

working families whose income is less than \$30,000 per year.

Now, the Republicans like to give the impression that all earned-income tax credit recipients are so poor that they do not pay income taxes, and therefore, do not deserve a tax credit, however much such people in such low-income working categories need it. Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true.

The Republican budget actually targets tax increases to millions of working families who do pay income taxes, taxes that are withheld from their hard-earned paychecks.

Now, the Republicans also claim that their \$500-per-child tax credit makes up for their cuts to the earned-income tax credit, but that is not true either. Even with the child credit, the Republican plan leaves over 7 million families poorer.

Now, that is not a tax policy that helps families; it is one that drives them toward poverty. It does not protect children; it threatens them. And it does not live up to the continuing resolution agreement; it violates that agreement.

The Republicans even had to violate their own House rule requiring a three-fifths majority to raise taxes in order to pass these tax increases.

It was all to give \$245 billion in tax breaks that go mostly to the fewer than 10 percent of the wealthiest Americans who make more than \$100,000 a year, tax breaks so large that they actually cause the deficit to go up in the first 2 years of the Republican plan, and then, after 7 years, the tax break explodes as far as the eye can see.

So do not believe the Republican plan when they say they have to raise taxes on working families to balance the budget. It is unnecessary. It is unfair. It is wrong, so we should not do it.

The Republicans should live up to their agreement to support a budget that does not rob struggling families to pay the rich.

H.R. 1020 WILL BUST THE BUDGET

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

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about H.R. 1020, which has to do with nuclear waste storage. It is also called the "budget buster," because this bill will indeed bust the budget. It will bust the budget by over \$4 billion in the next 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, not only is there a problem with this bill as far as the budget is concerned; there is also a problem with this bill as far as safety and as far as States' rights are concerned. Let me address just a few of the points that this bill fails to address.

First of all, the nuclear waste repository was originally put forth in 1982 to be in the State of Nevada or two other sites. In 1987, the famous bill that we in Nevada obviously are very much op-

posed to eliminated the other two sites from being studied and put it only at Yucca Mountain. This deep geological storage area has been being developed for the last several years.

No good science is being used out there; this is purely a political process. But in the process of developing Yucca Mountain, transportation of the waste to Yucca Mountain has been studied. It had to be made safe.

Well, in the process of developing a safe, reliable way of transporting the nuclear waste to Nevada, lo and behold, it was discovered dry cast storage would also store nuclear waste for the next 100 years in a very safe, reliable manner.

We can actually leave this nuclear waste on site in dry casts for the next 100 years, and if we want to retrieve it, if we develop technology that allows us to use this spent nuclear waste, then we will have it at the sites and be able to retrieve it very easily. If we bury it into the ground, we will not be able to retrieve this waste. Therefore, from an economic standpoint, it is much cheaper to have on-site dry-cast storage.

Yucca Mountain was originally supposed to be \$200 to \$400 million total. In recent years now, new studies have come out where Yucca Mountain will cost over \$30 billion to develop. That is one of the reasons it is a budget-buster, \$30 billion versus \$200 million, and that is just current estimates. We all know, 10 to 15 years from now, what happens to government estimates; they always go up. So how big will this bill be for the U.S. taxpayer?

Some people say that this is a national security issue. I want to raise that point. Some people say that it is not safe to keep this nuclear waste at all of these storage facilities around the country. Well, if that were the case, why do we not have U.S. troops guarding these places currently?

This is not a national security issue, and therefore, it becomes a States' rights issue. All of these States that have enjoyed nuclear power over the years, Nevada not being one of those States, should have to deal with the waste, because it is not a national security issue. Those States that have benefited from the power and the low-cost power over the years should pay and should have that stuff in their backyard, this nuclear waste Nevada has never had the benefit of; and therefore, it should not be dumped on a small State just because that small State only has two Representatives in the House.

Mr. Speaker, this whole process has never been based on sound science, has never been based on economics, but has been based purely on politics. We in Nevada understand that everybody wants to get nuclear waste out of their backyard and into Nevada's backyard. However, we oppose this measure, because not only will it bust the budget by over \$4 billion, and when we are looking at potentially \$30 billion total money spent on this deal, the \$4 billion

actually becomes a very small number, but we also oppose this on States' rights issues.

The 10th amendment clearly states that those powers not given to the Federal Government are reserved for the States and/or the people. Where in the Constitution does it give, when it is not dealing with a national security issue, this Congress the power to ship nuclear waste to a State that does not want it? This is a clear violation of the 10th amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that political expediency is not what this new Congress is about. That is not what we were elected to do. We were elected to respect the Constitution, and we were also elected to balance the budget. H.R. 1020 is a violation of everything that we were elected to do.

AMERICANS NEED MEDICAID WORKING FOR THEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the assumptions by the Congressional Budget Office give us greater flexibility in reaching a budget agreement, and that is indeed great news. However, we know we will not be able to use all of that \$135 billion that the Republicans have found, but one of the places where in the budget we ought to at least begin to think about investing those moneys would be Medicaid. Medicaid needs those funds for a variety of reasons, because this is the Federal program that is indeed provided to provide health care for the most vulnerable of our society.

The Republican plan that was rejected and vetoed by the President really ignores the past and hurts senior citizens; it disregards the present and neglects the future. It hurts children, as well as women who suffer under this program.

If the Republicans have their way, you must remember that they would give 245 billion dollars' worth of tax cuts, but at the same time, they would have 163 billion dollars' worth of cuts in Medicaid.

Now, those are not really cuts; to use their words, this is just slowing the growth. Nevertheless, you would have \$163 billion less resources to provide health care for the elderly, for children, for mothers and the disabled who need those programs and who are currently using those programs now.

We should be reminded that some 36 million Americans use Medicaid, and that is the only health program that they have available to them; 26 million of those 36 million people are the very poor. Of that 36 million, 26 million of those persons are very poor. They are children, they are elderly and, again, they are the disabled.

Again, if the Republican cuts stand, that would mean that they will

underfund a block grant to the States, and those persons who are now covered by Medicaid, currently covered by Medicaid, will now have to compete among others, if they will be covered at all, in the year 2002.

So Medicaid as a program, we must understand, is the underpinning for at least 26 million very, very poor persons, and at least 36 million Americans. Again, who are they? They are the elderly, they are pregnant women, they are children, and they are the disabled; no other health care do they know other than that. So when we reduce that by \$163 billion over 7 years, choices will have to be made as to who will be covered and who will not be covered.

States will be forced to make some very difficult decisions with their limited Medicaid funds. They must choose now, who will they offer health care? Which among those who are disabled now will have a health care and which will not have health care? Those are difficult choices to make between people you are now serving; and why should we have to make those difficult choices when there are other options? These choices are unnecessary in the very beginning.

We should remember that when we created Medicaid in the first instance, it was indeed to speak to the most vulnerable of those who need health care. This is not to suggest that Medicaid does not need to be reformed; of course, containment needs to be made. There are ways to have cost containment. There are ways to have better health care and prevention without denying people the opportunity of having health care.

Again, if you have to choose between \$245 billion worth of tax cuts at the same time by reducing the growth of \$163 billion over 7 years, you will have to make choices between millions of disabled persons, thousands of elderly persons and an unknown number of persons who are covered as mothers and children.

In my judgment, that is no choice, no choice whatsoever. Again, the President has offered a plan that cuts Medicaid by one-third as much as the Republican plan and yet balances the budget, cuts Medicaid by one-third as much and balances the budget. But more important than that, he maintains Medicaid as a Federal program, as entitlement to the people, not to the States, where the Republican plan would be an entitlement to the States. They would say, States, you have a right to this program, not people, not those 36 million people.

We will now be saying, North Carolina, California, Montana, whatever, States, you have that right, not people who live in the State.

So the President's plan would preserve Medicaid as a federally sponsored program that would be provided for those who are least among us and the poor.

Medicaid is indeed an important program. We need to know how to make it

more efficient; we need to make sure we serve as many people as we can.

Again, Medicaid as a block grant with no guarantee of health coverage whatsoever will mean that children and older Americans may have no place to turn. Indeed, America can do better than that. America can find a way to keep this entitlement for all of its citizens.

□ 1330

WHY WE NEED A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the first day during the budget negotiations to try to come to a compromise for a balanced budget, the administration and Congress, I think, have made some progress. Maybe some of the hopefulness is in what has been suggested, that the CBO has estimated now that approximately \$135 billion extra will be available in their new baseline, and that means the differences are less in the dollar amount between the House and Senate.

Here is one problem, though, in the CBO estimate of their prediction of a somewhat rosier economy in the next 3 or 4 years. That is the fact that it is exactly that, it is 3 or 4 years. The projection in the fifth, sixth, and seventh year is so ambiguous that that is not where additional revenues coming into the Government are coming from.

Therefore, when you decide the social programs that are going to be continued and expanded, when you decide the entitlement programs that are going to be continued and expanded, you have to take into consideration what is going to happen the fifth, sixth, and seventh year. Those issues still need to be addressed today.

I particularly am very concerned about what happened on November 15 when the President disinvested the so-called G fund and the thrift savings fund as well as the civil service retirement trust fund for a total of \$61 billion.

Congress, who is given the authority in article 1, section 8, of the Constitution to control borrowing, has now had some of that power taken away from them by an administration that has found a special way to increase the debt load of this country by raiding the trust funds, \$61 billion.

It took this country the first 160 years of its existence, through Pearl Harbor, into World War II, before we had amassed that kind of a \$60 billion debt. In one fell swoop, the President and Mr. Rubin increased the debt load of this country another \$61 billion.

What I would suggest is that it is important to try to regain control of spending in this country and the debt ceiling in this country.

Mr. Rubin suggests, well, once we have appropriated the money, it is the responsibility of Congress to come up with whatever is necessary in additional borrowing authority to pay off those debts.

Here is what is being left out of the discussion, Mr. Speaker. It is the fact that most of the spending, most of the cuts to achieve a balanced budget are coming from the entitlement changes. Since a majority in Congress can no longer reduce spending through the entitlement programs without the consent of the President, we have lost some of our authority to control the purse strings of this country. So it is very appropriate to tie the debt ceiling limit to conditions of changing the entitlement programs of this country, to try to have the U.S. Government live within its means.

We need to remind ourselves what we are talking about in terms of what borrowing is doing to our economy and the obligation that that is passing on to our kids and our grandkids.

We are borrowing money now because we think what we are doing and the problems that we face are so important that it justifies us going deeper into debt and telling our kids and our grandkids that they are going to have to pay back this debt out of money they have not even earned yet. They are going to have their own problems.

Most people conceptually say, well, yes, Government should try to live within its means and balance its budget. The fact is, is that it has such an impact, not only on our moral obligations of what we pass on to our kids as far as increasing their obligation and problems, but also its effect on our economy.

Alan Greenspan, our chief banker of this country, head of the Federal Reserve, came into our Budget Committee and said, "Look, if you are able to end up with a balanced budget, interest rates will go down between 1½ and 2 percent."

Two weeks ago, he went to the Senate Banking and Financial Services Committee and said, "Look, if you do not end up with a balanced budget, interest rates could go up another 1 percent," a dramatic difference in the effect of our individual lives, on how much it costs us to buy a home or borrow money to go to school or buy a car.

Let me just say that it is so important to our future, to our economy, to our well-being in this country and the well-being of our kids, that we have got to have a legitimate balanced budget, and I sincerely hope the administration and Congress will get together and achieve that particular goal of a real, no smoke-and-mirrors balanced budget.

RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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