

The Clinton debt numbers actually underestimate the problem because they fail to account for four additional powerful factors, Mr. Speaker. The taxpayers' burden is paying interest on the debt, the cost of higher interest rates caused by the Federal Government's borrowing, the imminent financial crisis in Medicare, if it is not saved, and the soon-retiring baby boomers and their effect on the Social Security trust fund.

Every citizen will have to pay a lot more in taxes and interest on the debt unless we solve the problem. Over the next 11 years, we will pay as much in taxes just to pay the interest on the debt as the entire debt that has ever existed.

The following Americans will pay a lot on interest to the debt which builds up over a time in their lives. Let us take Sally, in 1995, \$187,150. Our spending today saddles our children with debt tomorrow. That is not a legacy that I wish to leave my children.

In 1997 we will pay more for the interest on the debt than we will pay for all of national defense. That is sad, Mr. Speaker, and that is on the interest. That is not on the principal. It does not go into our banks. It goes to foreign interests and foreign subsidies used against us in economic warfare such as Japan, such as China, such as Russia.

Budget deficits raise interest rates and cost everyone additional money. What a balanced budget will mean, I quote Federal Reserve chairman Alan Greenspan; I think real incomes and purchasing power of the real incomes will significantly improve what they look for in their children and they are doing better, and they will do better.

Alan Greenspan stated that most Americans feel that their children will do worse than they have in their present lifetimes. That is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker.

I feel that we are doing the most important things that we have ever done in our lives. When we are only getting small amounts of dollars to the problems that we have, when this nation is headed for economic ruin and a second rate country economically and we are going to lose our health care systems, we have got to do something about it.

I feel proud to be able to take part in that. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, put away the rhetoric, put away the information that is coming out and join us and embrace it. We want to save this country for our children, because, again, if we do not, they are going to owe far more than we could ever pay: not a legacy that we want to leave for our children.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close in just a second. I am going to basically state that in the future of this House and working with the Senate, with both sides of the aisle, whether we receive a balanced budget amendment or not, we are going to balance the budget in 2002.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] of the Committee on the Budget

has taken every single Member's information into account in our conference. The COLA's for retirements are back in. The items, the common goal and the common thread when it comes down to it, in the year 2002 we will have a balanced budget in this country, and what a great thing that will mean, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2015

#### THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to clarify a budget process that has been caught up in much controversy and debate. I heard a colleague today at an earlier presentation suggest that we might do well to engage in dialog and turn ourselves away from this whole idea of debate and speak to the issues that I believe the American people can understand. Coming from the 18th District in Texas, the fourth largest city in the Nation, Houston, I am going to use as a backdrop to this discussion this evening as a reminder where our State already finds itself under the present rescissions bill that is yet to come back to the House but already evidences that our State will lose some \$1.1 billion in needs of family nutrition, aid to dependent children, school nutrition, and Medicaid, that takes care of the many needs of our children and our senior citizens.

Interestingly, there is a sharp divide in the vision and the focus of this Nation. For in the debate and the discourse that we have heard, we have been told that the deficit will break the very backs of this country. Yet we find when we analyze the deficit and compare it to the GNP in this Nation compared with other western civilization nations, we have the smallest percentage of deficit of any other country.

This does not mean that we do not face up to our responsibilities and begin to confront the hard issues of deficit reduction. As a new Member of Congress, I have made that commitment because I have come from that kind of history. For local governments do not carry deficits from one fiscal year to the next. We know the hard response of being able to pay as you go.

I do want to clarify, however, that many of the local and State governments have a luxury that this country does not, and, that is, that they separate out their operating budget from the budget that deals with capital improvements, a consideration that I have raised as a possible direction for this Nation to take, ongoing debt versus immediate debt.

In any event as we begin to dialog about this deficit reduction and this budget resolution, which has been characterized as a resolution to solve the budget deficit by the year 2002.

Juxtaposed to that representation is the inquiry of where the Democrats' budget proposal might be.

To clarify, it is the responsibility of the majority party in this House, of course, to present a budget. Certainly that was to have been done by April 15 and, of course, we did not receive such a resolution until last week. Not only did we not receive it until last week, about the second week in May, but we now are to address this resolution and find a common bond and resolution in a matter of less than 48 hours. This will be debated on the House floor tomorrow, Wednesday, and voted on before the end of this week. There will be Democratic proposals. There will be amendments that will be offered. And so the responsibility that is charged to those of us who are Democrats is being upheld. It is unfortunate that the tone of the debate is suggesting that one's responsibility has not been taken care of.

But the sharp divide over which direction this Nation should go causes me to rise this evening to say that clearly the Republican Party needed to take a couple of more months in order to strike a more effective chord of bipartisanship that would help to approach the deficit reduction that we all would like to have but, as well, create a vision of opportunity and challenge and success for this Nation.

Interestingly enough as we were being cajoled into thinking that life was all right in the late 1920's and the early 1930's under the leadership of the Republican Party as we moved into the deep recesses of depression, many people would have thought of a variety of ways to increase productivity and to get this country out of the depths of depression. It, however, took a creative Government under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to both answer the question of debt but as well answer the question of productivity.

This country today is crying out for productivity. It is crying out for a need of jobs, for the engine to run corporate America to produce jobs, for the domestic energy industry to be refueled and retooled. It is crying out for those who would seek to bridge themselves out of dependence into independence an opportunity to do so. This budget does not speak to that. In fact, it undermines that.

While their proposal would provide for a balanced budget by the year 2002, it would abolish several vital Cabinet departments. Low and moderate income Americans and particularly children would be impacted. According to the new Washington Post/ABC News poll, if we are to be pundits of polls, my opinions are apparently shared by a majority of Americans. Sixty percent of poll respondents oppose abolishing the Education and Energy Departments and 56 percent oppose shutting down the Commerce Department, which, by the way, has been a most

productive department that we have seen over the last couple of years creating billions of dollars in business opportunities for America's business, both small and large. And, of course, they oppose the cutting of the needs of those who rely upon Medicare and Medicaid.

I am further concerned about the budget resolution for several reasons. One reason is because it would negatively impact the Social Security System and the 43 million Social Security recipients nationwide.

The Republican leadership has pledged that Social Security would not be hurt by their budget, but we now know that they want to change the rules. They want to reduce annual cost-of-living increases that would in effect cut Social Security benefits by \$24 billion between 1999 and 2002.

Let's put some faces to that, because obviously these are just numbers. But what happens to those citizens who totally rely upon their income and their support from Social Security? It is all right to say that in the years past, you would match pension benefits with Social Security benefits. Those were the good old days. It comes now full circle that many of our working citizens, who for many reasons believed that Social Security was a trust fund, although we recognize that it is one where you are now paying into it to pay for those who are on it at this point, still the concept is, I paid into Social Security with the belief that it would be there for me upon retirement. The tragedy of that, however, is that many of those individuals, and particularly those who are on SSI, the physically challenged, our children, have come to have that as the only source of support that they might need to carry on their life and to survive. That is the face of Social Security. So we can fix something without eliminating it.

Second, the budget resolution does not represent an adequate investment in human capital. We have spent an exercise over the last couple of weeks talking about welfare reform. I clearly challenged that, for I am committed to welfare reform and challenged the proposal that passed this House as welfare punishment, for it was inconsistent with the so-called results that were looked to. That is, by terminating people a certain period of time, there was some reason to that debate, that citizens should not be on welfare for their entire life, to break the cycle, but how much of a response do you get by terminating someone off a benefit that they may need? Not the able-bodied citizen or someone who can go out the next day and get a job but the person who truly has dependent children, did not finish their education, and has no skills.

If you are serious about welfare reform, then you would have several elements: Job training, child care, and some sort of incentive to your businesses to provide jobs for those individuals. None of that was included in the

welfare proposal that was passed out of this House. Yet now we come full scale with a budget that would include several points that cut into my sense that there is any seriousness with the Republican Party on, one, their commitment to true welfare reform, and then to a realistic budget that responds to the deep diversity of this Nation; not necessarily poor to rich but all of those in between who may at some time in their life fall upon hard times, those individuals who may need Medicaid at some point, those individuals who may need a school lunch program or a school breakfast program at some point in their life, those who may need aid to dependent children at some time in their life. Much of this now in the rescissions package, which is rescinding back what was already authorized, is further being cut through the budget.

Let me just cite what is being cut out of the Republican budget as I talk about the human capital impact, putting faces to the impact of this budget resolution. Again, moving us far away from striking a bipartisan chord to move us toward deficit reduction and as well strike a positive vision for this Nation, one that captures the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, creating the productivity of this Nation to create jobs and opportunity.

First of all we cut Medicare under this budget by \$283 billion over 7 years from 1996 to 2002. Falsely we are hearing that in fact Medicare will be increased to about \$1.4 trillion approximately. This cut, however, which is a realistic aspect, and I would welcome a dialogue and a rebuttal of this particular point, it will add \$1,060 to the out-of-pocket costs of seniors by the year 2002. It will cut Medicaid by \$184 billion over the 7 years. Many of our indigent seniors rely upon that kind of health dollars to provide their health care for them. Clearly there is a singular voice saying, "Why do we not have health reform?" Of course, we have attempted that on many occasions. That might be the appropriate answer than rushing to judgment and making cuts that would burden those already burdened.

I have mentioned Social Security cuts and that would cut the average benefit over 1999 to 2002, this would bring the benefits cut to about \$240 by the year 2002.

Of course all of this points to the Republican tax cut which loses revenue for this Nation of \$353 billion over the next 7 years and gives the wealthiest families a tax cut of about \$20,000 while giving middle-income families only about \$555 in total tax relief.

I said that this was an opportunity to clarify the Republican budget, not a time so much to cite those who would offer their views. But I will say that many, many of the economists around this Nation have all had one voice in saying that this is the inappropriate time, the worst time to offer unneeded tax cuts.

We all wish to offer to the American people their fair share back from the

Government. There is no doubt on that. But when you ask them a pointed question as to their desire for effective Federal services, efficient, downsized, responsible Federal services, they will answer you yes every time as opposed to a one-time tax cut that does nothing but add a burden to the Federal Government and reduce the revenue for much needed desires of reducing the deficit.

□ 2030

Of course ultimately this budget proposal will raise taxes on families by \$17 billion between 1999 and 2002 by reducing the indexing of tax breaks, et cetera, and the personal exemption by 0.6 percent each year.

Let me add what else it will do. I supported the unfunded-mandates legislation, which means that you do not burden your States and local government with legislation of which they cannot pay for.

What happens, however, when the myriad of programs that have been effective and effectively utilized by State and local governments are no more and thereby they have to fill in the gap and pay for these with moneys that they do not have? That is, in fact, an unfunded mandate. There you have a budget resolution that has no vision and needs to be clarified and does not seek, if you will, or does not provide the results of which the proponents argue that it does.

Student loans. I received a very personal and very moving letter from a student from the University of Houston asking why would we in a time when we are encouraging our young people to be prepared for the technology of the 21st century, when today we find that most college students will come out of college with 70-percent loans and 30-percent scholarships or grants, contrary to some 10 or 15 years ago when it was quite the opposite, it was 70-percent scholarship and grants and possibly 30-percent loans, they come out already with a burden of some 70 percent in loans, looking for employment. We now have before us a proposal by the Republican Budget Committee, presented to the House, to cut student loans by \$18.7 billion by charging students interest on their loans while they are still in school. This is a \$5,000-per-student increase in the interest costs of the average loan.

What that simply means is for many students that will simply, and I can underline that word even more, deny them an opportunity for higher education.

We will also find that a great deal of the focus will be on domestic spending, they will cut a lot of our domestic spending as opposed to spreading the burden of these cuts around a whole source of individuals.

Defense spending increases by \$69 billion above what has been asked for by the President's budget, thereby cutting

domestic spending and adding to the defense budget without the full hearing as to whether or not that is truly needed.

I cannot imagine how in this high-tech economy moving into the 21st Century we would pull away from investing in human capital. I cannot imagine how we would present to the world economy ill-prepared students and ill-prepared citizens because of a lack of opportunities for education.

The GOP budget would make inexcusable cuts in educational and training programs over the next 7 years. The Goals 2000 program designed to assist local school districts, parents and students, and by the way have been touted by school districts around this Nation, will experience a \$2.8 billion cut over this period. Again let me remind you we are talking again now about unfunded mandates because those programs have been effective in providing the even playing field in education for many of our primary and secondary students.

Title I grants which currently aid more than 700,000 disadvantaged school children would suffer cuts of \$5.1 billion; in essence what happened is they take the programs that have the least number of individuals who can walk the halls and lobby Congresspersons, because either they are unable, they are disabled, or they are too young to speak and, so here we are, here we are looking at the budget cuts that are supposed to be reasonable and are supposed to put us moving forward in to the year 2000, and I can point to you time after time after time the cuts for children.

Bilingual education programs serving 650,000 children are particularly important to the State of Texas; that would be cut by \$1.4 billion. Vocational education programs, the programs business leaders tell us will become increasingly critical for the competitiveness of the American work force, programs that assist 1 million noncollege-bound Americans gain skills they need to find good-paying jobs, would be cut by some \$8.2 billion. That is very interesting, because what you find there is quite the contrary view being spoken by the CEO's of major corporations. They are concerned about the training of the work force for the 21st century. They are concerned that there will not be enough individuals well trained in technology to meet their employment needs.

What does that say in cutting the kind of training that is job-specific, which is vocational training, that many of our young people, sometimes returning adults, adults that are going back to school having been laid off through downsizing or the changing technology in their particular job or profession, to not have the opportunity to train in the best training for the jobs of the 21st century, so we will cut that.

Some would say well, let the private sector do it. That has typically not

been the case in these kinds of vocational training opportunities. We have certainly been able to partnership with the private sector, but the Government has been an effective partner in that to provide the training for these individuals then to go into the work force, to be productive to allow us to be competitive and then for them to be taxpayers. We have just cut that cycle off in the most ill-conceived manner that I could imagine.

The safe and drug-free schools and communities program would be cut by \$3.4 billion. Having met with two of my school districts, North Forest Independent School District and Houston Independent School District, I realize how important these programs can be to setting the tone and as well providing a violence-free atmosphere for our children to learn.

Just today I announced two of our schools in Houston that were cited for their drug-free and violence-free atmosphere, Principal Alice Brimberry of Link Elementary School and Theodore Merrill of Tidwell Elementary School with efforts to keep their schools drug free and violence free, and I would think they would be shuddering that these programs would not have the support that they have had in the past to go forward more than simply saying to your youngster, "Just say no," but actually allowing them to feel free. I wonder if you realize that in recent studies of elementary school students and middle-school students when questions were asked of them what did they view as their future or what did they hope for, some of them said merely to be alive or they wondered about whether they would grow up to be an adult.

It is the kind of influence that many of us could not fathom, that children worry about violence and surviving past a certain age, whether or not they will get to be an adult, whether or not they will get to be married or have children or live in a society where they feel safe. These are frightening answers, but it means that it is important for us to invest in human capital.

The Perkins student loan program which I mentioned earlier in the listing of the cuts, which makes low-interest loans to 700,000 students—how about this—would be totally eliminated.

Now I think we all can address the issue of ensuring that we pay for what we get. We want to ensure that students pay back their student loans, and every student I have seen on campus has those intentions. If we create a positive job market for that individual they will be glad to work and pay back their loans, but when you talk about eliminating the opportunity for these students coming from families who do not have the means for them to get a higher education, cutting off their very lifeline for being further productive citizens and taxpayers, and contributing to their desire to have a piece of the American dream, then you have no vision. And I would not remind many

of you that where the people have no vision, they will perish.

With respect to Medicare, the proposal favors a reduction, as I said, of \$283 billion over the amount that has been projected as necessary over the next 7 years. This cut would result in an additional \$1,060 in out-of-pocket costs to seniors in 2002. With these proposed reductions in projected costs or growth, the Medicare Program would be reduced by 25 percent in 2002. Thus the annual growth in Medicare would go from 10 percent down to 5.4 percent.

However, the plan does not take into account the increase in the number of the elderly and the inflation in medical costs. During this period it is estimated that the State of Texas would lose \$17.6 billion by the year 2002, and it is estimated that each beneficiary in Texas would be paying an additional \$1,102 in costs.

The Medicare debate is one that I think causes us a great deal of concern, because many people ask the question what are the facts about the Medicare debate. I would simply say that the Medicare Program is a critical safety net for millions of seniors and disabled Americans. For nearly 30 years this program has enjoyed a high level of support from Americans of all ages. While I support careful and equitable revisions in this program which are necessary to secure its long-term stability, I am strongly opposed to harsh budgetary restraints and spending growth caps that will adversely affect our elderly citizens, and which are used to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

As we look to tighten our Federal financial belts during this budget process, let me remind my colleagues of Speaker GINGRICH's words, every penny saved in Medicare should go to Medicare.

Well, I wonder if that is actually the truth. And I would simply raise the question that I would hope that would be, in fact, where it would go. But everyone knows that each penny saved in Medicare will be used for a variety of other reasons. One, for the tax cuts that economists have said across this Nation we do not need.

This is an assault on the livelihood of this country's most vulnerable and its least able to support themselves, and I believe this is absolutely unacceptable.

If my Republican colleagues are calling for a 5-percent growth cap for this program, which translates into a program cut by \$283 billion, the result will be an increase of out-of-pocket costs of \$1,000 yearly for Medicare beneficiaries by 2002. What we have to recognize is that those who are the beneficiaries of Medicare are basically on retirement; their income levels are low. I am sure many of us have heard the stories about making decisions to buy prescription drugs verses nutritious food. For many of our seniors this is reality. This is something I face in my community on a regular basis. I try to put faces to statistics, and clearly there

are seniors concerned about how they will survive.

This does not mean that they are selfish, that they are not concerned with, as I said earlier, about being more efficient on Medicare. But they wonder simply the basic question of how they will survive.

Such increases are virtually equal to cutting their Social Security benefits by the same amount. They will have to take that money to pay for the increase they need in their health care. As most Medicare beneficiaries must use their Social Security to pay for their out-of-pocket costs and expenses, and to aggravate the situation further the Republicans are proposing a 0.6 percent consumer price index reduction for 1999, which will reduce the average Social Security benefit by \$240 per month below current law projections.

I thought they said Social Security was off the table. That was mentioned in a debate that we had. Clearly, it seems that it is not off the table. What it is, it is off and out of the pockets of senior citizens who will have to take money and use it elsewhere.

I refuse to pick up the newspaper and read of another senior citizen who has to make that choice between buying food and buying medicine. The GAO has recently reported that the Medicare Program could save over \$3 billion during a 5-year period if their computer systems were upgraded to detect billing fraud. I ask the question if we are dialoging about a reasonable budget, and a reasonable method to reduce the deficit, where is the plan to provide a computer system that can detect fraud? There is not a senior who would not agree with you that we support getting rid of abuse, getting rid of fraud, and getting rid of the misuse of Medicare dollars.

Another option to consider is means testing for beneficiaries, and that is, as Senator SIMON has indicated, those individuals earning amounts \$100,000 and above.

□ 2045

I would just simply ask the reasonable question: Could there not be some manner in which part of their health costs they could pay for? Again, a hard question. Sometimes hard answers. I would imagine you would get some individual who would say, "I should not pay for any of my cost," but reasonable men and women could agree that if your income reached a certain amount and you had the ability that you did not have catastrophic illness that took away all of your income, then we should look at ways of improving the medical care system so that individuals with a certain high income bracket might be able to provide for their own costs by paying for some of their own insurance.

We have not exhausted all options, nor have we properly opened this issue up for public debate. Savings of any kind add up and allow us more flexibility when dealing with a program that is facing insolvency.

The other point is that we are doing this in a vacuum. Where is the debate on health reform that would take into consideration improving Medicare and taking some of these efficiencies so that we would not talk about burdening seniors with the high cost of Medicare by the cuts that have been proposed by this budget resolution? Medicaid would experience a reduction of \$184 billion.

You can see under the rescissions, and I am jumping back to the rescissions of which we have already gone through the House now and gone through the Senate now, in conference; we will be seeing it again. The State of Texas presently under the Republican rescissions package would lose some \$753 million in Medicaid, mostly on the backs of our children and elderly.

Now. In this new budget proposal, \$184 billion projected growth over the next 7 years, and to be converted into a block grant which would be a reduction of about 30 percent of this program which would add, if this stays as it is, to the burden of the State. Here we go again with an unfunded mandate.

Annual growth will be 4 percent instead of the current 10 percent. However, the proposal does not take into account the increase in the number of beneficiaries, and the projected increase in nursing home costs and prescription drugs.

Block grants have been touted as an attractive means of cutting costs. What block grants do not necessarily account for and creates a crisis, and again an unfunded mandate, is increased need. What happens with a block grant when a community has a downfall in the economy, a recession, a loss of an immense number of jobs, when individuals have to fall back on their family members for support and then the block granting for either Medicaid or, in this instance, school lunches or school breakfasts, run out and you have a community with express need and no money to pay for it? As plain as day, as clear as it is in front of you, it is an unfunded mandate, and clearly it is a burden on local government, but more importantly, it is people going without in a country that has been touted again as a country that cares, but more importantly, as one of the greatest nations in Western civilization.

Taxes would be raised on families by \$17 billion between 1999 and 2002, as we have noted already, and again, that means that the least of those, when we are telling people we are giving them a tax cut, by this very budgeting process, we would wind up raising taxes ultimately on individuals, and so this would be more or less getting it in the back, if you will, because it would not provide any opportunities for these working people to find any kind of real benefit.

As we begin to look at how the burden will fall, let me clarify so that we do not get a sense that these programs I am talking about are programs that

help those who will not help themselves, and for lack of a better term, one that emphasizes these are the deadbeats of our society, and so we do not want to particularly involve ourselves with those people, because they do not deserve us to be supportive. If we want to see who is being helped, let us look at the percentage of the elderly that rely on Social Security. Those who rely on it for 80 percent of their income, that is about 32 percent, so Social Security represents 80 percent of their income. Fifty-nine percent of them, it represents 50 percent of their income, a real hold, if you will, on many of our senior citizens in our Nation. Social Security is the backbone of their survival. Then if we want to look at what will happen under the Republican proposal for seniors and for individuals paying Medicare expenses, by the time we get to 2002, we would wind up with having to pay benefits or having to pay out of their pocket \$3,075 to ensure that they get the coverage that they need.

Let us find out who uses Medicare. These individuals who are on Medicare, 51 percent of them are between the ages of 65 and 74 years. We are recognizing more of our citizens are living longer, and so their needs are there. You have got 29 percent who are between 75 to 84 years, then you have got a good 10 percent that are disabled, and you have got 10 percent who are 85 years and over. Share program expenditures by income of Medicare individuals or couples; I think this is very important. For some reason, as I indicated, we need to look at means testing for Medicare, and we can see that there are about 3 percent of the population that has Medicare that is making \$50,000 and over. So we see that that is not a real large problem. The key comes in; the people who utilize Medicare we can see where their need is. Sixty-two percent of those make \$15,000 or under. That is their income. And then some 21 percent make \$15,000 to \$25,000 a year. This is not a program that is going to people who can afford to throw away money.

I think that it would be extremely detrimental if we followed the Republican plan and cut into the vision of this country, which is to reward people who have worked hard and to reward people who have made a commitment by their tenacity and perseverance and their love of this country and then to undermine them in their later years.

In the State of Texas, we would find that we would lose a great deal of money, some \$17 billion if this particular program was to go forward. I think that the vision is foggy, and it is particularly foggy, because I am in shock that a Republican majority would now want to posture themselves to cut into human capital in terms of education, in terms of Medicare and Medicaid and then to cut us off in terms of technology and the ability to advance and compete in a world market.

For their programs will cut into the science programs and research development in a very large way. The majority's budget resolution ignores the reality of our global economy and makes short-sighted cuts in critical areas.

From fiscal years 1996 to 2002, the GOP would cut \$5.5 billion from the human space flight program. In fact, as the budget resolution was unveiled last week, it would almost double the cut already proposed for NASA. It would take \$4.9 billion from space and aeronautics and technology research, and more than \$1 billion from academic research infrastructure, like computer networking. The GOP budget would also cut several items of medical research.

Let me cite for you an interesting point that I have just learned, and I think it is an important point to acknowledge. As we provide health care dollars and we pay for our health needs, none of those dollars go for medical research. We see the tragedy that is going on with the virus in Zaire, and the inability to detect how to cure it. Medical research saves money. Medical research creates an opportunity to cure illnesses, and yet medical research is funded predominantly by Federal funds, and if we were to cut medical research, then we dictate for this Nation and for this world, and we submit them or submit all of us to the inability to find cures for illnesses or to improve the health condition of the Nation.

Medical research is important. Part of the budget cut and the budget resolution will negatively impact on medical research. And so it confuses me that this budget resolution seems to strike a chord of disharmony.

It pitches itself to a small 3 percent or more of the Nation, and it does not set a vision for moving us into the 21st century. That is why without consultation with local government, you can find some \$6.5 billion being cut from the Community Development Block Grant, some \$868 million being cut from the community development financial institutions, employment training, employment and training and social services. You are cutting Goals 2000 \$2.8 billion, title I \$5.1 billion. You are cutting safe and drug free schools \$3.4 billion. You are cutting all of the housing programs that would include modernization of our public housing units. You are cutting the new construction of public housing units some \$4 billion, eliminating construction of new public housing units, \$13.4 billion, Legal Services Corporation, you are cutting \$2.5 billion, and with a great emphasis on vocational training.

And so there is a mixed message here. There is a message that we have instructed and we have called upon America to stand up on our feet, to stop being dependent, to get off welfare, to stop the cycle of poverty, and yet we do great damage to our science and research. We do great damage to our vocational training, our secondary and primary education. We do great damage to our opportunities for local communities to go into their neighbor-

hoods and provide economic and social advancement through the Community Development Block Grants. We take away the incentive for drug free and violence free schools. We intrude into the lives and the needs of our senior citizens and the physically challenged and the disabled by cutting Medicaid and Medicare, and then we want to carry on the debate to suggest that it is the other party that does not have a budget proposal and an answer.

Well, my cry and my call today is that reasonably we must come together looking for a bipartisan approach to what is a bipartisan problem. It is America's problem, and that is to acknowledge that we have a deficit.

Yet I would say in acknowledging that we have a deficit, truly we should acknowledge that we cannot break that deficit on the backs of those who are trying to stand up, and clearly I think the point should be made that if this budget is to represent a vision of a people, then in a bipartisan way those cuts must be spread evenly to provide the incentives for young people to go to college, to provide the incentive for businesses to grow and develop and certainly to be able to provide for those in their older years. The opposite of that is to ensure that working families will be able to face every day the question of how I will take care of my elderly parent. They will have to face every day the idea that their young person in their home, although they may have had a job during the summer, while they were in high school, they may have the potential for going to college, but with no work study, no grants, no loans, they just might not get there. I would like you to think what we would face if that was the case.

There is a time now for this to end, not so much in the resounding debate, but in solution, and that solution has to be do not hurt the State of Texas. It has to be do not hurt the many cities and towns and rural communities around this Nation. Let us put forth the budget resolution that clearly answers the needs of all people, answers the vision of this country, and that is that we can make a difference, cut the deficit, but be proud of the asset that we have in this Nation, and that asset is an investment in human capital.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), until 12 noon today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. KLECZKA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. LIPINSKI (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of family illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WYNN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes today, and May 17 and 18.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on May 17.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, on May 17.

Mr. MARTINEZ, for 5 minutes, on May 17 and 18.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WYNN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. BORSKI.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. LEVIN in three instances.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. STARK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. WELDON of Florida.

Mr. RIGGS.

Mr. METCALF.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. WICKER.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. COMBEST.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. EMERSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. LATOURETTE.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

Mr. PASTOR.

Mr. BUYER.

Mr. ENGEL in two instances.

Mrs. LINCOLN.

□ 2100

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.