

important things to the constituents that I represent here in Washington, DC, when I come here to work from Indiana, is that we give them and their children the opportunity to get to college. Some of my people that have been working for 10, and 15, and 20 years find because the economy is changing they have to go back to school and learn some new skills, some computer skills, some blueprint skills, some total quality management skills, and they are going to schools in Indiana to learn these new skills. We should not make it more difficult, we should not make it more expensive we should not make it more arduous for these people to get this education and training, to help our economy move forward.

But where do we cut, Mr. Speaker, because we do need to balance this budget in 7 years? I think that is where the Republican colleagues of mine have it right. We do need to make tough decisions with a fair outcome to get this balanced budget on line in 1995.

I think we start with B-2 bombers that the Pentagon does not even want, that the CINC commanders, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have said we do not need these. I think we talk about tobacco subsidies where we cost taxpayers money twice, once by paying their tobacco subsidy through the Government, another time by paying hospital costs for patients that go to the hospital and contract cancer. I think we cut in a host of areas, through eliminating the Interstate Commerce Commission, to eliminate or at least reforming and changing, the market subsidies we give to big corporations to advertise overseas. These are corporate welfare proposals and programs that we do not heed in 1995 if we are going to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, over 300 Members of Congress have voted for a balanced budget; 73 voted for a coalition budget; over 230 Republicans voted for a balanced budget proposal some weeks ago. Now I think we should begin to move forward in bringing a number of these people together, hopefully 218, that will come up with a fair way to our seniors, and our students and our working people in this country to get that balanced budget in effect.

THE PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS OF BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk a little bit about our balanced budget proposal, our 7-year balanced budget proposal, and in particular the President and his previous claims of supporting a balanced budget, and I do want to dwell a little bit on the issue of Medicare. I think Medicare is a very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am very familiar with the Medicare system. I earned my liv-

ing prior to coming to the House of Representatives, and I plan on when I leave the House of Representatives going back to, practicing medicine. I am a physician, and I very much enjoyed taking care of senior citizens as an internist. About half of my clinical practice was caring for seniors, and I know firsthand how much our seniors depend on the Medicare program, and I think what the President is doing with this issue is truly disgraceful, and he is playing pure politics with the Medicare program, and in his proposal he wants to lower the Medicare premium to 25 percent, and then in subsequent years, after the election, essentially after he has bought the senior vote, he is going to let it drift up. In our proposal the Medicare part B premium will do exactly what it has done over the previous 7 years under the Democrats of this House. It will slowly double. Under the President's proposal it will double as well, but it goes down in the crucial year of 1996 when he is seeking to get reelected.

What are we talking about in our budget proposal? We are talking about a 7-year balanced budget proposal. We have not been able to get the President to agree to this very fundamental principle. This is a man who ran in 1992 pledging that he would balance the budget in 5 years. Three years after he has been elected, he is refusing to sign on to a 7-year balanced budget proposal. Instead he is putting forward this budget proposal that supposedly gets us to balance in 10 years, 13 years after he has been elected when he ran on a 5-year proposal. We have welfare reform in our budget proposal. He refuses to support that, a man who ran saying that he was going to end welfare as we know it.

What else do we have in our budget proposal? Tax relief for families with children. When my father was raising myself and my three sisters, as a postal worker he sent 4 percent of his income to Washington. Now those working fathers with children send 25 to 30 percent of their income to Washington. That is the single biggest reason why so many of those working families with children have to put mama out to work, too, and my colleagues know what happens then. They do not spend as much time with their kids. In the 1950's the average parents spent 35 hours a week in direct contact with their children. They now spend 17 hours a week. Who is talking care of the kids? The television loaded with violence.

Finally, what else do we have in our budget proposal? We have economic incentives, a capital gains reduction that will pump money back into the economy, that will create jobs, jobs for people who are unemployed, and the President is refusing to sign on to any of these things, and what is the most crass thing, he is actually going so far as to try to claim he is trying to protect Medicare when in reality it is a temporary thing in Medicare. A year

later the Medicare premiums will rise, and rise, and rise, and rise, and the President knows all this. But yet he is continuing to play politics. When the Medicare program was created, the Medicare part B premium was supposed to be shared by seniors, 50 percent coming out of the pockets of working people, 50 percent coming out of the pockets of seniors. Today many of those working people who are being taxed to support the Medicare Program cannot afford health insurance themselves. In our budget proposal we keep the percentage at 31½ percent. That is what it is at today. We think that is a fair and reasonable thing to do.

But yet the President is trying to play politics with this. He is trying to lower the Medicare premium in an election year, and then he is going to turn around and raise it on seniors just like he turned around and raised taxes in 1993 after he ran in 1992 saying that he was going to give middle-class working Americans a tax cut. He raised taxes on them; he raised taxes on senior citizens. Senior citizens had their Social Security income taxed, an increase in their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues in the House, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to put politics aside and join together in a reasonable proposal to get us toward a balanced budget in 7 years.

□ 2000

It is for our future, it is for the future of our children, it is for the future of our children's children. What kind of life are we going to leave the next generation? In years past, you paid off the farm, you did not leave the kids a mortgage. Today in America, today in America, every child that is born is being born into an economy where they owe \$18,000 of debt. They are going to have to pay back with interest on that debt about \$18,000. That is \$4.9 trillion worth of debt. Mr. Speaker, I encourage the President to support our budget, to vote in favor of balancing the budget in 7 years.

NOW IS THE TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I agree with just about everything my colleague the gentleman from Florida, who preceded me, has just said. I have been in Congress now for 13 years, and I have gone out and had a lot of town meetings with senior citizens and people from all across my district. I have talked all across the country. When you talk to people about the pain of cutting spending, people say, "We have to balance that budget. We do not want to leave a legacy of debt to our kids and to our grandkids. We do not

want to see hyperinflation in this country."

After you get through talking, we start going around the room and we let them ask questions. Inevitably, somebody will say, "You are not going to cut this program, are you?" Somebody will say, "You are not going to cut this program, are you?" Before you know it, everybody in the room has some program that the Federal Government funds, or partially funds, that they are all interested in; maybe highways, maybe Medicare, maybe Social Security, maybe welfare. It may be a number of things, but everybody wants the budget balanced and they want their kids to be secure and their future to be secure, but they do not want their programs to be cut.

We have had 40 years of movement toward socialism, toward complete government control over our lives. Make no mistake about it, we are at a point now where if we do not make some real hard decisions, we are going to get what we do not want as a Nation. If you look around the world, and I am on the Committee on International Relations, I can tell you a lot of countries that have hyperinflation have disintegration of government and government services because they have gone too far. We are heading in that direction. We have to make some choices.

The people in this country last year elected a Republican majority in the House and Senate because they wanted change. They wanted a balanced budget. Eighty-eight percent of the people in this country want a balanced budget. If I were talking to America tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would say, "Look, there is no easy way out. We are going to have to bite the bullet. Everybody is going to have to have a little bit of the share of pain."

We are not cutting these programs. We are slowing the growth of the programs. Medicare is not going to be cut. The growth in Medicare is going to be 6.5 percent over the next 7 years. It is going to grow. But we are not going to allow it to grow at 10 to 15 percent, like it grew before. We are going to give money for the school lunch program. It is going to grow, but we are going to send the money back to the States so the Governors can more efficiently spend the money, rather than have some bureaucracy here in Washington spend it.

We have to do something about welfare reform. The President now says he is going to veto welfare reform. Everybody in the country knows welfare is out of control. There is flagrant fraud in the welfare system. We have to do something about it. Now he says he is going to veto it.

The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, if I were talking to America, I would say if we want a balanced budget, then we are going to have to get on with it. We are going to have to get on with it. We are going to have to slow the growth in these programs. Yes, we are going to

have to cut out some bureaucracy and some governmental agencies. We intend to do that.

The President is pandering to the fears of senior citizens. He knows that the premiums for Medicare are going to have to go up, but he wants to postpone these major changes until after the next election. I am telling seniors, if they are paying attention, that after the next election these increases are going to be there, but they are going to be bigger, because we will have postponed them for a year. We want to deal with the problem now. We want to deal with it in an equitable and fair way.

The benefits will continue to go up. The premiums are going to go up a little bit. There is no question about it. But we know that the Medicare system is going to fail if we do not do something. The President's commission said it is going to go bankrupt if we do not do something, so we are trying to do it in a responsible way, and he is down there at the White House with his glasses down over his nose, vetoing it, saying he is going to save it for seniors.

The fact of the matter is he knows, we all know, we are going to have to deal with that problem. We want to deal with it now, in an equitable way, so the pain they are going to feel in a year is not as severe as it would be right now.

We have no deal with the budget deficits. We are at \$5 trillion. In a few years it will be \$7 trillion. The interest alone on the debt will be so high we will not be able to manage this Government without printing money and causing hyperinflation. We have to control the deficit. We have to balance the budget, and we have a plan to do it in 7 years.

He does not want to do. He says how about 9 years, 10 years, 11 years. There is going to be no end to it, America. We will never have a balanced budget until we make the decision to do it. We want to do it now. We want to hold the President's feet to the fire. I think that is what America wants. If we do not do it now, it will never happen, and we will rue the day that we turned our backs on this opportunity.

WHY CRITICIZE THE PRESIDENT WHEN THE HOUSE HAS NOT COMPLETED ITS WORK ON APPROPRIATIONS?

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad for my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to come back. I think the gentleman and I agree on most of what the gentleman has said, not everything. One of the things that has puzzled me about this emergency, and why we are sitting here 3 hours and 55 minutes from shutting down the Government, and we

keep talking about what the President has or has not done.

It has always seemed reasonable to me that the House should have completed its work, that the budget reconciliation bill that should have been addressed by October 1, which has not been addressed, which I was told tonight at 8 o'clock the conferees were going to meet for the first time, only to be told that we are not going to meet tomorrow until 3 o'clock, but it seems to me that the House should have done its work if we are going to be criticizing the President.

What am I missing?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman well knows, we made a commitment to the American people that we were going to pass a Contract With America in the first 100 days. Because we spent the time making good on that commitment and did it in 93 days, the appropriations process was set back. He knows that.

We are trying to catch up and we will catch up. We will pass all 13 appropriation bills, as well as reconciliation, but it is a bogus argument in my opinion, and I have great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, to say that we are playing games here. The fact is we want a balanced budget and we are on a trend line to do that. The legislation we sent to the President gets us on that track.

Mr. STENHOLM. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, there are at least 68 Democrats who agree with you.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I appreciate that.

Mr. STENHOLM. It seems to me if you have Democrats also saying balance the budget in a time certain, if you have Democrats also saying to balance the budget by the year 2002, it should not be unreasonable for us, before we shut the Government down as we are doing, that we ought to let the regular legislative process go before we start criticizing the President. It seems to me that what we ought to be doing is going ahead and doing our work.

We have wasted 5 days playing this game that we are playing. The gentleman and I do not want to play games, we say. At least he has made a speech, it was excellent, on what he is for. I would want to make the same speech. But it seems to me when we are talking about the President not engaging, under the regular legislative process that everyone in this House understands as clearly as anybody could, when you have a bill, the House passes it, the Senate passes it, you go to conference, the conference works it out, the conference then goes to the President, the President signs or vetoes the bill. If he vetoes it, then we try to override, or we start over and we start negotiating.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact of the matter is, and my colleague well knows, the President has stated his opposition to a number of the provisions