

meanwhile, those equal cuts that went to the rich means they are going to get \$20,000 more in their pocket per year.

That is not a fair deal. I was accused of being a socialist on this floor the other day by a Member, and I must say what I want to say is the other side in their budget is socialism for the rich. No one has ever seen socialism for the rich. But this is a whole new Republican program, socialism for the rich so they can get richer. Those are the cuts that help them.

Well, I am not that kind of socialist, I can tell you, and I will make it very, very clear over and over again. That is not my program. I think Government is there to help people who need help, to teach them to fish, to get them on their legs and get them going, and I think the time has come and the American people have figured it out.

WE HAVE TO MAKE RESPONSIBLE CHOICES

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the words of my colleague from Colorado, and would propose to offer to the American people, Mr. Speaker, that we see another sterling, yes, even a textbook example of why there is a new minority in the Congress of the United States on that side of the aisle. It is fascinating to listen to this almost instant revisionism of history, socialism for the wealthy.

Well, that is a very interesting point of view, and I guess in terms of playground name calling, that certainly may have some validity in a nonsensical sort of way. One analog that does pertain, however, is the notion of the American family being put into a cage. The American family has been enslaved, but it has been enslaved by those proponents of big Government who believe that always there must be tax increases, that always people need to take out their wallets and give more and more money to Washington. And the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that in 1948 the average American family sent 3 percent of its income, the average American family of four paid 3 percent of its income in taxes to the Federal Government. And yet by 1994, on the heels of the largest tax increase in American history, the average American family paid 24.5 percent of its income in taxes to the Federal Government. And this was not class warfare, this is virtually everybody, with a quantum leap in what they had to pay to the Federal Government. And now, fresh on the heels of a nonsensical, dishonest school lunch scare program, the new minority, the guardians of the old order, are trying to scare seniors and students.

The fact is that we are not taking away student loans of the new major-

ity, but it is also the fact if we do nothing, if we allow the status quo to persist, there may not be university systems, there may not be a constitutional Republic in 5 to 10 years to have a worthy educational system to begin with.

To those who would always use the scare tactics about school lunches and claim cuts when there are increases, let me simply say this: The fact is we have to make responsible choices. The fact is that even in increasing funding or changing the method of supplying funding to give the money to people on the front lines, we are transforming what is done. We are making programs more effective to ensure that we may save them. And no clearer tactic or example can we see than in the realm of Medicare, where in fact my colleague, the preceding speaker, the gentlewoman from Colorado, tried to scare seniors and claim there are cuts.

Friends, we are making rash on America reasonable increases to save the Medicare Program. We are not making cuts. That is what we must do: make responsible choices, not come in and carp and complain and hope against hope that somehow in November 1996, the voters of America will return to a bankrupt policy of always and constant growth of Government.

GUAM COMMONWEALTH

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the lack of action on the part of the administration in fulfilling its responsibility to the people of Guam in appointing a special representative for the Guam Commonwealth.

The special representative would complete the discussions that were initiated in 1993 with the Guam Commission on Self-Determination on the issues that the Guam Commonwealth Act raises in defining a new relationship between the Federal Government and the people of Guam. Congress has deferred its action on the Guam Commonwealth Act, H.R. 1056, until the discussions with the administration's special representative are completed. However, it is impossible to complete the Commonwealth discussions when there is no one to discuss these issues with. A dialog, by definition, requires two parties.

Mr. I. Michael Heyman, the special representative who began these discussions with Guam in December 1993, announced his intention to resign on February 7 of this year. We have been waiting patiently for the administration to name a successor to Mr. Heyman. It is now 95 days later, and we are still waiting. There have been hints, rumors, and meetings, but no appointment. There have been assurances that issue this is receiving the highest

attention, but still no appointment. In short, there has been a lot of activity, but no action.

Mr. Speaker, the Guam Commission on Self-Determination and I have been extremely patient with the administration, but our patience is wearing thin. We can understand their wanting to find the right person for this job, but we question this excruciating and time-consuming scrutiny worthy of a Supreme Court nomination. In an administration not known for its speed in filling vacancies, we fear that the search for Guam's special representative is setting a new speed record, one that we are not particularly fond of holding. We'd rather leave the distinction of longest vacancy in the administration not filled to other more worthy contenders.

Mr. Speaker, the quest to establish a new self-governing Commonwealth for the people of Guam is of paramount importance to us, and is also important to the national interest. A prosperous, new Commonwealth of Guam, possessing the economic tools to secure a good future, will serve the interests of the United States in the western Pacific and the Far East into the 21st century. But none of this can happen if we don't conclude the ongoing discussions between Guam and the administration. These discussions must come to some conclusion so that Congress would have a better sense of how the important issues of self-governance can be resolved.

I, therefore, call on the administration to name a special representative for Guam Commonwealth, and to resume the important discussions that have been delayed for the past 3 months. And I again remind the administration that time is running short to complete this process within a time-frame that allows the 104th Congress to also begin its important review of the Guam Commonwealth Act.

FISCAL YEAR 1996 BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the budget that the Republicans on the House Budget Committee have produced.

It produces a balanced budget in 2002—just as we promised.

This will be the first balanced budget in 33 years. That is right, 1969 was the last year the Federal Government balanced its books.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I can say we have worked tirelessly since January to produce a plan that is fair and honest.

The plan has the unanimous support of the committee Republicans, as well as Democrat MIKE PARKER of Mississippi. Opponents are already attacking this plan, and distorting what it

really does. That is why I want to get out the facts.

To those who oppose this plan I say, what is your alternative? Where's the Beef? How would you balance the budget?

The President's plan produces \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. He never balances the budget.

Now, let us talk about this budget. First, as we promised, Social Security is off the table.

Second, we freeze defense, and make clear that defense spending will continue to undergo the kind of scrutiny of other aspects of the budget.

Third, we reduce all discretionary spending, including foreign aid.

We abolish three Cabinet agencies: Commerce, Energy, and Education.

This plan also eliminates 283 programs, 14 agencies, and 68 commissions.

Overall this budget simply slows the growth in spending to just over 2 percent a year. The difference is that under current forecasts we grow over 5 percent a year.

This plan is not perfect. But it is far superior to other options, and far superior to doing nothing. This is the best plan that has been put on the table in years. It produces a balanced budget. It is a budget for our children.

Now let me talk about health care. This is important because it will be the source of much distortion in the coming days.

First, we do not cut Medicare or Medicaid, both grow under our plan. Let us look at this chart. It shows why we have to slow the rate of growth in Medicare and Medicaid. Both programs are growing at over 10 percent a year.

The rest of the Government is growing at much slower rates. This is not sustainable.

In fact, the Medicare Trustees Report, released in April, and signed by three members of the President's Cabinet, says that Medicare will go broke in 7 years if we do nothing. That is why we slow the growth in both programs.

Let me focus on Medicare. We slow the growth to 5 percent a year. This means we will increase Medicare spending over 7 years, from \$4,700 per beneficiary today to \$6,300 per beneficiary in 2002. This preserves the solvency of Medicare.

Now, enough statistics. Why are we doing this? Why is a balanced budget so important for our children and grandchildren?

Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, summed it up very well when he testified before the Budget Committee earlier this year.

Let us go down the list on the chart. If we balance the Budget:

One, our children will have a higher standard of living than their parents.

Two, there will be improvement in the purchasing power of incomes.

Three, a rise in productivity.

Four, reduction in inflation.

Five, strengthening of financial markets.

Six, acceleration of long-term economic growth.

And most important, seven, a significant drop in long term interest rates.

Now, what does all this mean to American families. It means a higher standard of living.

It means families will pay less for their home mortgage because of lower interest rates.

It means more families will be able to afford college for their children.

It means lower car payments.

This week's Time magazine has an excellent article on this topic.

It explains how balancing the budget can help revive the American dream.

The article talks about how lower deficits mean lower interest rates, and therefore more job creation by U.S. business. The article provides one very specific example of a young couple who are considering a new home.

Under a mortgage rate of 8 percent, they would pay \$734 a month on a \$100,000 mortgage. If interest rates are 1 percent lower, this payment is cut to \$665.

This would save \$28,000 over the life of the mortgage. This would be enough to put one of their future children through a year of college.

Similarly, I have been using the example of farmers, because there are reductions in agriculture subsidies in this budget.

However, it is estimated that a 1.5-percent reduction in interest rates would save the farm sector over \$10 billion in interest payments on their debt over 5 years. This more than offsets the reduction.

These are examples of what it means to balance the budget. This is not just an exercise in accounting. It really matters. It will make a difference in the lives of every American. It will particularly, make a difference in the lives of our children and grandchildren.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the first balanced budget in 33 years.

A CRISIS OF LEADERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, good morning. It comes to mind, as I have seen the week's last activities, that there is a crisis of leadership amongst those who would claim themselves bearers of the Constitution and members of the National Rifle Association. Interestingly enough, it is because of this Constitution that we allow those who have certain ideas to gather together.

But yet as we gathered to acknowledge and honor our mothers, on this past Sunday, Mother's Day—nurturers to a one, those who love children, promote peace, and work to comfort their young ones, we are bombarded with newspaper articles evidencing the self-righteousness of an organization who would be so irresponsible to send let-

ters out claiming that Federal law enforcement officers are just "boot-wearing thugs." And, yes, they have the sheer audacity to claim that the former President of the United States of America, George Bush, should reconsider his membership in the NRA.

I simply say to that Texan and my neighbor, George Bush, thank you for having the integrity and leadership to recognize that sometimes we simply have to stand for what is right. How appalled I was to see in the Houston Chronicle a letter to the President from the NRA suggesting that he just wait and see what proposed hearings on Waco might bring about, then he would realize how right the NRA was.

I simply say to the National Rifle Association, the Constitution reigns. I keep it close to me. You have a right to organize and associate. The first amendment protects your free speech. But it does not give you the privilege of crying "fire" in a crowded theater, of fostering hatred and antagonisms against people who are designated to uphold the law.

As an African-American, I know full well the abuses that can come about through excessive government. But I also know how Federal officers went into the deep South and protected those young students going into universities who would foster segregation. I do know that there are heroes and heroines in our law enforcement officers. I support them and they support us everyday. If there is abuse, I simply say to you we do have to stand up against such abuse, and I will tell you that good law enforcement officers likewise do the same.

We have a task force in the House to rid us of the assault weapons ban. How frivolous and ridiculous. Not only are they opposing the assault weapon's ban, but they are going into your neighborhoods and telling you laws to prevent guns in schools are illegal. That is part of the proposed legislation. Not only is the task force saying that, but gun safety and responsible legislation, some of which I passed as a council member, preventing young children from getting guns, the task force will be taking the Federal Government into your homes to intrude by saying those laws to protect your children are illegal. How ridiculous.

Then my Republican colleagues want to come forward and suggest that we have hearings on Waco. I say fair enough. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am willing to own up and look at issues that affect the American people. At the same time, let me say to you, where are they on the issue of hearings on the militia? For Waco is absolutely no excuse for Oklahoma City. And I will stand here in the well of the House and claim to you that those lives that were lost, over 160 lives, children, hard working individuals, the devastation to Oklahoma City and the State of Oklahoma, the fear