

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. DELAURIO] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. DELAURIO. 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,

veterans will have to look to the VA for health care. With the cuts proposed for that system, they will also be limited in their ability to get the care they need.

When we called upon our veterans, not one of them said, "Sorry, I cannot afford to serve." When veterans asked their country to keep the promises made to them, how can we say now, "Sorry, we cannot afford it?"

I simply fail to understand how we can repay the very people who fought for us with massive cuts to the medical care they were promised.

We must be vigilant in protecting our veterans and the benefits they were promised. As a Nation, Mr. Speaker, we have a moral obligation to keep the promises we made to our veterans.

DO NOT SACRIFICE THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. HILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I came to Washington to help the American people, and not vote for anything that would hurt them.

The Republican budget would hurt the American people. For a week, the Republicans closed down the Government, sent Federal employees home, kept people from signing up for Social Security, Medicare or veterans' benefits, because they did not want to negotiate in good faith and tell the American people that a tax cut for the wealthy is not needed to balance the budget and would hurt most Americans.

The Republicans want to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, the disabled, the elderly, and children of working mothers so that they can pay for a tax cut for the rich.

I will continue to oppose the tax cuts for the rich, and I will continue to oppose hurting the American people.

If the proposed budget does not strike the tax cut for the rich and provide fairly for the young, the elderly, the poor, and the disabled, it will be a bad budget and I cannot and will not support a bad budget.

HISTORY OF BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity today to visit with all of you. Of course the last 48 hours we have had a very busy weekend. I think we have come up to a compromise, but I am a little discouraged this morning to see some of my colleagues on the floor come to you and act as if they have been strong warriors for a balanced budget over the period of time that some of them have served in this office.

Let me tell you that all of a sudden, some of my colleagues cannot rush fast enough to embrace the words "balanced budget," so that they can say to the American people, you know, I have been for a balanced budget all this time. The question is not whether or not we balance the budget, the question is how we do it. That is their little wiggle room that some of these people are using.

I think it is important that we look at the history of this country.

A lot of these people that are talking to us, a lot of our colleagues that are talking that way, have served in previous Congresses. We have not had a balanced budget come out of these Chambers in 25 years. The Federal Government has not reduced Federal spending in 40 years. Look at what this deficit is doing and the debt is doing to the American people. Where are they, Johnny-come-latelies; where have they gone? It is about time they embraced a balanced budget.

I tell you it is about time the President, who by the way said when he ran for office he would produce a balanced budget plan in 5 years, then he switched it to 10 years, then he dropped to 7 years, then he went to 8 years, then he went back to 7 years, then he was back to 10, and finally last night, finally last night, we got the President to commit to a 7-year balanced budget.

Why is that so critical for the American people? What is the deficit doing to us? Take a look at what it accrues.

It accrues at \$30 million an hour. This Government spends \$30 million an hour more than it brings in. The average person in America, each person in America, not the average, excuse me, each person in America owes \$18,000 on the Federal debt. For a family of four, what is that, over \$60,000, almost \$60,000 in the debt for a family of four.

Do you know that a child born this year, a child born this year, will owe out of their lifetime earnings, if we do not do something about this deficit, if the President does not keep his word to do it in a 7-year period of time, that child will owe \$180,000 of their lifetime earnings just to pay interest on the Federal debt.

Now some of the preceding speakers have stood up here and said, take a look at the vets, take a look at Medicare, take a look at welfare, take a look at every entitlement program out there. What they are trying to convince all of you is that you could reach a balanced budget without touching entitlement programs. We can. We do not have to cut entitlement programs. We do have to control their growth.

Do not let anyone stand up here in front of you and pretend that we are going to be able to balance the budget of this country without cutting growth on some of these Federal programs. You cannot cut the growth on every other program except entitlement programs, and even have a hope of ever balancing this deficit.

Do you know that if we went out to every Federal agency next year, every

Federal agency out there, and we said to those agencies, look, you do not have to cut one penny out of your budget, you do not have to cut one penny out of your budget, but next year your budget can only grow at a rate of 1 percent, you can only grow at a rate of one penny on the dollar, if we could get the Federal agencies to do that, we would balance this problem, the annual deficit, in probably a 4-year period of time.

Now you are going to hear some of my colleagues say, well, where is this 7 years; where did they get 7 years? Did the Speaker just pull it out of the sky? I can remember when the Speaker explained to us why the 7 years.

You know what he said to us? I thought it made a lot of sense. He said to us, we could balance this budget this year, we could balance it in 4 years, we could balance it in 3 years. Then it would be so harsh on the American people that the hardships would overcome the benefit of the balance of the budget. Seven years is a period of time that, yes, everybody is going to have to pitch in, but it is not going to be especially painful for any particular group.

I take that back, any particular group. We are going to have some pretty basic requirements out there on some groups. For example, we have some able-bodied people in our country who draw Federal benefits because they are not working. They ought to be working. I do not have any problem with saying to those people, you know something, you can work, you are able to work, and you ought to work. I do not think it is particularly harsh on you when we do welfare reform to say, look, we are not going to let this go on forever. So I encourage all of us to work together to get this balanced budget.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has past expired.

There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1404

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

With every morning Sun there is the reminder of a new day and with each new day there are occasions to do the works of justice. Teach us, gracious