

district, a matter of great concern. It is also sad that a friendly neighboring nation that is so close to our shore is having such a difficult time coming to grips with the development of democracy.

We will not have a full, fair election there on December 17, if the election comes off, because the legitimate opponents who would run have been intimidated. They have been threatened with being burned to death if they even registered and showed up. Most of the opposition offices are closed. There is no campaigning going on.

Fear is throughout the countryside. This is not the ingredient of a democratic election. Businesses are closed. Business is worse. The economy was bad. The economy is even worse than bad now. People just simply do not want to open their stores. They are afraid of mob violence.

The privatization effort that the Government was supposed to introduce has not worked. In fact, not only has it not worked, the Prime Minister who was its champion has resigned in protest. A new Prime Minister has come in and is going to a different policy.

So those agreements toward privatization, getting that country back on an economic footing, are not working out either. Apparently the government of President Aristide is going the wrong way on that.

The most important point is stability. Mobs are driving people into refugees, including Americans. When it gets to that state, it is time to reexamine.

PRINCIPLES FOR BUDGET BALANCING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am very pleased today so to see that we have worked out the continuing resolution between the President and the Republican leadership in Congress, and that Federal employees are back to work. I cannot emphasize enough how pleased the Federal employees in my district are. Some of them have been calling the district office to say that.

Even more or just as important, though, is the fact that the language of this agreement essentially says not only that will we have a balanced budget, but that the priorities which I have been talking about, which President Clinton, the Democratic leadership have been talking about, which are to preserve Medicare, to make sure that Medicaid is adequately funded, to make sure that this budget provides ample funding for education and also for the environment, that those are included in the language of the continuing resolution.

So I hope that with these principles that are so important to President

Clinton, so important to Democrats and important, I believe, to the American people, that those principles will guide the negotiations over the larger budget agreement that must be reached over the next few weeks.

Let me tell you why I think that these principles are important. I have said it over and over again on the floor, but I am going to say it again today. When we talk about Medicare and Medicaid, the Republican budget essentially says that those programs are going to be cut by a significant amount of money, 270 million for Medicare, 170 million for Medicaid, in order to pay for a tax break, mostly for wealthy Americans.

What I hope is that this budget agreement will put more money back in Medicare and Medicaid, retain the entitlement status particularly for Medicaid, so that those who have low incomes and are on Medicaid now, get their health insurance through the Government, will continue to be entitled to health insurance.

What we can do is reduce those tax breaks or eliminate those tax breaks for the wealthy in order to make sure that these programs continue the way they have.

PUTTING OUR HOUSE IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, what if an unpopular President shut the Federal Government down and no body outside the Capitol beltway, except CBS, NBC, and the New York Times cared one whit? Judging by what the people of eastern North Carolina told me, that's exactly what happened last week. So let me cut through the fog that engulfed the White House and its bagmen in the media and tell you what this fight is really about.

The shut down of the Federal Government was not about petty partisan politics. This fight was and is about our children and our future. It is about two competing visions of America. The first vision is Bill Clinton's America where an army of Federal bureaucrats tells us how to raise our families, spend our money, and run our businesses. The second is our America; and America built on the promise of individual liberty and material progress.

The new majority was sent to Congress by Americans frightened of Government and exhausted by its ravenous demands. We were sent here to bring runaway Federal spending to a standstill. We hammered out a budget plan to balance the books, chop the arms off the Federal octopus, and let the people keep their money.

Bill Clinton's opposition to the Republican budget tells America three things:

Bill Clinton did not want a balanced budget.

Bill Clinton was never serious about carrying through on his campaign pledge to cut middle-class tax rates.

Bill Clinton is an old-fashioned tax-and-spend liberal who genuinely opposes any reduction in Government spending.

We have had 800,000 Federal workers on furlough. Can the liberals continue to argue that these Federal workers and the thousands of idle programs they administer are critical to the health and safety of our country? Bill Clinton's own administration determined 67 percent of the employees at the Department of Commerce, 89 percent at Education, and 99 percent at HUD are nonessential. But Bill Clinton has done everything in his power to keep us from closing these and countless other Federal departments. So much for Bill Clinton, the new Democrat.

Americans don't miss these programs on Federal holidays and they certainly don't miss them today. For all of Bill Clinton's talk about the hazards of shutting down Washington, DC, most of these programs didn't exist prior to 1965 and America prospered for 190 years without them. By a margin of 10 to 1, my constituents in the second district of North Carolina said keep the nonessential parts of Government closed down and out of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, there was much more to this debate than furloughed Federal workers. Time is running out for our children. We are about to enter a new century on a collision course with catastrophe. If you add up all of the Federal entitlements, at their current growth rates and add the inevitable increase in the national debt, what you have in 20 years is a financial disaster of unimaginable magnitude. Entitlements plus our Federal debt will consume every last penny of Federal tax revenues. As it stands now, in 20 years our children and grandchildren will have half of their paychecks taken by Uncle Sam just to pay for entitlements alone. There will be nothing left for defense, law enforcement, foreign affairs, or agriculture, absolutely nothing.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to drive America off the cliff. For the sake of future generations we must put our house in order now. It's good to get a pledge from the President to agree to a balanced budget in 7 years. But that can't and won't take place without real reform of welfare, Medicare, education, the legal system, and workplace and environmental regulation.

We've won the balanced budget debate. Now we have to win the details and make sure that the left does not continue big Government business as usual. Our children's future depends on it.

BUDGET COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, we are all delighted of course that the Government is back to work and in West Virginia 17,000 Federal employees are back on the job.

I also want to thank my congressional staff, over half of whom were furloughed during this period. It is not that they were nonessential. It is that they were, in the decision of the Committee on House Oversight, non-legislative. Today the mobile office is back on the road visiting one of the many counties it visits every day. The caseworkers are working, schedulers are putting together events, constituent organizers are working. We are back in business.

Americans finally are once again getting the Government that they are paying for. That is what was lost in this whole debate. Americans were not getting the Government that they are paying taxes for.

I believe there are two reasons that we reached this situation today, this compromise. First of all, the public was telling everyone, Republicans, Democrats, the White House, it is time to get back to work. Do not hold us as hostages to this budget battle that is taking place.

The second reason is, I believe, not reported as much, is the decision on Saturday by Democrats and then joined by a lot of Republicans to say, no, we are not going to shut this House down, this House should not adjourn even for 1 day while there are Federal employees out on the street.

So let us get to the good news. The good news is that this side-bar, this preliminary fight on this boxing card, is behind us at least for 3 weeks. Now we can get down to the real issues; the real issues of what kind of budget we have in this country and what kind of priorities is Medicare and Medicaid; what kind of tax cuts are they going to be and are they going to go to the wealthiest or to the low- and middle-income; what kind of education programs are we going to have; how you are going to actually balance this budget over 7 years.

The good news is hopefully that this will not be affected by temporary events, the fact that the Speaker is dissatisfied with the seat that he gets on an airplane or somebody's attack on somebody else on the floor of the House. Now we have a fight over principles, and that is a fight that I welcome.

We are going to hear a lot about scorekeeping, whether Congressional Budget Office or Office of Management and Budget will keep the score and make the estimates on growth. The fact is, the people should be the scorekeepers, and that is what this battle is going to be about.

CALL FOR PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, both sides did compromise to bring us to the point where we are today. The Republican leadership gave up some original provisions that were not related to the budget in the originally proposed continuing resolution.

This weekend the President agreed to a 7-year goal for reaching a balanced budget, combined with using the Congressional Budget Office economic forecasts, although with consultation with other agencies. Now we have to head to the task of passing a long term 7-year balanced budget.

Very shortly, the Republican majority in Congress will pass such a budget. Seven years, scored by the Congressional Budget Office. I do not agree with every single decision in that budget, but it is a budget that meets the requirements of the framework that has been agreed upon.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest it is now time for the President of the United States to submit a new budget to Congress, a budget that is also within the framework that we have agreed upon, a budget where the President proposes a balanced budget in 7 years, rated by the Congressional Budget Office.

I understand that the President of the United States has some very strong feelings about budget priorities. This is not only his prerogative, I think it is his responsibility in his office.

However, how do we know what his priorities are, how do we negotiate differences between the two, unless we have a budget from this administration that lays out those priorities so that we can compare the two budgets, the congressional budget and the administration's budget, on a side-by-side basis? If the President proposes, for example, that spending be raised in one category, how will we know how to pay for that increase in spending unless we can see where the President has proposed reducing spending elsewhere?

Mr. Speaker, so the American people can compare our priorities, so that the Congress can negotiate with the President to reach a 7-year balanced budget, we need the President and the administration now to send us their version of a balanced budget in 7 years.

BUDGETARY PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I must say how very proud I was to be a Democrat this weekend, because this weekend the Democratic party and this House stood up in the grand tradition

of Roosevelt and Truman for work, for work.

We insisted that this body keep working as we ran out of "no" cards, when the other side finally decided we should not adjourn, that we should stay in session until we got some kind of an agreement to get Federal workers back to work. That happened, and how proud I was of the solidarity on our side of the aisle as they chanted "work, work, work," to the other side to get all of the petty nonsense of the last week behind us.

That is now behind us. And now for the next 3 weeks this body must sit down with the American people and we must all dialog about what our priorities really are.

Today we are going to see the first priority category. We see the defense bill going to the President. And after all of this that you have heard about balanced budgets, they are going to put a defense bill on the President's budget that is \$7 billion over what the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for. That was never done, even during the cold war. So we will be spending more than the whole rest of the planet combined on defense.

If you think this year is expensive, wait until you see the rest that is coming in behind it for the next 7 years. This is just the teeny little Ritz cracker hors d'oeuvre, for the banquet that we will be ordering if we cannot override the President's veto of that bill.

These are the kind of priorities we are going to talk about as we figure out what we do in this next 7 years. These are the priorities that are taking us into the 21st century. This is going to be a historic 3-week debate. Everyone in America should roll up their shirt sleeves and join it. It is our country and it is our future.

PRESIDENTIAL PROMISES ON BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad the President finally agreed to balance the budget in 7 years.

It really should not have been quite as difficult as it turned out to be, because really when you go back and look at what the President said in his State of the Union Address in 1993, and what he said when he ran for the Presidency in 1992, and when you put them all all together, it would not have been possible for him to continue to say he was not for a balanced budget in 7 years.

Let me quote what the President said in 1993 in the State of the Union Message.

My budget plan will use independent Congressional Budget Office numbers. I did this so no one could say I was estimating my way out of this difficulty. I did this so that the American people will think we are shooting straight with them.