

proposes a \$5 billion cut in the crime trust fund over the next 6 years. The measure directs that the justice assistance grant programs would be consolidated into a single block grant program. This plan will only serve to weaken our crimefighting ability by taking money away from law enforcement officers.

□ 2115

Certainly there is much more Congress can and must do to reduce crime and violence in this country. Crime continues to be the number one concern for millions of working families. That is why it is imperative that Congress not gut the crime bill as a means of playing partisan politics.

Therefore, I say to my friends on this side of the aisle, I say to the Republicans, stop playing politics with the crime bill. Respect the men and women in law enforcement. Instead of providing them with a few encouraging words during National Police Week, give law enforcement the financial assistance they need to keep them secure in their jobs and to keep us all secure in our neighborhoods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MISSISSIPPI AIR NATIONAL
GUARD'S 186TH REFUELING
GROUP RECEIVES HIGHEST IN-
SPECTION RATING

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the news that the Air National Guard's 186th Air Refueling Group in Meridian, MS, received an "outstanding" rating after completing an operational readiness inspection conducted by the Air Mobility Command [AMC].

This is the first time in the history of the Air Mobility Command that any unit has been given an "outstanding" rating, which was announced on May 11 by Lt. Gen. Malcolm Armstrong, commander of AMC's 21st Air Force.

The unit was required to deploy more than half of its 900 members for the week-long inspection at Fort Hood, Texas, along with nine KC-135 tanker aircraft. They lived and worked in a wartime scenario during the inspection. While deployed, the unit was subject to simulated conventional and chemical attack, terror-

ist activity and hostile threats while continuing to perform its mission of air-to-air refueling of military aircraft. The AMC inspection team, composed of active duty members based at Air Mobility Command headquarters, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, tested the unit's capability under the same criteria used for inspecting active Air Force units. The exercises ran 24 hours a day while the unit was deployed.

Col. Frederick Feinstein, air commander of the 186th, said, "This was undoubtedly the finest display of professionalism and dedication that I have seen from any unit in almost 40 years of military service. Every Member of the unit had a job to do in this effort and each of them performed flawlessly."

I agree with Colonel Feinstein. This rating means the 186th was exceptional in all areas of inspection. That is almost unprecedented for any unit, active duty, National Guard or Reserve. It is a credit to the men and women who make up this unit. Their training and teamwork came together to put the 186th at the top of the class.

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

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

WE MUST PASS OUR BUDGET TOMORROW, TO SAVE AMERICA FROM A MASSIVE DEBT

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

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I come here on this historic night of American history as someone who is concerned about a sound and stable future for this great country.

The massive overspending this Federal Government has done for the past few decades has finally caught up with us, and it's time we take action to stop this dangerous spending.

These deficits will cripple our future generations with a mountain of debt which they will be forced to pay if we do nothing to stop this out of control spending.

Now that Congress has finally realized this problem, it's time to commit ourselves to solving it.

We must eliminate these deficits and balance the budget in order to preserve a sound, financial future for ourselves, our children, and many generations to come.

The Kasich plan we will be voting on tomorrow to balance the budget is a realistic blueprint for a balanced budget.

If we care about the future of this country, we must begin to lay the foundation for a solid economy with this blueprint and use this map on the road to a balanced budget.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I have heard many false and unfounded attacks coming from those who are apparently opposed to balancing the budget.

We heard these same attacks from the same people who fought H.R. 1215

and killed the balanced-budget amendment in the Senate.

Now, once again, they are saying we are going to balance the budget on the backs of senior citizens by cutting medicare and Social Security.

And so I would like to set the record straight on exactly what we are going to do about medicare and Social Security.

First, we're not touching Social Security to balance the budget. Period. That charge is simply untrue.

In fact, the only "cut" that Social Security will experience is a cut in the current administration's tax hike on Social Security benefits.

So I'm having a hard time comprehending the accusation that we're "cutting" Social Security when all we're really doing is providing tax relief for Social Security benefits.

Second, as everyone in this Chamber is well aware, medicare is going to be bankrupt in 7 years.

I know everyone has heard this statement time and again recently, but it's certainly worth repeating.

For the second year in a row, the president's Medicare board of trustees has stated that under current spending projections, Medicare will be bankrupt in 7 short years.

There is no disputing this inescapable fact, and we are taking the lead to prevent that from happening with our budget.

We have committed ourselves to preventing that from happening by slowing down the rate of growth in Medicare, not by cutting it.

Medicare spending is actually going to increase by over \$740 billion over the next 7 years.

Only in Washington, DC can an increase in spending for a program still be considered a cut.

The dilemma this Congress faces tomorrow will set the tone for the future of this great Nation for many, many years to come.

We have arrived at a crossroads, and we must rise to this historical occasion armed with a vision for the well-being of our future generations whose hopes to realize the American dream are in the balance.

A vote against the majority's budget tomorrow will signify failure to uphold our responsibility to the millions of Americans who sent us here to get Washington out of their wallets.

Many millions of Americans are depending on us tomorrow to do the right thing to prevent their future from heading down the wrong road of massive debt.

We must not fail to deliver the American people a sound future.

We must pass our budget tomorrow.

EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED BUDGET ON TAXES AND MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Minnesota

[Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened and I assume most of the Members have listened today to the debate. I have found it particularly interesting, and I would like to share some of my time with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] tonight.

I would like to also share with the Members and those who may be watching at home from, and I hope this is not an ethical violation because I get no residuals from this book, but this is a book that I read during the district work period that was written by my predecessor, Tim Penny. I commend it to all of the Members, and other people who are interested in the budget debate that is going on, because I think it is very instructive. He has an awful lot to say. I would like to share some of those things with the body tonight.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, after listening to some of the debate earlier today, I just wanted to talk a little bit, too, about one of the things we have heard so much about in the last 2 or 3 days, and that is the tax cuts for the wealthy.

I'm not particularly good in math, and I do not serve on the Committee on Ways and Means. I did serve on the Committee on Ways and Means when I was in the State legislature back in Minnesota, so I have a little bit of understanding.

However, based on what I do understand about the tax cuts that we passed earlier this year, about 75 percent, about three-quarters of the benefits of the family tax credit, will go to families earning \$75,000 a year or less. Perhaps in some places of this great National people earning \$75,000 are considered rich, but I do not think in most places families earning \$75,000 and less are necessarily considered rich.

Another part of that tax cut proposal that I think is important that will ultimately lead to economic growth is the cut in the capital gains tax rate. Representing an awful lot of farmers and small businesses in my district, I think I do understand something about capital gains taxes. As a matter of fact, one of the things I really understand is that 44 percent of the people who get stuck with a capital gains tax are rich for one day during their life, the day they sell their farm or sell their business.

I do not think, back where I come from in Minnesota, when a farmer who has worked hard all of his life and sells his farm, does he really consider himself rich? Obviously, in economic terms, in real dollar terms, many people would say that when you sell a farm for half a million dollars or whatever the particular price of that farm, you would say that they are rich, but these are people who have worked hard, who have lived poor all of their lives, who have made their payments, who have paid their taxes, and all of a sudden, because on one particular day

they sell an asset, they get stuck with a capital gains tax.

I think if people will think about that in those kinds of terms, I think they will look at this whole thing and say "Wait a second, we are not talking about tax cuts for the rich."

Second, I wanted to talk a little bit about Medicare tonight, because I think there has also been a good deal of misunderstanding and misinformation spread about what we are doing with Medicare. It has been alluded to earlier today, but I would call attention to the Members and folks around the country to an article that appeared, I believe, in today's Investors' Business Daily. In that, there is a quotation that just literally jumps off the page.

It says:

Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at 2 times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut. So when you hear all this business about cuts, let me caution you that this is not what is going on. We are going to have to increase Medicare and Medicaid at a reduced rate of growth.

Now, I did not say that, NEWT GINGRICH did not say that. That came from Bill Clinton. I think that is what we are doing. We are not talking about cutting Medicare, we are talking about reducing the rate of growth.

Mr. Speaker, I also served back in Minnesota on the Health and Human Services Committee in the State legislature. I remember just 2 years ago when we were talking about health care and how much health care costs were going up, everyone predicted that we were going to see double-digit increases in the cost of health care for the next 5 or 6 years.

In the private sector, and I visited during the district work period with a number of health care providers, with representatives of some of the biggest insurance companies and HMO's in the State of Minnesota, they assured me that what is happening in the private sector, because of some of the changes and reforms that are going on with more managed care and preferred provider networks, we are seeing health care costs virtually at or below the inflation rate. We are seeing health care costs going up at less than 3 percent in the State of Minnesota.

Using the mathematics that we have heard about today and the last several days, we could assume that some of the health care providers in the State of Minnesota could be saying "Compared to what we thought health care was going to go up, we are seeing a 7 to 8 percent cut, because we thought health care costs were going to go up by 10 percent, but because of market-based reforms that are happening without the Clinton health care reform plan, without a whole lot of Government intervention, we are seeing health care inflation rates going down by about one-third or less of what they were expected to be." So using the arithmetic and some of the rhetoric we have heard today, I think we could say that we