was conducted for skull fragments, as I said. Only a very cursory search was conducted for the bullet. White House Counsel Bernie Nussbaum refused to allow Park Police officers or the FBI to search Foster's office. In fact, the night of Foster's death, Bernie Nussbaum, the chief counsel of the President, and two other high level White House aides, Patsy Thomason, who was the chief personnel officer, and Mrs. Williams, Hillary Clinton's chief of staff, searched Foster's office and removed files having to do with Whitewater. This was after the Park Police asked that the office be sealed, and it was not sealed for at least 12 hours while they went through and rifled through those papers. Justice Department officials accused Nussbaum of violating an agreement they had reached regarding the search of Foster's office.

Second, the coroner that conducted the autopsy on Foster has made glaring errors in the past. This was not revealed by the "60 Minutes" show. Dr. James Beyer was the coroner who reviewed and did the autopsy on Vince Foster.

Let me tell you about Mr. Beyer. In 1989 there was an autopsy on establishing the death of a man named Tim Easley. Mr. Beyer, the coroner, ruled that Easley killed himself by stabbing himself in the chest. He failed to notice a defensive wound on the man's hand. The case was reopened, and, after an outside expert reviewed the case, Easley's girlfriend confessed to murdering him, after he had been judged a suicide by the coroner. That is one mistake.

In 1991, regarding a Mr. Tommy Burkett, Mr. Beyer did an autopsy on him and ruled that Burkett had killed himself with a gunshot wound to the mouth very similar to Vince Foster's. He said it was a suicide. Mr. Burkett's family had the body exhumed and reexamined by an outside expert. The second coroner reported that Dr. Beyer had failed to notice a disfigured and bloody ear, indicating a struggle, and a broken jaw, indicating he had been hit in the face and his jaw was broken during a struggle. The FBI is now investigating this case. It obviously was a murder or homicide, and not a suicide.

The first special counsel, Robert Fiske, appointed a board of forensic experts to review the Vince Foster case. They concurred in Fiske's opinion that Foster killed himself at Fort Marcy Park. However, they were not appointed until a year after Foster died, and the only way that they could come to the conclusions they did was to read the coroner's report and use that as a guide to come to their conclusions. So they never saw the body, and they verified he was killed at the park. But the

fact of the matter is, they could not possibly have known that, because they only used the coroner's report to come to the conclusions they did.

So, in conclusion, last summer, when the Senate Committee on Banking and Financial Services held a hearing on Foster's death, the FBI testified there was absolutely no doubt that Foster killed himself, and that he killed himself at Fort Marcy Park.

Now, let us review the problems and glaring inconsistencies with this investigation.

First, the eyewitness who found the body testified that he is sure there was no gun in Foster's hand and the hands were in a different position than when the police arrived. That was not mentioned on "60 Minutes."

Second, the confidential witness said there were no bloodstains on the face when he found the body. There were bloodstains on the cheek when the police arrived, indicating it had been moved. When they moved his body, his head went over to the side and blood drained out on the face.

Third, the confidential witness testified he saw a wine cooler bottle close to Foster's body in the park, and a package of similar wine cooler bottles in a car in the parking lot that did not belong to Foster. Where did they come from? Where did that bottle go?

Fourth, despite extensive searches of the park, the FBI has been unable to find the bullet that killed Vince Foster, and they are still looking for it. Evidently the independent counsel sent them back out there 2 or 3 weeks ago to look for it again.

Fifth, no skull fragments were ever found at the site where Foster's body was found, even though there definitely would have been skull fragments from that kind of a wound.

Sixth, there were no fingerprints on the gun. Get this: The gun was in his hand, and there were no fingerprints on the gun. The FBI said they probably, get this, "melted off in the heat." And yet when they took the gun apart, they found fingerprints there from the time the gun was made at the factory.

Seventh, there were no fingerprints on the suicide note found in Foster's briefcase in his White House office. It was torn up into 28 pieces, and the first few times the briefcase was searched, they could not find the note at all, even though they turned it upside down, and there were no fingerprints on it.

Eighth, the coroner who conducted the autopsy of Foster's body has made glaring errors of high profile cases in the past. In one case, a body had to be exhumed and reexamined in order to change the ruling from suicide to murder.

Ninth, security guards working at the Saudi Arabian Ambassador's residence across the street from the park, within 100 yards, 300 feet, with guards outside all day and night, heard no gunshot.

Tenth, Foster's shoes were completely clean, with no grass or dirt

stains, even though he was supposed to have walked 700 yards through the park to the second cannon.

No. 11, the FBI never made any attempt to identify the carpet fibers or the blond hair on Foster's clothing.

No. 12, the police photos at the death scene did not turn out, leaving a serious lack of documentation of the death scene.

With all of the glaring problems, can you imagine the FBI telling the Senate Banking Committee there could be no doubt about where and how Foster died? With all of these glaring problems, can you imagine what Johnny Cochran, F. Lee Bailey, and O.J. Simpson's other lawyers would have done in a case like this?

Independent Counsel Starr is still investigating this death. "60 Minutes" should not jump to conclusions until Mr. Starr has completed his investigation, and Members of Congress should not jump to conclusions until Mr. Starr completes his investigation as well.

So I just would like to say to my friends at "60 Minutes," Mr. Wallace, Mr. Hewlitt, and everybody else, before you make the kind of determination that you did and do the kind of reporting that you did 2 weeks ago, please talk to all the people involved, especially eyewitnesses. The man who found the body, who gave a sworn statement under oath to me and to two other Congressmen, was never contacted, never interviewed, and nobody has seen that report, even Mr. CLINGER, who is the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight here in the House.

So I just say that I think it was a bad piece of reporting, and I would urge them to be more thorough in the future.

#### BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 45 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take advantage of this momentous occasion to talk with some of my distinguished colleagues a little further on what we did on this floor today.

This vote earlier today on the Seven Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, as far as I am concerned, is not only the defining moment for the 104th Congress, but clearly it is one of the most historic votes in modern memory.

I had the opportunity to preside for a short period of time today in the Speaker's chair over the debate, and, as I was sitting up there, Mr. Speaker, where you are sitting now, I was really struck. I found myself thinking back

on my first stint in Congress, since some of my friends and families like to teasingly call me a "retread." But I have served in Congress once before, took a time out, I guess a forced vacation or sabbatical, going through a near-death experience politically, and then won election again to Congress, and had, obviously, the good fortune to come back to Washington as part of our new majority.

As I was sitting up there today I thought back on the debate we had in the 102d Congress, when a group of us, led by the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, who is now the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget and the primary architect and sponsor of this Seven Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act, attempted to force a debate on this floor on balancing the Federal budget.

□ 2015

As I thought back on that debate, I realized that the terms of the debate back here in Washington have fundamentally changed, and for the better, in my view. I think there is no going back to that time and that tenor in previous Congresses. The debate has changed again because now the debate is framed in terms of what we will do, even if it entails sacrifice on the part of ourselves and our fellow Americans to preserve the American dream for our children, and, frankly, to create a better opportunity, a better future rather for better opportunities for all Americans, particularly for our kids and grandkids.

So back then the debate was cast in terms of why we cannot and will not balance the Federal budget, and today, concluding with this historic vote on final passage for the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act, we saw that the debate in the 104th Congress and, as far as I am concerned from here on out, will be cast in terms of how we can and we will and we must balance the Federal budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, things have very much changed. Back then, in that 102d Congress, and what made me think of this is now that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, one of our former colleagues, Senator SANTORUM came over to join us tonight on this floor for the conclusion of the debate and the vote on final passage. Back then I recalled doing special order with him into the wee hours of the night. Now we are a little more civilized, we have a certain time restraint on special orders to allow our hard working staff to get home. But I remember that on that occasion we both took from our wallets, as I am right now, photographs of our families. We both have young children. As I look at mine, mine are much older than then and certainly have grown much bigger, but I really think what we did today is all about our kids and America's children.

Again I am struck by how much the debate has changed back in Washington, and I look forward to talking about these fundamental changes with

my colleagues on the House floor tonight during the remaining time for our special order.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I want to yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] who can, I think, set the stage for the debate to follow, and then we will go to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD], and my colleague and very good friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], who I think has made some major contributions to the budget reconciliation package.

So I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and I want to set the framework for the rest of our discussion by giving to the audience here in the House Chamber and elsewhere what the marching orders have been for Congress, and they are expressed on this chart here.

This is something that has been driven by the American people. We have had a lot of polling data that has been given to the Congress and it says there are some things they want to see happen over the course of the remainder of this year. Well, top on the list here is balancing the budget in 7 years.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of voting for a reconciliation package that does balance the budget in 7 years and it passed on a vote of 227 to 203.

We also received from the American public the request to save Medicare from bankruptcy this year. I want to make a comment that there has been some confusion between tax breaks, which we will talk about in a minute, and saving Medicare. The allegation has been that we are taking cuts in Medicare and giving it to our rich friends, but it is really not true. In fact, it is an outright lie. We are increasing. What is going to happen in Medicare, right now the average recipient gets \$4,800. By 2002 the average recipient will get \$6,700, an increase of \$1,900, 43 percent.

There is a provision called a lockbox in the bill that says that any savings go right back towards health care. They do not go towards any kind of tax breaks. So that has been a big misnomer the American public has had to swim through to get to the truth.

Also, as a request from the American public, we are going to reform welfare. That is an important thing to do because we have a system now that is obviously broke. It is anti-family and anti-work. Just since October 1st, in Wichita, Kansas, we had a toddler that was shot in a gang feud. A two-year-old child was sitting in a car seat out in front of a Quick Trip, which is a convenience store; in a gang-related killing this little child was shot. This is evidence of the breakdown of the American family. It is time that we change this system that has been around since the 1960s because it really is broken.

By any yardstick that we use to measure our social climate, whether it be violence or drug abuse or illegitimacy, they have all gotten worse in the last 30 years, and I think their roots are in the current welfare system.

The last thing I want to talk about is providing that tax relief for families and for job creation that is important, and we will expand more on that later, but one more chart I want to talk about before I yield back. This is from Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, and it goes back to the very first point we were talking about, balancing the budget.

We need to look at what are the effects of balancing the budget. Congress has been trying to do it for 25 years. They have been unsuccessful until this year. This year we are successful in getting on a glide path to balance the budget by 2002. But what will be the results, according to the chairman of the Federal Reserve? His vision says that children will have a higher standard of living than their parents.

Mr. Speaker, about a year ago there was a poll where about two-thirds of Americans had lost faith in the system. They did not think that their children would have the same or better opportunities than they had. We are going to restore faith in the system. We are going to provide the opportunity for may children and the children in the fourth district of Kansas and across America to have a higher standard of living than their parents.

Improve the purchasing power of incomes. We have seen a real degradation of purchasing power over the last 40 years. We want to reverse that trend by balancing the budget.

A rise in productivity. If we are going to compete on an international basis we must have a rise in productivity.

A reduction in inflation. We have not seen the inflation like we had during the Carter years, but we are right on the verge with a lot of short-term debt that needs refinancing and long-term debt. We have a very big increase in the money supply. We must check that inflation so we have a reduction in inflation.

We are going to strengthen financial markets. Acceleration long-term economic growth and a significant drop in long-term interest rates. According to Alan Greenspan, a balanced budget would reduce the interest rates 2 percent. And in the average house in Wichita, KS, that would cut the payment about \$100 a month, over a 30-year mortgage about \$36,000 to \$38,000. A significant reduction by simply balancing the budget.

So I think we have had a real challenge from the American public. We have seen a significant step tonight with putting the seven-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act in place, passed through the House. And as I yield back, I want to say I was very proud to be a part of that and hope that America will see this significant

achievement and have hope for the future, because I see that hope.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his participation in this special order. He makes, I think, some very significant points, not the least of which, to paraphrase that wonderful and venerable saying, we do not inherit the world from our parents, we borrow it from our children. I think what we are all about tonight, and as a majority party in the Congress, is making a better world for our children.

I really believe, Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of excuses. As the gentleman from Kansas points out, it has been more than a quarter of a century since Washington last produced a balanced budget. Twenty-five years. And the American people's patience with the excuses, with the Washington gimmicks, has actually worn out.

Last November, and I do not think there is any mistaking the message of last year's election, they demanded an end to ever bigger government, ever increasing taxes and endless deficits as far as the eye can see. They voted for smaller government, lower taxes, and a balanced budget, and that is the clear message to the Republican Congress.

After 10 months, Mr. Speaker, of frankly fighting the entrenched opposition of the defenders of the status quo, for the most part the Democratic minority, which has refused to acknowledge at least what the leader of their party, President Clinton, has recently acknowledged, and that is we must get on with task of balancing the budget. Despite all the obstacles we have encountered, we are able to report to the American people tonight mission accomplished.

So as the gentleman points out, for the discussion that will follow, we have produced today in this historic legislation the first balanced budget in 25 years, which includes a plan passed last week on the House floor as a separate freestanding bill and then incorporated into the legislation on the floor today, a plan to preserve, protect and strengthen Medicare which still allows Medicare spending.

As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] finally admitted a little earlier this evening in his special order, we still allow Medicare spending to increase for every senior every year. As the gentleman from Kansas points out, we have a genuine welfare reform proposal that emphasizes work, families and hope for the future. And, last, but certainly not least, in terms of importance, tax cuts to counter, and let us be honest about this, the huge Clinton Democratic tax increase in the last Congress, but tax cuts to strengthen families and to stimulate economic growth and job creation in the private sector, which gives us most of our new living wage jobs.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD].

Mr. NORWOOD. I thank my friend from California for yielding, and let me say to the gentlemen, Mr. HUTCHINSON from Arkansas, and Mr. TIAHRT from Kansas, that I am very pleased to share this hour with them. I think it is fortunate that we represent the whole southern end of the United States so that people can know that this is not just a Georgia thing and this is not just an Arkansas thing, this is a movement that we see in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate for us to recognize how fortunate we are to have such a wonderful speaker pro tempore tonight, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM]. We are privileged to be here with you, sir.

I also want to point out that I would rather be watching the Braves game, the Atlanta Braves are going to finish that series tonight, and I am sorry I will not be there, but today is such an historic day that I wanted us to have a little time tonight to talk about the truth again, because, generally, we have to come in an hour early to hear the misrepresentations and the half truths so we know really what to say to the American people in order to correct their misinformation.

It was interesting to me tonight, Mr. RIGGS, to watch the minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, and the fact that he was actually stunned that this body was going to balance the budget. He seemed in disbelief that after 25 years we were actually going to balance the budget. I think for me tonight I was a little stunned, too. I cannot imagine this body having an hour debate where the debate is what is the best way to balance the budget.

Do Members know we actually did that tonight? We had another group that thought we should do it a little different way, but the idea was that we have to balance our budget for our children and our grandchildren.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak a little bit to why we are dealing with the problem. What really caused this reconciliation package for a balanced budget over 7 years. We in this country, maybe not us, maybe our children and maybe our grandchildren, are in debt \$5 trillion. That is a fact. My 2-year-old grandson owes \$187,000 on his portion of the interest on the debt. If we continue to follow the lead of Mr. GEPHARDT, we would borrow another trillion over the next 4 years, get into the 21st century and start borrowing a trillion every 3 years, and next year we would pay more for the interest on the debt than we actually spend on defense and where would it end?

I think it is pretty clear if we continue to follow the Gephardt plan that we are going to end up bankrupt. We are going to end up a mess in this country with a standard of living that none of us want for our children.

Mr. Speaker, there is another option. We can follow the lead of the great South American economies and we can start printing a lot of money. Well, we all know what happens there. Our econ-

omy goes to ruin. A third option for us might have been to follow the President's lead and continue to do what we are doing and spend whatever we want to spend with no prioritizing, just spend it if we like it, and we could get into the 21st century and our children would be paying 85 cents out of every dollar they earn just for taxes, just to keep this country afloat.

□ 2030

Now, it is my personal opinion, my children are doing enough. My father paid \$1 out of every \$50 he earned in Federal taxes. My son is paying \$1 out of every \$4 he earns. They are doing enough.

Our only alternative, then, was to do what the people I know in the 10th District of Georgia said do. They said for us to balance this budget by cutting spending. And in addition to that, they said, we do not like the 103d Congress' and Mr. Clinton's \$260 billion tax increase. And if my colleagues do not believe they did not like it, look around this body sometime and look at all the new faces. The American people said we do not want the tax increase.

Now, what I think we are trying to do is exactly what my people at home said do. First, give them their money back. I do not think of this as a tax cut; I think of this as a tax return. We are giving \$245 billion back out of the \$260 billion.

Now, we start doing what they told me to do. Start by cutting the spending. That is precisely what this reconciliation has done. As we talk about more details of our tax return and details of this great Medicare Program, Mr. TIAHRT and I talked about it the other night. I cannot wait for us to get home and start talking to our seniors and give them the details.

Mr. RIGGS, I will yield back in hopes that we will come back and talk more about Medicare.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is very distinguished in his professional life. I guess he could call it his "real life." His professional career. He is one of a handful of medical doctors who joined the 104th Congress. He is a dentist by profession and obviously very knowledgeable about the issue of health care.

I know that he has worked hard on the Medicare Preservation Act portion of the budget reconciliation bill. So, I would like the gentleman from Georgia to review for us, briefly if he could, what we were able to accomplish last week when we passed the Medicare Preservation Act on this House floor, and why it was included in the budget reconciliation.

Mr. NORWOOD. First of all, I do not think any American would disagree with us on the point that Medicare part A was going bankrupt. If my mother-in-law was to have Medicare in the year 2002, we had to act. We could not hide behind a rock; we could not wait until the next election; we needed to deal with the problem today. That is

exactly what we have done, and I am very, very pleased with the outcome.

I think we have managed to do some very good things for the patients, if you will. That is how I tend to think about people. But the patients in Medicare are going to be much better off.

First thing, we are going to increase the spending greatly. I know, 40 percent; I get new numbers saying up to 50 percent. But the spending over 7 years is going to increase greatly.

Mr. Speaker, I will use the same tired numbers. We are now spending \$4,800 per recipient. In the year 2002, we are going to be spending \$6,700 per recipient. I know in Washington that is a cut, but in the 10th District of Georgia, that is a \$1,900 increase.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman would yield for me to interject, those figures are actually higher in high-growth States like California. The increase in California is roughly from \$5,000 per Medicare beneficiary today to \$8,000 per Medicare beneficiary in the year 2002.

Our Medicare Preservation Act anticipates that we will spend an aggregate of \$50,000 per Medicare beneficiary in California over the next 7 years.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NORWOOD. If I could, I want to hurry and bring this up. My mother-in-law may be watching. One of the things that is so great about the Medicare plan is the options. The patients are going to have the same options that we have as Congressmen. They are not going to have to have one-size-fits-all. They are going to look at a number of alternatives and they are going to pick the option that is best for that family. A 65-year-old is going to take a different option than an 85-year-old, but the point is, they will have options.

Quickly, let me say, Medicare recipients do not have to do anything. If they want to stay in Medicare exactly as it is today, all they have to do is stay there. They do not even have to make a phone call. If they like part A and part B and Medigap and that suits them and they are happy with their doc, they can stay put.

There is no increase in the copayments; there is no increase in the deductibles. It is exactly like it is. We are not changing anything for anybody.

Now, having said that, Mother-in-law, I want to look at some of the other great options, because there are new ways to have health care. We are going to have provider service networks. Listen, I have been in health care. That is going to be great. The doctors are going to come together. The hospitals are going to come together. They are going to have efficiencies. They are going to work at getting the costs down and not have to worry about the Federal Trade Commission putting them in jail.

Mr. Speaker, that is what has been holding the price up, partly, in health care. The Federal Trade Commission would not dare let two of our hospitals come together and share a CAT scan. Lord knows, that is cheating.

Mr. RIGGS. And that is the antitrust reforms we made.

Mr. NORWOOD. Antitrust reforms are very important in that bill.

Another option for patients will be to try managed care. That is going to be the right thing for certain people. It might not be right for everybody, but recipients can get into these programs for the first 2 years and if they do not like it in 30 days, go back. Try them all. Try even one of them. See what is best for your family.

Medical savings accounts will be terrific. Not for every patient. Not for every person. But they are going to be very good for many families to choose the medical savings account where they simply get a cash rebate from the Government. Rather than them paying a recipient's Medicare bills, the recipient will put that money in the bank and draw interest on it and no tax on it. They will have a catastrophic insurance plan and they even choose the amount of their deductible; \$3,000, \$5,000. It is a terrific bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Georgia who is one of the leading architects of the Medicare reforms that are contained in the bill.

Now, if the gentleman would not mind, I want to turn to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON]. We are also joined by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is one of the principal movers and shakers in the House of Representatives for real reform of the American welfare system; one of the chief architects of the welfare reform provisions contained in the Seven-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is the leading proponent of the section in the budget reconciliation bill which effectively will abolish the Department of Commerce and at least partially address the criticism from some of our political opponents and other skeptics and pundits across the land who believe that we are not willing to tackle in an earnest fashion the whole issue of corporate subsidies.

Let me turn first to the gentleman from Arkansas and then next to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join my friend and colleague on a truly historic and monumental night. I have admired the gentleman's contribution for many years back when he was in the gang of seven in his first round in Congress, and I think he had a great deal to do with bringing this day and making it a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I first got into public life and ran for public office back in 1984. We had a business and I have been involved in education. People asked me, "Why would you get into politics and go into the State legislature?" I served 8 years in the Arkansas State Legislature with Bill Clinton as the Governor.

My answer was very simple. I had one motivation. I had three boys who at

that time were pretty young. I had twins who were 12-years-old at the time and I had an 8-year-old. I looked at where our country was headed and even then 12 years ago at the kind of debt that we were accumulating in this country and the burden that we were placing upon them. I wanted to be able to look them in their eyes and say, "You guys, the Nation that I am leaving you, the heritage that I am leaving you may not be what I wanted it to be, but I did what I could to reverse that."

Mr. Speaker, here a dozen years later it is so gratifying to know that all across this country there were people who were feeling that same way and who took the step to get into public life and who have made this day a reality.

For the first time in 25 years, we passed a reconciliation bill that leads us to a balanced budget in the year 2002. I suppose if it had been easier, there would have been a Congress that would have done it before. It has taken courage and there were some choppy waters out there, but today we cast the right vote.

In the midst of all the debate and statistics and rhetoric today, I am afraid it could be easy to forget that the real winners in this vote today, the real winner is the American family. And that is the purpose of this, and I appreciate the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for organizing this special order to remind us that the real victors today were the families.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] a moment ago had the chart up, the marching orders for Congress: Balanced budget, tax relief, welfare reform, and Medicare reform. When we really look at those issues, they come right back to the American family. There is nothing more that we could do for the American family than balance the budget.

My district director has a 2-year-old little girl, Abby Deatherage, and we have all fallen in love with her. When Abby was born 2 years ago, she inherited \$18,000 worth of debt and she is going to pay \$187,000 over her lifetime just to pay her part of the interest on the national debt, and it has gotten worse every day.

Mr. Speaker, we finally have started to change that with this historic vote today.

Mr. RIGGS. If I may interject for a moment, that will be taxes that she will pay over the course of her lifetime as a wage earner and taxpayer just in interest on the national debt for no productive purpose. This is money that otherwise could have gone perhaps for college education, home purchase, health care, but instead it will go just to pay interest on the national debt at the present rate.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. That is her paying for our luxuries and what we wanted to consume during our generation.

Let me illustrate it a different way. It is not a partisan issue. There was a bipartisan commission on entitlements. It was chaired by Democrat Senator KERRY, and it made this observation. In just 17 years, the year 2012, Federal mandatory spending, that is entitlements, plus interest, that is mandatory spending, entitlements plus interest, will consume all of the total amount of revenues collected.

Not a penny for roads; not a penny for courts; not a penny for Head Start; not a penny for drug enforcement; not a penny for the FBI, national defense, and on and on we go. All of it consumed on entitlements and on interest.

Mr. RIGGS. And that is the course we were on until today.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Until today.

Mr. NORWOOD. Let me ask a question about that. Had we not changed things, I can expect that the likely solution would well have been to raise taxes until we get up to the President's number of 85 cents out of every dollar, leaving our children to live on 15 cents of every dollar.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. My colleague is exactly right. The liberal solution has always been raise taxes. But the interesting thing is that the Joint Economic Committee that produced a report in 1992 demonstrated that during the last 40 years, every time Congress raised taxes \$1, they increased spending \$1.59, which I think is the clearest evidence that raising taxes is not the solution to deficit spending. Rather, it is to control spending and that is what this Congress took a big step toward today.

Ronald Reagan said, "Never give a big spender a bigger allowance." That is what we have been doing for too long.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about tax relief. Back in my district, there are some awfully patriotic people. They say, We would like to have a tax cut, but why cut taxes if this is the time to balance the budget?

I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] said it well. He explained the situation that we face appropriately. They deserve a dividend out of the savings that we are generating. The tough choices that we have made, they deserve to get a dividend on that.

There is nothing I have worked harder on than this \$500-per-child tax credit. My Senate colleague from Minnesota, ROD GRAMS, and I worked very hard to get it into the Republican budget 2 years ago when the Republican budget did not seem anything more than a symbolic gesture. It became part of the Contract With America, and now it is passed today.

In 1948, the average family paid 3 percent of its income to Uncle Sam and today that same family pays 24.5 percent. When we combine it with State taxes, local taxes, the cost of government regulation, the average family pays 52 percent of its income to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, that is more than they pay for clothing; more than they pay for food; more than they pay for recreation; more than they pay for health care. All of those things combined, they are paying more to the Federal Government in taxes.

Then they say, "You are cutting Medicare so that you can give breaks to the wealthy." Who are we really giving relief to? That \$500-per-child tax credit will benefit most the middle-class working person who has seen his lifestyle squeezed over the years. If he makes \$30,000 and they have two children, that couple is going to see their Federal taxes cut in half.

□ 2145

If they make \$25,000 a year, two children, that \$500 per child tax credit will mean that they owe nothing.

Mr. NORWOOD. They do not pay any taxes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Those are not rich people. They will not owe anything at that wage level.

Mr. NORWOOD. It depends on who defines rich. I notice some on the other side say anybody who has a job is rich. A family of four making \$25,000 a year is not rich. You mean to tell me they will not have to pay any? All of their tax liability goes away?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. That will be the effect.

Mr. NORWOOD. What a great move.

Mr. RIGGS. That family of four effectively gets a \$1,000 tax break each and every year until those two children turn 18, and I believe the estimate was that the \$500 per child tax credit will completely eliminate the Federal tax liability for something like 4.7 million American families with incomes below \$25,000 a year.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. They are suddenly going to discover, when this becomes a reality next year, that they are the rich people that people said we were cutting taxes for.

I might point out, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for his efforts on insuring that the earned income tax credit for even lower-income working Americans, those making \$12,000 to \$20,000, to insure that this budget reconciliation will make them a winner as well, that there will be no working Americans with children who will be net losers because of this budget reconciliation bill. I think that is very important. We want to reward working Americans and working American families. That is what this budget reconciliation can do. The issue is who can spend it better.

For years, for a generation now, we have confiscated the taxes, the wages of hard-working Americans, brought that money to Washington; we in our wisdom in the Washington-knows-best mentality decided where it should go, sent it back to them in the form of entitlements after we took out a huge surcharge back in Washington.

Back in Arkansas, we kind of have the notion God made the family to be the primary caretaker of their chil-

dren, not the government, and that the moms and dads of middle America will know better how to use that money for the benefit of their children and their families than bureaucrats in Washington, DC.

Mr. NORWOOD. Just for a second, you mentioned the earned income tax credit, and you know and I know we have heard so much unbelievable rhetoric about that.

Do you know that this 7-year reconciliation balanced budget bill increases that by 35 percent? "Increase" in Georgia, that means going up, you know, 35 percent more for the earned income tax credit.

Mr. RIGGS. Likewise, we increase spending, of course, on Medicare, Medicaid, and the welfare program, although at a slower rate than the present course.

So I thank the gentleman from Arkansas very much for his contribution, and I was really remiss. I introduced him as one of the leading architects of welfare reform in the House of Representatives. He is certainly that. But he is also the chief proponent of the \$500 per child tax credit going back to the last Congress in his first term in Congress. I want to thank the gentleman for what he has done to provide much-needed tax relief for American families.

I want to turn to the gentleman from Michigan, who, as I mentioned earlier, was the chief proponent, or is the chief proponent, of our plans for reinventing the Federal Government by beginning with the elimination of the Commerce Department.

I also want to signal to my colleagues that we have a little bit less than 15 minutes remaining on our special order.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the gentleman. It is good to be here joining you at this moment, certainly a moment of history when this Congress has passed Medicare reform, welfare reform, balanced budget, certainly the dismantling of the Commerce Department, which is near and dear to my heart, but also tax cuts.

You know, I would like to take a minute, and my colleague from Arkansas, you know, I think you hit it right on the head. The Republican Party is the party for people that work. That is really what we are saying here. You know, when you talk about these tax cuts, the only people that say that they do not want a tax cut are people that can afford it. But people that work, they are the ones that really want it. You know what this thing is all about, and the Democrats know what this is all about, they are railing against this tax cut.

I mean, it was, first of all, school lunches. We heard that back in May, school lunches; we were eliminating the School Lunch Program, we were taking the food out of the children's

mouths. But guess what happened in August, a school year started, and we have not heard one story or one comment from anyone about one child in this country that did not get their school lunches. Is that not amazing?

I think it speaks volumes about the rhetoric we heard today, and what we are trying to do to balance this budget, what that really means is instead of spending \$3 trillion more than what we are spending today over the next 7 years, we are going to spend \$2 trillion more than what we are spending today over the next 7 years. The Democrats know that. They know we are increasing spending. The only way to get to a balanced budget in 7 years is to increase the growth of revenue, and the only way to increase the growth of revenue is to have these tax cuts.

You know, it is not money the Federal Government has that we are going to say we are going to give you some money back. It is money that we are saying to people out there, keep it, do not send it in, you will make a better decision about spending it. The Democrats know it. They know that we need those tax cuts. All of us in this country need those tax cuts in order to get this balanced budget, and we need to make sure, as we did tonight, as the Senate will do tomorrow, that there will be \$245 billion worth of tax cuts in this.

There also is certainly a provision in this thing that says we have to have the spending cuts first, and they have to be certified before the tax cuts kick in. I think it is important for the American people to know that.

Mr. RIGGS. Is that the lockbox language?

Mr. CHRYSLER. I was going to say, set up the lockbox provision, that says that when we eliminate a program, those savings go to eliminating the debt which is other than the deficit. So we have set up a number of things.

Mr. RIGGS. Just on that one point, to make sure I clearly understand what the gentleman is saying, the gentleman is saying our 7-year balanced budget plan has to be certified as getting us to a balanced budget, and perhaps even generating a budget surplus, an unheard-of idea in this town, but a budget surplus, a balanced budget and a budget surplus by the year 2002 before any tax cuts can take effect.

Mr. CHRYSLER. That is exactly right. Now, the American people need to know that, because there is a lot of demagoguery going on about this, and it is amazing to me, the American people need to know that this is not the Government's money. This is their money. All of us. We are the taxpayers. We are the government, in fact, and most Americans, it is a strange phenomenon, but most Americans think the money withheld from their paycheck is not even their money, and, you know, it is the single largest expenditure they make, as the gentleman said, higher than the car that they buy, higher the clothes and the food they put on their tables, the clothes they

put on their backs. This is a tremendous expenditure on the part of the American taxpayers. It is their money. It is not government. We are not cutting taxes. We are just letting people keep more of what they earn and save, and we need a little less government. We need lower taxes. We need to let people make their own decisions about how they spend their money and not government, because we need to preserve the opportunity, certainly that all of us have had in our lifetimes, for our kids because when it is their turn, they deserve the same opportunity that we have had.

That is what this is all about.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Very eloquent. The gentleman made a crucial point. The gentleman actually made the point that by allowing people to keep more of what they make, more of their hard-earned money, we actually create an incentive for average Americans to plan and save for their own retirement, which helps reduce the strain on the entitlement programs. I think that is a crucial point.

Mr. CHRYSLER. When we let people keep more of what they earn and save, we let them make their own decisions how they spend it, they are always going to make the better decisions. They are going to go out and buy something. When they buy something, somebody has to build that something. When somebody builds something, they are earning a wage and paying taxes. That is how you create revenue for the government.

Mrs. MYRICK. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Michigan makes a very good point, you know, when you talk about government funds, and it is really our money and the taxpayers' money. Have we ever considered the fact that why do we not just talk about, instead of saying government funds, taxpayers' funds or taxpayers' money every time that we mention it? Because really and truly there is a mentality up here that says, "Oh, it is the government's money," and so the American people really do not have the benefit of the thinking to realize that we are here to say, hey, wait a minute, this is your money, and we want to give it back to you. Just a thought.

Mr. CHRYSLER. It is a very good thought. Certainly, you know, we all need to understand that we have got to talk in language the American people understand. We talk about Medicaid and Medicare. The average American out there does not understand the difference. This Medi Grant Program is much clearer than Medicaid, and certainly things like Most Favored Nation status for China should be called normalizing trade relations. Community Reinvestment Act should be called high-risk lending because that is exactly what it is. When the American citizens, the American taxpayers, can understand what we are talking about in clear and concise language, then

they will feel more a part of the government and there will be more respect for it.

Mr. RIGGS. I look forward to doing further special orders with my colleagues. I know, with the frantic pace we have been keeping in this Congress, we will be on next week on to other matters. Really I think we hopefully will at least periodically pause and reflect on what we have done here today. We still have a ways to go. Obviously, we will have to work out any differences between the House and Senate versions of this balanced budget reconciliation bill. Then we have to see what the President does, the one remaining obstacle to the critical reforms we discussed here tonight. I am committed to coming back here and reinforcing our actions and making sure we convey our message to the American people because again this is by far and away the most momentous and historic vote in any Congress in modern times.

I want to go very quickly to my colleagues to give them an opportunity to make some closing remarks.

Mr. TIAHRT. As we close, I want to say the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act is for Gene and Kathy Ewert, who have Tia, Trevor, and Katie. It is a \$500 tax break for each one of those. That will cover several months; rent. For David and Kay Walker, who have three sons, Caton, Daniel, and Body, that will be \$500 for each of those boys, and that will cover several months of house payments, and it is very important to David because he is on strike right now.

So this tax package that we have in the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act is for families, and I am excited about that, and I am happy that we can still balance the budget, get the workings of government going and take care of families here in America.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman for his comments and participation.

Mr. NORWOOD. In closing, I will make three quick little points. No. 1, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] on behalf of my 29-year-old son and two of the most beautiful children you have ever seen for the \$500 tax credit. I know that it is going to the right place for the right people.

I think it is very important that we say to the American people, because I know it drives me crazy when they talk about tax cuts for the wealthy, when 90 percent of these tax returns that we are going to give people back are for families with incomes of \$75,000 or less, and 75 percent of the capital gains that we are going to return to people go to families with \$50,000 or less.

In conclusion, I want to talk about a lady back in my district. I will not talk about her name, but I think it points out what this tax cut, tax return bill does as much as anything. She is a single parent with two children, and she makes \$17,500 a year. Under our present

system, she gets back each year \$939, under the current tax rate, and the earned income tax credit. Under our plan that we passed today, that family

will get back \$2,214. That is \$1,275 more for a low-income working single mom than she would get under the current law.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank all of my colleagues again. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Michigan.