

CBO. You have to have the Medicare cuts before you can have the tax cuts. Everybody acknowledges that.

So if you are going to make the \$270 billion cuts in Medicare, why not apply them to make the Medicare fund more secure; either that, or reduce the deficit. This does not make any sense to burden our senior citizens with an increase in premiums simply to have a tax cut almost corresponding to the same dollar amounts, from the \$270 billion you are going to make in Medicare to give a \$240 billion tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can talk about it all he wants, but there are going to be cuts and there are going to be cuts to supply the funds for a tax cut. It does not make any sense to put that burden on our senior citizens.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that is an excellent explanation, and that is why I came over, because it concerns me when many of my constituents are raising the question of what is happening here in the U.S. Congress.

I would like to just briefly relate to them the lack of progress that we have made. Frankly, under the Republican majority, they have not done their job. These appropriations bills were supposed to be passed in early September, and if they had been passed at that time period, we would not have reached this point, this time, this day.

All that we are asking as a Congress, and particularly those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle, is that let us just deal with the issue at hand. The issue at hand simply allows us to have one, a continuing resolution to allow this discussion to go forth and the doors of the Government to stay open; and then second, allows the debt ceiling to increase so that this country does not default on its obligations.

We have a philosophical difference, and that is understandable, but I do not think the American people should be misdirected and misrepresented that there is some reason that we have come to this, other than the fact that the appropriations bills that should have been passed in September were not passed. Why is that? Because there is some magic number to the number seven in terms of balancing the budget, when in actuality, we have looked at the President's budget, we may have wanted to improve that budget, but that is a 9-year budget. Is there some difference, something magic between 7 and 9?

When you begin to look at the direction that the Republicans' 7-year budget takes, cuts in school lunches, cuts in Medicaid, children's programs, cuts in student loans, ending nursing home regulations where many of your parents are staying; a lack of worker safety regulations, curbing food and drug standards, forgetting the environment, criminalizing various procedures dealing with the question, the very private question of women to choose; ending

the national service group, and of course, cutting science and research. All of these issues were part of the appropriations bills when we should have been able to discuss these separate and apart from that process.

□ 2030

Do you want nursing home regulations to be eliminated? Do you want to eliminate the progress we have made with respect to environmental protection? These debates should be separate and apart from the question of whether the doors of this Government stay open.

Just this past weekend, I spent Veterans Day acknowledging the many veterans in our community and saluting them for the service they have given. In addition to saluting my veterans, many of them asked the questions, not only about themselves but about those who would come after them that would be denied benefits.

I had Federal workers working with me on their day off to give constituency service in my congressional office, meaning those in Social Security and those working in other agencies. Those are the ones that are going to be counted out.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask, let us be reasonable. Deal with the issue at hand so the American people can have faith in their Congress again, get back to the business that we have, and that is the business of running this Government properly, making sure that a budget is balanced but is not balanced on the least of those that we have in this country. Let us be realistic, both Republicans and Democrats. Keep doors open so that we can face this together, and make sure that we are having a budget that answers the concerns of all Americans, and not cut it on the backs of children and senior citizens.

#### RHETORICAL AND SUBSTANTIVE DIFFERENCES

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I got a call from a good friend of mine tonight. His question was, what is this big difference of opinion between the White House and the Congress? What is it all about, and what can we do about it in the short time that remains?

As we discussed it, it occurred to me that maybe the differences are not as wide as we think they are, at least in rhetoric, and maybe they are wider than we would like them to be perhaps in substance.

In rhetoric, the President of the United States in 1993 appeared on "Larry King Live" and promised a 5-year plan to balance the budget, not a 10-year plan like he came out with in 1995. A 5-year plan. This year, just recently he said, "Well, maybe I could go along with a 7-year plan. Maybe I

could, if I liked the way it was done." But in 1993 he promised a 5-year plan. You would think we could come together tonight.

Also in 1993, the President spoke out very forcefully and I think very courageously on the question of Medicare and Medicaid. His words then were that we cannot let these two programs grow at three times the rate of inflation without them going bankrupt or bankrupting our future. He called for a reduction in growth.

In fact, in his 10-year budget plan this year he called for a \$192 billion reduction in the growth of Medicare. That is on the same baseline we use here in Congress. He called for a \$120 billion reduction in the growth in Medicaid according to our congressional baseline. That is some pretty severe reductions in growth.

Our Democratic leadership would call that cuts. The President said, "Don't call that a cut." He said, "I'm talking about reducing the growth of the spending out of these programs, the excessive amount they spend, because they are driving the programs and our future into bankruptcy." At least the President said that.

You would think perhaps we are closer than we think tonight, because if we are talking about reducing the growth in Medicare and Medicaid, the President himself has conceded that that has to get done and he has recommended some pretty healthy reductions in the growth in Medicare and Medicaid.

Finally, the President in 1992 when he ran for election, when he asked us all to vote for him, promised a middle-class tax cut. He did not give us one. What he did last year was to raise taxes.

Just recently he appeared before a group of supporters and said, "I know you think I raised your taxes too much, and guess what, I think I did, too." You would think the President would be supporting a balanced budget plan that included some tax relief for Americans.

You could think we would be a lot closer than we are tonight. In fact, we are not. The reason we are not closer than we think tonight is that those who want a clean CR, those who want no changes in the way this Government operates and spends money, those who want us to send the President a clean CR, a clean extension of the debt, simply want to keep on going like we are going. That is wrong.

The President knows that is wrong, you know that is wrong, I know that is wrong. The President has said he believes we ought to balance this budget in at least 5 years, or 7, or 10. He believes that Americans deserve a tax cut, he taxed them too much last year, and he believes we need to reduce the growth in Medicare and Medicaid spending.

One would think we could come to terms tonight. What holds us apart? One, we have a majority in this House

but not a two-thirds majority. We have got a majority in the Senate but not 60 votes to override a filibuster attempt, nor a two-thirds majority to override a veto. So the President can use his veto pen to stop changes here in Congress that he opposes.

What kind of changes? Changes like changes in the regulations of this country. When you hear this talk tonight about, well, we are going to have dirty water and dirty air and dirty food as a result of what we are proposing, remember, this House voted for changes in the way regulations are made in those areas, to require a simple cost-benefit analysis. That is all that is in the CR, just the regulatory reform this House voted upon.

You would think that there was something awful about the Congress trying to reform the Medicare Program, but the President himself said it has to get done. His trustees said if you do not do it in 7 years, your parents and my parents will not have a Medicare Program to depend upon because it is going bankrupt.

You would think that there would be an interest in this House, in this Chamber and the other Chamber, to come to some kind of conclusion on a good Medicare reform. We have tried to deliver one, and this House passed one, but we do not have two-thirds to get it through. We do not have 60 votes to get it past a filibuster in the Senate, and so the red pen is being waved tonight.

There is a big difference in substance, not much difference in rhetoric but a big difference in substance. Hopefully in the next few days those differences can be resolved and we can get about the business of reforming this country and bringing a balanced budget for our future and our children.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to take stock at this time, while we have a lot of focus on what the Congress is trying to do, to look at where we have come from in this first session of the 104th Congress.

We passed the regulatory reform that Congressman TAUZIN was speaking of. We passed the line-item veto to take care of eliminating the pork-barrel legislation and excessive spending. We have passed the prohibition of unfunded mandates so that our local governments will not have items we passed back to the local government without the funding that goes with it.

We have already passed \$90 billion in deficit reduction, \$190 billion in spending reductions, and now we have the possibility, if the President agrees, to balance the budget, something that every other government has to do, every family has to do. The State government has to balance its budget,

county governments, school governments.

The economic experts, Mr. Speaker, have told us that if we can balance the budget so we do not have to spend so much of the tax dollars to pay for the debt, we will have a reduction of mortgage payments for our fellow Americans, we will reduce the car payments, we will reduce the college payments. We will be able to make sure that our goal will be that we are taking care of essential services for people and not the Government waste and fraud that we have seen that the Federal Government has had for years.

We will also see with our tax reform proposals, if they get adopted again and signed into law by the President, a \$500 per child tax credit. We will have the new IRA programs with \$2,000 for individuals, \$4,000 for a couple. We will roll back that unfair 1993 Social Security tax on our senior citizens. We will give our seniors the opportunity to make more than \$11,280 who are under 70 without having a bite out of the Social Security. Under our new proposal, it will be up to \$30,000 a year.

We will also have capital gains tax reductions for individuals of 19 percent, 25 percent for businesses. This will allow us to have new jobs, expansion of businesses, and also increase savings. Adoption tax credit is included within this proposal, as well as an elder care tax credit.

We are on our way, Mr. Speaker, with many new reforms in this 104th Congress, but the balanced budget awaits the President's signature. He has said he is committed to a balanced budget. Both sides of the aisle have supported the concept of a balanced budget. It works in business. It works in our families. It can work for the country. But we need the President to come to the table to work with our congressional leadership in the House and Senate in a bipartisan fashion. If we do that, we are going to help our senior citizens, we are going to help our working families, and we are going to help our children. We can make a difference. We ask for the President to come to the table and help us make it happen.

#### EDUCATION: AN ISSUE WHICH UNITES US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are at a critical moment in the life of the American democracy. I think it would be helpful if we lower our voices and come together on an issue which unites us. Education is that issue.

On this Wednesday, the day after tomorrow, National Education Funding Support Day has been proclaimed. It is important to note at this point that education has always been an issue that has received bipartisan support.

Education is an investment. It has always been recognized by both Democrats and Republicans as an investment. Only this year has Republican extremism and recklessness led to a division that has critically injured the support for education in the Congress.

On our National Education Funding Support Day, we hope that we can reach out to both sides, both Republicans and Democrats. We hope that we can get the American people to understand what is at stake in the Federal support for education.

I think to have something now which leads us to lower our voices and come together would be a good thing. Despite all of the heated rhetoric of the next few days, and despite the fact that there are real issues on the table and very important decisions to be made, I think it would be good if we sort out something that we can agree on, and education is the one thing in the past that we have agreed on.

It is time for some effort to calm the waters. Like the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], I happened to hear part of the GOPAC celebration. It was on C-SPAN this morning. I could not avoid it. It was on a respectable media outlet, and I heard part of Rush Limbaugh's speech to the GOPAC audience here in Washington.

He was addressing a crowd of people who seemed to need at this time some therapy, so Rush the jester, he is the Speaker's jester, became Rush the therapist. It was very interesting to watch how he was calming the fears of the GOPAC crowd that the American people have misunderstood them. He kept telling them do not be anxious, do not be bitter; the American people are going to understand you sooner or later.

The fact that the Republican extremism policies have taken a great plunge in the polls, a Wall Street Journal poll shows that more than 60 percent want the President to veto the Republican budget, and more than 70 percent are against the Medicare cuts, has led to some serious soul-searching among Republicans. So Rush Limbaugh was there spreading his arms to calm down Republican fears.

I thought that was very interesting. Everybody needs something at this point to calm them down, and certainly to come together on an issue like education I think would have a calming influence.

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

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that he is talking about some of the fears and some of the concerns that the American people have at this point in time. He talked about some of the objections to cuts in very, very important programs that are helpful to senior citizens and students that are trying to get back to school.