

The President apparently has pollsters who have told him, "What you've got to do is establish some leadership credentials, so go over there, and look presidential, act like command in chief, and the people will reward you for it." Not only that, they told him something, and if this is the way he is operating, and this is truly what is behind this, this is a very cynical way to manipulate the American people and to perhaps bring about the loss of lives and a lot of dollars. They said, you know, "It doesn't matter if the American people are opposed to this action, it does not matter if Congress is opposed to it. You put the troops in the field, and they will be forced to do the loyal thing and say they support the American troops."

That is the box he is putting us in, and I think he is making a tragic mistake, and I wish he would reconsider.

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

[Mr. BRYANT of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FOCUSING ON A POSITIVE FUTURE

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wanted to thank the President of the United States. We had the great fortune of going to the White House the other evening for the Congressional Ball, and my mother, Frances Foley, was in town. I was able to take her to that great honor, and it was an evening of celebration, it was an evening of sharing the great bounty of this Nation in the people's home, the White House, and, yes, as a Republican, it was a great honor to be in the company of President Clinton and his wife.

The spirit that was alive in the house, the White House, that evening, was one that should be evident on this floor, one that should be evident in the debate about our budget for the Nation's future. He signed the veto message the other day, and the pen failed to write, and while many are making a joke about it, it does symbolize one thing: Our well is dry here in the Nation's Treasury. We are running on empty financially. It is time to step up to the plate and face the very important responsibility of Congress with the help of the President in balancing the budget with legitimate numbers, with legitimate dialog, with legitimate protections for our Nation's resources, but doing it in an honest and honorable and peaceful fashion, so that all Americans, regardless of party, can be proud of the actions of this Congress, that they have, in fact, done the people's work and they have done it professionally and respectfully.

I want to discuss another issue because from time to time Members of the House talk about public education as if it is a disaster, and they make unkind statements to public education. The teaching profession, teaching our children, is one of the most noble professions in our Nation.

There are problems in schools. There are problems on campuses. But they are not all related to schools and public education. They are related to a lot of external factors in our Nation.

I think about one of my counties, Palm Beach County, and I think of all the great things our school systems are doing. My father is a principal of an alternative school, a school of last resort for children with behavioral problems, drug addictions, truancy problems. He tells us often about the successful graduations of children that were otherwise thought of as not having a potential for passing anything, never mind high school, but they graduate; stories about young girls who become naval officers, who are the top of the naval class, who a few years earlier were counted out as derelicts, druggies, incompetent youth. The School of the Arts in Palm Beach County, allowing kids to express God-given talents in arts, and music, and dance, and theater, things that are not traditional, but they are learning something that they have a skill and an expertise in. Junior ROTC programs teaching children military leadership. They are enrolling dozens of people in my school community, and they are succeeding in educating our young people. The science, the math, the police academies that spring up around our communities that are successfully graduating children with an educational opportunity that allows them to go out, and get a job and become meaningful, taxpaying, productive citizens.

Palm Beach Garden High School; I visited the film school. We did interviews. They had tremendous technological equipment, learning to be little broadcasters. Someday they may be on the evening news.

These are things that are working in our school system that we need to magnify, talk about in a positive way, show that public education is working, show that teachers who are sacrificing in a job dealing with difficult students are doing so because they love this country, they love children, and they want to see the future of those children succeed.

Future Farmers of America programs, 4-H Clubs, all things that are working in public education that we all too often in Congress just say things are bad in public education, but it is time to stand up for the programs that work. It is time to talk about the one thing that we can make certain when we talk about the future direction of America is that children have a positive education, that they learn, that they are inspired, that they are told different things, learn to work on computers, learn to talk about children

who may not go to college, but in fact may work at McDonald's, may in fact become a store manager and a store owner, may work at Publix as a bag boy and rise to be a manager of that store; that it is within each of us that we can excel, that we can excel and be supportive of this great country of ours.

We have got to focus in this Congress about the very good things in our Nation and not always be talking about negativity, and disastrous consequences and evil, mean-spirited politics, because this Nation is the greatest Nation on Earth. God's gift to us has been one of being able to enunciate those positive things on this floor.

So let us respect teachers, let us respect public education, let us respect private schools, but education is everybody's future, it is our Nation's salvation, it is the elimination in the future of crime and dependency in our Nation.

So, I urge my colleagues to focus in the next year ahead, as we enter 1996, on positive education, positive future for our Nation, positive leadership for our children.

KEEP MEDICAID INTACT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today was National Medicaid Day, and myself, and Senator LAUTENBERG, and a number of other Members of Congress, participated in an event on the front lawn of the Capitol where we stressed the fact that the Medicaid changes that have been proposed by the Republican leadership will have a severely negative impact on the low-income people, be they seniors, children, the disabled, who now benefit from the Medicaid Program, which is the Federal program that guarantees health care for low-income people.

I was very pleased to see that yesterday when the President signed his veto and sent his veto message to Congress in reaction to the Republican leadership budget that he stressed the extreme impact, if you will, and the unacceptable changes in the Medicaid program that were set forth in that Republican budget. I am hopeful that during the negotiations that are taking place now over the budget where the President and the congressional leadership, particularly the Republican leadership, seek to come together on a compromise budget bill, that the bill will successfully keep Medicaid intact and guarantee health care coverage for those people that are currently covered by the Medicaid Program.

What I think is most important during these negotiations is that the Medicaid guarantee, the guarantee that has been around here now for 30 years, that low-income people have health care coverage, that those same eligible people be eligible in guaranteed health

care under whatever comes out of these budget negotiations.

There has been a lot of talk about flexibility on the Republican side, and specifically today a number of Republican Governors came down to the capital and stressed that they would like to have flexibility in the Medicaid Program and how it is administered, and I agree with that concept of flexibility. But the flexibility should not go so far that they can declare certain people ineligible for Medicaid and, therefore, have no health insurance, or set the standards and the coverage for the Medicaid Program so low or so slim, so to speak, that the type of coverage that is now provided where certain services, certain health care services, are provided, would not be provided or the quality of care would be diminished.

So I am hopeful that we will not only see in these negotiations a Medicaid Program that guarantees coverage for those who are not eligible for Medicaid, but also that certain minimum standards be put in place as to what a health care coverage or what a policy would include for low-income people, and lastly that sufficient funding be put back into the budget bill for the Medicaid Program so that we do not see a decline in quality for the program.

□ 1530

The President mentioned in his veto message five concerns that he had about the Republican budget when it dealt with Medicaid. I would like to go through those briefly.

First, he said that the Republican budget cuts Federal Medicaid payments to States by \$163 billion over 7 years, a 28 percent cut by the year 2002 below what the Congressional Budget Office estimates is necessary for Medicaid spending. So the concern here is that if you cut Medicaid by 20 percent over what we estimate we need for those who are currently eligible for Medicaid, that by the year 2002 States with the lesser funds would have to eliminate that many people from the Medicaid Program.

Second, the President mentioned that the Republican bill converts Medicaid into a block grant with drastically less spending, eliminating guaranteed coverage to millions of Americans and perhaps forcing States to drop coverage for millions of the most vulnerable citizens, including children and the disabled. This is really the key during the budget negotiations. We do not want to eliminate what we call the entitlement status of Medicaid, so that certain people are not eligible because States decide that they do not have enough money and will not cover them.

Third, the President said that the Republican budget purports to guarantee coverage to certain groups but does not define a minimum level of benefits. There again, it is not only important that a eligible Medicaid recipients continue to be eligible, but that whatever package is put together of coverage for

them, that those same minimum level of services be included for a national standard so that individual States can change it.

Fourth, the President said that the Republican budget purports to protect certain vulnerable populations with set-asides, but would cover less than half of the estimated needs of senior citizens and people with disabilities in the year 2002. The best example of this are those particularly vulnerable seniors who are low income, who now have their Medicare part B coverage paid, but would not necessarily have it under this proposal. As I said again, Mr. Speaker, we will be talking about this a lot more. It is most important that Medicaid be guaranteed for those low-income people.

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

[Mr. SOUDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S VETO OF THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT PURELY A PUBLIC RELATIONS STUNT

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the President vetoed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. I am not surprised, but I am disappointed. I want to talk about why I believe the President vetoed what I think was a very good budget for this country. It was a bad veto for all of us. First of all, it was purely a public relations stunt, as full of irony as hypocrisy. The President had the pen Lyndon Johnson used to sign Great Society into law flown into Washington, DC from Texas.

After his speech, the President quickly left the room before he had to answer questions about his balanced budget, but there were plenty of questions Mr. Clinton should have answered for the American people. The President criticized the House-Senate plan to save Medicare for the long term, but has failed to offer his own. Perhaps worse, 1994's Clinton health care plan contained major spending reductions in the growth of Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why it was OK for the President to control spending on Medicare but not for the Republicans to do the same. He also should have spoken further about the Great Society programs Lyndon Johnson used that pen for. For instance, most Americans consider LBJ's war on poverty a terrible failure. Today, one child in three is illegitimate, drug use is up, education scores are down, and generations of families have depended on wel-

fare instead of work. We have the highest crime rate in the world, and many of our inner cities are devastated.

Is the President endorsing LBJ's war on poverty that has cost \$5 trillion and left this country's poor in worse shape than before? One more question, Mr. Speaker. When Bill Clinton was running for President, he promised to balance the budget in 5 years. In his first State of the Union address he promised to use economic projections of the Congressional Budget Office. Now he not only refuses to offer a real 7-year balanced budget plan, but he uses economic figures cooked up by his own economists so he does not have to make tough choices. Then he stands on the sidelines and demagogues honest efforts to balance the budget. Why does the President consistently say one thing and do another?

I realize that this may sound more than a little partisan, but frankly, I am upset about a veto of the first balanced budget we have had in more than a generation, our first and perhaps last chance to stop robbing our children and grandchildren.

My daughter, 13 years old, my son, 24 years old, what kind of future are they going to have unless we get realistic about balancing the budget? I call on the President to do just that. The President's LBJ pen did not work at first. After trying a new inkwell he was finally able to sign his name. If there was any justice, the ink would have been red.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CHENOWETH addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE REAL ISSUES REGARDING AMERICA'S ROLE IN BOSNIA

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy in Bosnia is very much on the mind of every Member of this Chamber. Bosnia is not a partisan matter. Our policy in Bosnia, in my judgment, has been the error of two administrations, one of one party and one of another party. The embargo was put on by one, said that it would be lifted by another, but that still has not been done.

The result is that the Bosnians, who were aggressed against, attacked, have not had the weapons to defend themselves when they wanted to defend themselves. Now we say in the Dayton agreement that we will make sure the Bosnians are finally armed. The embargo still exists. It needs to come off. Of course, it never should have been put on.

Mr. Speaker, the issue in this debate is not who is an internationalist and who is an isolationist. I would like to think the issue is who is a realist.