

you know I have expressed strong doubts that the budget can be balanced in 7 years, if we use the current Republican congressional budget assumptions. But I am nevertheless committed to working in the coming weeks to see if we can reach common ground on balancing the budget. The key is that nothing will be agreed to unless all elements are agreed to." Unquote.

I must confess that I am concerned about that statement. The agreement, the specific language which we will vote on today, is not an agreement simply to see if we do it.

So I call upon the President not to run from the language, from the specific language, that he has agreed to sign, even before he signs it. The majority of this House of Representatives has shown that we can balance the budget within 7 years using CBO scoring. Coalition Democrats have come forward and given their version of the balanced budget, within 7 years, using CBO scoring.

I now call on my friends from the other side of the aisle to get with the President and to make sure that he comes forward with an honest budget using CBO scoring, and to tell the American people how he proposes to balance the budget within 7 years using the honest CBO figures that he has agreed to.

The President so far has had it both ways. He has had the best of both worlds. On one hand, he has been for a balanced budget, and on the other hand, he has not wanted to make the difficult decisions to get us there.

The American people have told us that our days of having our cake and eating it too are over. I look forward to seeing where the President would reduce the growth of Government spending. Then we can reach a balanced budget in 7 years, show the American people that a promise made is a promise kept, and give our children the future they deserve.

THANKSGIVING TRUCE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, surely all America can give thanks this Thanksgiving for a Thanksgiving truce in a truly senseless war. Our Republican colleagues in the Senate, as well as the President and his staff, deserve our praise for their hard work this weekend to try to reach a Federal budget eventually that will be balanced not only in terms of numbers, but in terms of the way it treats the American people with true fairness.

The only way that this agreement was implemented and 800,000 Federal workers returned to work today is because our Democratic colleagues worked together here in the House. I feel good about that.

Because of our willingness to work this weekend instead of to quit in the

midst of a national crisis, we were here on the floor last night, ready to implement this agreement. Had the adjournment motion that was forced on us on Saturday been approved, we would have had another day of delay for the American people, delay that would have cost them \$100 to \$150 million for our Federal workers to be idle again.

For, you see, from the very beginning, those who forced this crisis intended to pay people for not working for the Federal Government. Eight hundred thousand people were paid for not doing any work during the course of this crisis. Hopefully, those in this House who were so very determined and who spoke with such strident comments to impose their will on America, that they were willing to pay these 800,000 people not to work all of last week, those folks heard the message of the American people that Americans have been saying in one poll after another about the way this whole crisis was handled.

To be honest, the cost of that message was fairly dear to the American people. I think it can be estimated at well over a half billion dollars—\$100 to \$150 million a day. Hopefully the message is now heard and we can refocus on budget priorities, whether we want to give a tax break to the most prosperous Americans or protect our people on Medicare and who rely on educational assistance to have a better tomorrow.

PRESERVING NATIONAL UNITY

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, if ever we needed to be reminded of the need for America to preserve our precious national unity, recent events around the world have provided us with helpful reminders.

The most obvious was the wake-up call America received earlier this month, when our great neighbor Canada narrowly avoided splitting in two over linguistic and cultural divisions. Canada may yet divorce, and a nation founded on many of the same principles America was, might actually cease to exist. Canada's continuing bushes with separation should be the red warning light that causes us to stop and think: Could our Nation fragment like Canada almost did?

The answer is a disconcerting but resounding yes. Columnist Charles Krauthammer in a recent essay notes that "Separatism is the single greatest political fact of the post-cold-war world." Today, it is increasingly difficult for diverse, multicultural nations to keep from splitting apart. And, as Krauthammer rightly remarks, the United States is not immune to the centrifugal forces of separatism.

It is a seldomly discussed fact in the debate over America's growing dis-

unity that countries the world over are dealing with similar problems. We are all familiar with the cases that have captured the headlines—Quebec, the end of Yugoslavia, and the fragmentation of the old U.S.S.R.—but this has truly become a global concern.

I know this because I have met and discussed with a number of foreign leaders and academics on this very issue. In March of this year, I participated in an international conference on this topic at the University of Paris. There, I met with the French Minister of Culture, who had just introduced legislation to preserve French in increasingly diverse France. I also met other Western European and South American leaders who were preparing to establish national languages in their respective countries.

It surprised me that so many nations around the world were dealing with many of the same concerns I have had about the disuniting of America. I probably shouldn't have been surprised; while our Nation is the most diverse in the history of the world, it is the hallmark of the late 20th century that almost every country is being enriched and impacted by immigration. With the advent of the global economy and the global village of communication and culture, the world has begun a mass migration of peoples that has no historical precedent. In a century, most—if not all—of the world's countries will be as diverse as America, or diverse nations will no longer exist.

The reason is because most nations are not addressing the fundamental challenge of the 21st century: how to defuse the time bomb of rising nationalism and tribalism in a post-cold-war world market by mass immigration.

The countries, whose representatives I met with in Paris, have begun to attack this problem. They are on their way to establishing national languages in their countries. They would join 87 other countries around the world who have declared official languages, 63 of which have chosen English as their national language. One of those countries is India, who recognized some time ago that in a nation where 14 different languages and dialects are spoken, one common language is needed to unite their people. They chose English, because of their colonial relationship with Great Britain, but also because it is the international language of commerce, diplomacy, air traffic control, and the Internet, among others. Ironically, India has recognized the need for making English their official language before the United States has.

I hope the events around the world and the emerging global realities of the 21st century will convince us in this country that we need to act to preserve our common language. We have seen the future of America if we don't; I pray we don't have to actually live it.

Congress should start to show the common sense that legislators the world over have demonstrated in dealing with the major challenge of the

21st century and join me in declaring English our official language. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 739, the Declaration of Official Language Act.

FRAMEWORK FOR NEGOTIATION

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, now that the Republican manufacture of Government shutdown is over, as America's families gather for Thanksgiving, they should thank our President of the United States for hanging tough.

Because he did, no longer under this agreement will Medicare be allowed to be used as a piggy bank to pay for the tax cuts for the wealthy. Because he did, we now have an agreement that states that this balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, and provide adequate funding for Medicaid, none of which was accomplished under the Republican language.

It also provides that we protect future generations by adequately funding the environmental programs of this Nation. Again, it was not required under the Republican language.

Most importantly, the new language that the President's hanging tough allowed us to achieve last night was that it will now help working families as opposed to the original Republican plan of taxing working families.

We have now the framework for negotiation among the administration and the Congress, and hopefully among the American people, about the direction that this country will take, about our future, about future generations, and the kinds of decisions that we can make to ensure that we continue a progressive and civil society, or we can turn to budget cuts that are so drastic that they reach into the inside of almost every American family and pit a younger generation seeking education against an older generation that may need long-term health care and protection from rising health care costs.

The framework has now been set by the President of the United States, the negotiations begin next Monday, and I believe now we have an opportunity for truly a national conversation about the priorities of this Nation.

OUTLINE FOR BUDGET TALKS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last night's agreement was a victory for the American people. The agreement gives us an outline for the budget talks, that

truly reflects the values of the people of the United States.

For months and months and months, Democrats have been fighting to protect Medicare, education, and the environment from the budget ax. Yesterday, President Clinton stood firm for those principles and he stood up for our seniors, for our students, and for our environment.

The agreement also reaffirms the commitment of Congress and the President to balance the budget. The question in this battle has never been, Will we balance the budget, but how will we balance the budget? Yesterday, the President ensured that we will balance the budget in a fair manner and in a way that protects health care for our seniors, educational opportunities for our children, and that protects our environment.

A balanced budget is a goal that we all share, but there is nothing balanced about cutting Medicare for seniors, student loans for our children, and rolling back environmental protections while cutting taxes for the wealthy.

Democrats believe that it is wrong to balance that budget by cutting Medicare, education, and environmental protections, while doling out massive tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. That is why we are so pleased that the Republicans have agreed to protect those priorities and to put the \$245 billion tax cut on the bargaining table.

President Clinton has started the ball rolling on a real balanced budget, one that protects America's priorities: Protecting Medicare, education, and our environment.

BUDGET EFFECTS ON CALIFORNIA

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am very pleased that we now have a framework within which to debate the issue of the budget. Who we tax and how we spend that money is what we will be seeing debated in the next 3 weeks.

I am very proud and pleased that President Clinton held firm in saying, yes, we want a balanced budget, we want to balance it financially, but we must balance it in terms of values as well.

I oppose the Republican proposal that is on the floor now for two reasons. First, because of its priorities; and second, because of the unfairness in the tax situation in it.

This morning, however, Mr. Speaker, in this morning hour is usually the time when we try to convey some information to our colleagues, in addition to our point of view. I want to say why I find the Republican-Gingrich proposal to be so harmful to my home State of California. I point out the harm to California because that is the State I represent, but other Members must look to their own States to see

the impact that this budget will have on individuals, on the State budgets, and on the economies of their own States.

I have this chart which indicates, Mr. Speaker, that in California, we will have, at a minimum, at a minimum, a \$72 billion cut in funds that go to California, to individuals, and I will explain in what proportion.

By comparison, our State budget is around \$55 billion a year. The cuts that this budget will give to California are more than, by almost a half again, the budget of California; over \$36 billion in Medicare cuts, affecting 3.6 million beneficiaries; 16, almost \$17 billion in Medicaid cuts.

In California, 26 percent of the children of California depend on Medicaid for their guaranteed health services. Two point three million of those children will be drastically affected, severely affected by this.

I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, in addition to that, 2 million people will suffer because of the \$3.5 billion cut in the earned income tax credit.

I urge my colleagues, look to your own States, see the severe impact that this will have on your people, on your budget, and on your economy.

CALIFORNIA'S VETERANS WILL SUFFER

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues before me have said the issue is not the balanced budget, but who is going to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today because it is vital to inform the country about the impact of the Gingrich budget on our Nation's veterans.

The budget bill is a three-pronged monster: Cuts to the Veterans' Administration, cuts in Medicare, and cuts in Medicaid mean our veterans will not have access to medical care when they need it most.

Let me tell you what the impact will be on California's veterans. Twenty thousand California veterans will lose eligibility for Medicaid under the current Gingrich budget. Of those veterans, 12,000 are over 65 years of age, and more than 2,500 of them are in nursing homes. How would any of us serving in Congress like to be told at age 65 or older that we no longer had health care? What are these veterans going to do?

By the year 2002, California will be the home of almost a million veterans who are 65 and older. Most of them will be eligible for Medicare, and all of them will be affected by the proposed Medicare cuts.

My colleagues on the floor say that is not a cut. I will tell you that these veterans will know that it is a cut.

Cut off from Medicare and from many hospitals that will be forced to close,