their homes, their families and their jobs so that our Nation might be protected. Some faced hardships most of us cannot even imagine. Many died so that our cherished national ideals of democracy and freedom might live on, and live they have.

While we celebrate Veterans' Day in thousands of ceremonies across America, I believe it is also important to remember that our Nation owes a commitment to our veterans every day of the year. We owe our veterans the security of knowing that the programs created for them are not weakened or destroyed. On that account, I am afraid we stand on the brink of failure.

The Republican budget recently passed by the House and Senate will cut veterans' programs by about $6.4 billion over the next 7 years, including increasing veterans' copayments for prescription drugs.

The severe strains this budget will place on the Nation's 26 million veterans was one reason I strongly opposed it on the floor of the House.

The second way veterans will be harmed is the budget bill contains $270 billion in cuts to the Medicare Program, $27 billion in Florida alone. Medicare cuts will force the 8.8 million veterans on Medicare, one-third of all veterans in the United States, to pay increased premiums for low quality care. This includes more than 4.3 million veterans with combat experience and 1.2 million veterans with disabilities connected to their service. In Florida, 648,133 veterans on Medicare would be affected.

Veterans will also be harmed by another provision in the Republican budget cuts in Medicaid totaling $170 billion. Florida will lose almost $10 billion as a result, and approximately 12,700 veterans in Florida will likely lose their Medicaid coverage in 2002.

Republican proposals to block grant and cut Medicaid would deny Medicaid coverage to as many as 171,900 veterans nationwide just in the year 2002, including 103,600 elderly veterans and 68,300 disabled veterans under the age of 65. Where will these veterans who lose their health coverage go?

Well, most veterans who lose their Medicaid coverage under the Republican budget simply cannot afford private health insurance. Seventy-eight percent of Medicaid-eligible veterans have incomes of less than $20,000.

The bottom line is this: Because of budget proposals that cut veterans' programs, Medicare and Medicaid, the Veterans' Administration estimates more than 400,000 veterans who have no private health insurance may find it necessary to seek health care in VA hospitals. However, due to financial limitations of the VA health system, many of these deserving veterans would find themselves left out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, even as we seek ways to reduce the budget deficit, we cannot allow the burden of our efforts to fall hardest on those least able to carry it. In the name of fairness and equity and on behalf of the 26 million veterans of America, I believe we can achieve our budgetary goals without breaking faith with those who have already placed their lives and livelihood on the line in order to keep America strong and free.

REPUBLICANS ARE FAINT-HEARTED

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are faint-hearted. You know, we talk about balancing a budget. We are in the throes now of trying to say in 7 years we will balance the budget of the United States. That means we are going to quit borrowing money from what our kids and our grandkids have not even earned yet.

Here is why Republicans are faint-hearted. Number one, we are talking 7 years to do it.

Number two, after we finish this 7 years and brag that we have a balanced budget, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the people of America know that we are still borrowing, in the year 2002, $100 billion from the Social Security Trust Fund and the other trust funds, and yet we see people apologizing.

Mr. Speaker, did you know that out of the 7 years, this first year is the easiest spending cut year? And you hear the whining and moaning about the big spending cuts this first year. How do you think we are going to go for the fifth year and sixth year and seventh year if we cannot get through this first year?

We have been calling the President of the United States and saying, ''Look, at least agree to balancing this budget in 7 years, even if we continue to borrow $100 billion a year from the trust funds.'' He suggested that maybe 10 years is okay, but yet the budget that he sent to Congress, the budget he sent to Congress does not even balance ever. It continues to overspend $200 billion a year into infinity.

Guess, guess how much taxes a child born today is going to pay just to cover his or her share of interest on the public debt if we do not end up balancing the budget. $180,000, that is what, $187,000. That is what is going to be deducted from their paycheck.

There is a generation gap. You know, we have environmental checks. We should have a generation gap check for legislation that this body passes.

How many more burdens do we want to put on our kids and our grandkids? And it is not just the $4.9 trillion that we have in overspending. Look what we are doing in Medicare. In Medicare, we have now said that we are going to have an unfunded liability, and actuary debt, that amounts to another $5 trillion; social security, we have made promises over what we are going to be bringing in in the FICA tax. There is another $3.2 trillion.

Our obligation, now unfunded, to civil service retirees is another half a trillion. Guess what we just did in the last few years? We promised every private pension fund in the country that the Federal Government would make it whole.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman, it is time that we start getting tough. It is time we stopped apologizing and started living within our budget.

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

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

TOBACCO MARKETING PRACTICES TOWARD CHILDREN

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend by remarks.

We have all seen the full-page advertisements being published by the R.J. Reynolds tobacco company in major newspapers around the country. I have brought one with me. It says:

> Actions speak louder than words. . . . R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company does not, under any circumstances, want kids to smoke. . . . R.J. Reynolds' policy, like that of all American tobacco manufacturers, prohibits the distribution [of cigarettes] to anyone underage.

Those are RJR's words. Let us look at its actions.

Last Friday, the TV news magazine, ''A Current Affair,'' showed the results of its investigation of RJR marketing practices at stock car races. This investigation showed that as recently as last month, RJR employees were giving free packs of cigarettes to 16- and 17-year-old girls.

The ''Current Affair'' investigation also showed that RJR brings a kid's ride, called ''Camel's Smokin' Joe Ride,'' to each race. This ride, which simulates a stock car race, is very popular with young kids. During the ride, cigarette advertisements for Camel and Winston cigarettes flash across the screen and are viewed by the children.

Mr. Speaker, I believe RJR's actions speak louder than words. At the very same time that RJR has been running advertisements that say children should not smoke, its own employees have been giving free cigarettes away to children, as well as showing cigarette advertisements to children.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a transcript of the ''Current Affair'' investigation for the RECORD.

[From ''A Current Affair,'' November 3, 1995]

RACE SMOKES

Narration by reporter Mike Salort: You may have been these national ads from R.J.