But now they realize they were sold a false bill of goods. Now they realize that abortion, far from being used to save the life of the mother, is little more than a convenient form of birth control for countless women. It is my contention that had Americans known that, they never would have consented to legalizing abortion in the first place.

Simply put, abortion detracts from our national greatness. As Alexis de Toqueville said in his pioneering study of American democracy more than 100 years ago: ''America is great because America is good.'' If we lose our goodness, our greatness is sure to follow.

I think most Americans realize this, which is why abortion troubles them. But as with all great public debates, we must reinforce our truths again and again. Together, we can make a difference. So let's make a commitment, right here and right now, that we will labor to restore America to greatness by restoring it to goodness. And do we really have any other choice? Basic morality demands that we who possess the power to speak, stand up for the rights of those who lack the power to speak for themselves.

□ 1300

GOP MOVING THE GOAL POSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in November, House Budget Chairman JOHN KASICH said this about the budget negotiations: ''Frankly, we don't ask for a lot. We ask for nothing more than a commitment to do this in a 7-year period. The priorities within that 7-year plan are negotiable.''

The Republican leadership in both House and the Senate echoed Mr. KASICH's sentiments and asked President Clinton to produce a 7-year balanced budget using the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. That's all we want, they said, and then we can negotiate the details.

Well, the President has done his part. He has given Republicans a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers. But now, Republican leaders want to move the goal posts in the middle of the game. Now, Mr. KASICH and the Republican leadership in Congress say they will not negotiate on the budget priorities.

The budget negotiations do come down to a question of priorities. Democrats and the President want a balanced budget that protects Medicare, education and the environment, and includes a tax cut for middle-class families. The Republicans want deeper cuts in Medicare, education, and the environment to help pay for a larger tax break that goes primarily to upper-income families and large corporations. And they want a backroom deal on Medicare. That is wrong.

Yet, despite our differences, a balanced budget is in reach. Both sides of the aisle have produced plans that will get us there. We will never all agree on all the details. However, if we can produce a balanced budget that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, it will pass this House, it will pass the other body and it will be signed into law by the President.

My Republican colleagues said that if the President gave them a 7-year CBO budget, they would negotiate. The President has done that. It's time for Republicans to keep your word and get back to the negotiating table.

For 220 years, this democracy has worked. Let's make it work again. Government shutdowns and threatened defaults on our debt—these tactics are an affront to democracy. It's time to put away the blackmail schemes and put America on the track to a balanced budget that protects our priorities: Medicare, education, environmental protection, and a tax cut for working middle-class families.

Thus far, this Congress has been the least productive Congress since 1933. Will that be the legacy of the 104th Congress? Or, will we rise above partisan politics and do what's right for the country?

FARM LEGISLATION FOR 1996 NEEDS TO BEGIN NOW

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to talk about something that is basic to America and basic to this country, and something that we need to take action on, and that deals with farm legislation for 1996.

We need to take action now, because even while you may have been snowed in here in the Nation's capital and winter holds its grip across this Nation, it is but a few weeks until we will be going to the fields in my district in Illinois, and, yes, across the whole Nation. It is time that we take action.

Unfortunately, the farm bill for 1996 and the next 7 years, which contributed $13 billion to deficit reduction, was vetoed by President Clinton when he vetoed the Balanced Budget Act. So since there has been no agreement with the President on a true balanced budget and it does not appear that one is going to happen, we have got to take care of agriculture policy, food policy for this Nation, just as we would our military policy if he had vetoed that bill also.

We need to do it in a bipartisan way. Agriculture and agricultural policy has, for the most part, always been a bipartisan effort. We need to do that, and I am sure that the gentleman from Kansas, Chairman ROBERTS, is working in that regard, and the gentleman from Texas, ranking member DE LA GARZA, is also very cooperative. But we are late, and now is the time to take action; we cannot wait any longer, and be doing what is good for the country.

What are the options? Well, of course, if the President would agree to a balanced budget that this Congress could approve, we could put it in that act. As I said, that is not probably going to happen.

We could do it as an independent bill, or we could attach it to the next CR, which I feel certain will be passed, and we could pass it on to the President, and hopefully he would sign it.

Now, another option is to extend the farm policy that has been in effect up until October 1 of last year. But, see, that policy does not contain the reforms, the market orientation, that we had in the new bill. It is counterproductive to go back and extend old policy, which really decreases the amount of investment we are going to put into our food policy and our food programs in this country. It is tired old policy. It is time to retire it. We need to move on.

The final option is we could go back to a 1949 act, and that is not practical at all. Certainly legislation in 1949 does not now cover the needs of agriculture today.

Finally, on this issue, let me say that the Secretary of Agriculture is considering retiring some of the CRP ground, the Crop Reserve Program. This program has been very beneficial to the environment, and I think that we should ask the Secretary to go very slowly in releasing millions of acres of ground, some of which should not be put back into cropland, to be put into crops. We should not overreact the first time in two decades that we have decent commodity prices and farmers across this country have a chance to be profitable. As we move with the new farm bill out of government-controlled agriculture, let us not kill the goose before it has a chance to lay a golden egg. I would ask that the Secretary of Agriculture take the very limited option in reducing CRP ground, and let us follow the pattern and see what happens before we get into it too deeply.

GIVE FULL ATTENTION TO STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE TONIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am just here to hope that this body tonight can listen to what the President says and we can come together and not have another shutdown of the Government or not declare a default on the debt, which would be the first time in the history of this great Republic.

This House floor has all the ambience of downtown Sarajevo before the Dayton agreement. I do not know what we do, whether we load everybody off and send them to Dayton. Maybe there is something in the water that can get

them to come together. But if we could find the parties in the former Yugoslavia that could come together and put a peace together, why can we not get an agreement to get this body going?

Why are we talking about shutting down the Government because we cannot do the budget this year, and basically the reason is they say it is because they are arguing over numbers for 7 years from now, which in all honesty none of us can bind people to 7 years from now. We ought to be held accountable for this year. I think we will be held accountable for this year by the voters. I think they are getting very tired of this.

Every time the President looks up, they are shooting at his feet and asking him to tap dance a little more. You put out one thing, he meets it. You put out another thing, he meets it. You put out another thing, he meets it. Finally, you begin to say, This must not be for real. Fifty-plus hours? Criteria after criteria met? And every time you do it, someone says, Oh, well, one more thing before we think this is really real.

Now, I honestly think that if anyone thinks this is new, they are wrong. I have been here for 23 years, and we have had all sorts of disagreements between this body and between the person down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. We have had Republican presidents and Democratic Congresses and all sorts of different combinations in between and all sorts of polarizing incidents. But we have never let it get to this level, never.

This is one of the great things we pride ourselves in America on, is pragmatism. At the end of the day we can all say, OK, we didn't get 100 percent of what we wanted, but we moved the debate in a certain direction, and we will come back and fight again tomorrow. But we do not stop everything, and we do not default on the debt, and we do not throw ourselves on the floor and have tantrums.

So I really hope that all of us, on both sides of the aisle, give full attention tonight to this State of the Union, to this President, our only President of this great Nation, who is out here trying to chart a course to get us out of this century and into the next.

Mr. Speaker, I think the citizens deserve much better than what they got in the first half of this Congress. Let us clean up our act tonight and let us start tonight for this second Congress.

REMEMBERING PRIOR STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE STATEMENTS

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 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for sharing her views here, and I think she does point up something upon which we can all agree, and that is that fundamental to debate in a free society is the notion of disagreement, and it is the mission of all of us to achieve consensus. But the question comes, at what price?

Mr. Speaker, I bring you greetings from Arizona, the Grand Canyon State. I am here, Mr. Speaker, to use this time to address what is not a credibility gap, but instead a credibility canyon. Indeed, all members of the new majority, as well as members of the minority, welcome the President of the United States to this Chamber tonight, where he will stand at this podium and deliver his State of the Union Message.

To quote one pundit in this town, he said, ''Heretofore most State of the Union Addresses by most chief executives have been forgivable.'' Well, at the danger of incurring the wrath of that pundit, Mr. Speaker, let us remember, let us remember the words of our President in his previous State of the Union Messages.

First dealing with the budget. Quoting now from his 1993 address:

> The plan substantially reduces the Federal deficit honestly and credibly by using in the beginning the most conservative estimates of Government revenues, not as the executive branch has done so often in the past using the most optimistic ones.

Again from 1993:

> This budget plan, by contrast, will by 1997 cut $140 billion in that year alone from the deficit, a real spending cut, a real revenue increase, a real deficit reduction, using the independent numbers of the Congressional Budget Office.

Yet throughout last year, throughout 1995, President Clinton submitted to this body budget after budget after budget, but refused to use those objective numbers of the Congressional Budget Office. It was not until this new majority ultimately persuaded him to submit a CBO-scored budget to end the recent shutdown that he lived up to the above statements.

Most astonishingly, Mr. Speaker, from last year, quoting now the President of the United States who stood at this podium. ''I certainly want to balance the budget.''

Yet the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, as reflected in the record of this institution and through reports of the news media, President Clinton vetoed the first balanced budget submitted by the Congress in a quarter of a century.

Then to the topic of welfare reform. Quoting again from 1993's address:

> Later this year, we will offer a plan to end welfare as we know it. I want to offer the people on welfare the education, the training, the child care, the healthcare they need to get back on their feet. But, say after 2 years, they must get back to work.

Then from 1994:

> So we must also revolutionize our welfare system. We will say to teenagers, if you have a child out of wedlock, we will no longer give you a check to set up a separate household. We want families to stay together. We will provide the support, the job training, the child care you need, for up to 2 years. But after that anyone who can work, must.

Then from last year:

> Nothing has done more to undermine our sense of common responsibility than our failed welfare system. Let this be the year to end welfare as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the President year after year has come to this House and addressed from this podium his willingness to end welfare as we know it, he did not support the welfare reform bill that had broad bipartisan support. Instead, he vetoed the welfare bill that Congress sent him.

Again from 1993:

> This plan will give this country the toughest child support enforcement system it has ever had.

From 1994:

> If we value responsibility, we cannot ignore the $34 billion in child support absent parents ought to be paying to millions of parents who are taking care of their children.

Then from 1995:

> If the parent is not paying child support, they should be forced to pay. We should suspend drivers licenses, track them across State lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the welfare reform bill that President Clinton vetoed would have required States to create a central case registry to track the status of all child support orders. The bill also gave the States the authority to suspend drivers, professional, occupational and recreational licenses of anyone whose child support payments are in arrears, all the things the President said he wanted to do last year.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I understand my time is short. The record is replete. Words mean something. Actions speak louder than words. Mr. President, keep your promises, join with the new majority, and let us help govern this Nation.

REPUBLICAN REVOLUTION IS PARALYZING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, it is said one can tell one who wants to move on by those who argue last year's argument. My last colleague who spoke is regurgitating for us the arguments they will not let go.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans demanded a 7-year budget. The President has given them a 7-year budget. The Republicans demanded that any budget plan that is adopted be approved by the Congressional Budget Office using their numbers. Again, the President has agreed to that. The Republicans further insisted that there be a large tax cut as a part of their budget plan. Again, the President has offered a smaller tax cut but for working families.

Mr. Speaker, the President has gone a considerable distance to meet the demands of the Republican Party, and