

trying to pass a new law to mandate the spending of billions of taxpayer dollars every year—to go mainly to this country's biggest corporations and largest landowners. A huge new Federal corporate welfare program, in other words.

Remember, these are the same Republicans who are looking to cut billions from housing for the poor, and nutrition programs for our kids, and student loan programs, and a hundred other programs that benefit the working people of this country.

I believe that if we pass this bill, we're going to see the absurdity of false takings claims like the one at the Summitville mine repeated over and over and over.

If you're concerned about the deficit, if you're concerned about entitlements, if you're worried about bureaucracy and red tape, and if you're worried about taxpayers, you should be very worried about this takings bill.

---

#### WE ARE GOING TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I wanted to take this time to kind of just register my concern and to just discuss a little bit the commitment I think we have on this side of the aisle to get our financial house in order, and my purpose for speaking is not to take a partisan tone, but to just express a tremendous amount of concern about what is really shaping up to be a battle between the White House and Congress over something that, if we work together, would be extraordinarily helpful for our Nation. I speak of the fact that, when President Clinton was elected, he found that he had a national debt of \$4.3 trillion, and he felt that he had worked out a plan to bring our annual deficits down, but we are going to see under his 5-year plan that he presented to Congress just last month that our national debt by the year 2000 will be \$6.7 trillion, that it will go up \$2.3 trillion, or 54 percent, during this period of time.

What concerns me is the fact that there are some who are saying, well, this is a smaller percentage, but it is a smaller percentage on a larger base, and so this two trillion, 2.3 trillion, will be the largest increase ever experienced at any time in our history, and I look now and think what are we going to do to resolve this? What opportunities do we have as Republicans and Democrats to get together?

One of the things that the President deserves high marks on is the fact that we have, in fact, started to get a handle on what we call discretionary spending, what we vote out of the Committee on Appropriations, and this has resulted in some hope for the fact that at least with what we spend in defense and what we spend in nondefense that

we are starting to show the kind of restraint that we need. We have simply decided that we will not add to discretionary spending. We have not in the last few years, and we are destined to keep it at a freeze for the next few years, but where we see the challenge is with, in fact, entitlements which constitute half of our budget, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and what we refer to as other entitlements.

The concern that I have is that the President has really taken a hard position that he is not going to touch entitlements, which is really the same old story. Republicans have not wanted to cut defense, and they did not. Democrats have not wanted to slow the growth of entitlements, and they did not. And Republicans and Democrats for 20 years got together and voted out budgets with large deficits so that we saw the national debt just continue to go up, and up, and up, and up.

The challenge we have today is that the fastest part of our budget are entitlements that are growing at 10 percent annually. I am talking particularly of Medicare and Medicaid. We need to slow the growth of Medicare and Medicaid to about 5 percent annually. We are going to spend 5 percent more next year than we did the year before, and 5 percent the year after. We are going to see Medicare and Medicaid grow. But if we cannot get those numbers down, we will never ever get our financial house in order.

I look at this budget, and I see that our foreign affairs expenditures are actually going down each year. I see the defense is going down each year. I see the domestic discretionary spending is basically at a hard freeze. Then I look at Medicare, and Medicaid, and other entitlements, food stamps, AFDC, and they are going up at triple the amount of inflation. What an opportunity we have to work together as Republicans and Democrats to get our financial house in order, but the kind of response we are getting when we start to try to make logical changes.

I happen to think the welfare state is dead. I think that 12-year-olds having babies, I think that 14-year-olds who are out selling drugs, 15-year-olds killing each other, 18-year-olds who cannot read their diplomas, 25-year-olds who have never had a job, 30-year-olds who are grandparents, is the legacy of the welfare state. It is dead. It is not going to be allowed to continue, and what I am pledging as one Member of Congress is that I believe that we Republicans in particular are going to get our financial house in order, and I speak as someone who is a moderate Republican, and I would like to think I am extremely moderate, someone who comes more from the center than from the right or left, and I can tell you that we have absolute conviction that we are going to work together to get our financial house in order. We are going to balance the 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.]

---

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 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 Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BROWDER 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. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WELDON of Florida 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 York [Mr. TOWNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TOWNS 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 South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GRAHAM 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 California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SEASTRAND 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 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 Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

□ 2200

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to rescind the 1-hour special order granted earlier this evening to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] for March 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALDHOLTZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

#### CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, my friends from California tell me the swallows return to Capistrano. My friends from Ohio tell me the buzzards return to Hinkly. And, Madam Speaker, as you and I have come to discover during our brief time here in the Congress of the United States, and indeed as the people of this Nation are discovering, Madam Speaker, liberal Democrats again and again come to the well of this House and distort and exaggerate and basically tell falsehoods about the aims of this new Republican majority with reference to our Contract With America, and especially when it comes to nutrition programs in the public schools.

It is amazing as we take a look at the publications from around the country, and I would simply point out to those assembled here, Madam Speaker, a very interesting article penned by Nancy Roman in today's Washington Times. I hesitate to read the headline because it contains a three-letter word that I really do not want to use in the course of this discourse, and yet it is part of the RECORD. The headline reads "Democrats Lie About Lunch." And the thrust of this article, to read the subhead line really sums it up. Madam Speaker, it is worth repeating and articulating so that the people of this Nation will really know the facts behind this debate. Quoting from the subhead line in today's Washington Times: "The GOP's school lunch program will grow by \$203 million. The government spends \$4.5 billion. The GOP would spend \$4.7 billion."

In other words, Madam Speaker, according to simple mathematics, we see an actual increase in this school lunch program of \$200 million. Simply stated, Madam Speaker, there is no cut, there is no cut. There is an increase in spending.

Now, in fairness to the way this town works, to the way the guardians of the old order have done their accounting for the past four decades, we should point out that there is some form of reduction, but it is only a reduction in the overall increase. Only in Washington would you call an increase reduced in some way, shape, fashion or form, acute.

Indeed, as we have looked at the challenge we face in putting our fiscal house in order, I believe that fair minded people, Madam Speaker, from both sides of the aisle realize that one of the problems we have had continually is in this creative form of accounting, which would call that increase acute.

I listened with great interest to my good friend from Connecticut, who stood before this House moments ago and talked about a cooperative effort to change the spending habits in this Nation. And I respect my good friend from Connecticut because he authored what again inside this beltway was a revolutionary concept, but to the rest of us throughout the country, Madam Speaker, was a very simple, rational, logical concept. And that is that the people who serve in this House, which we call the people's House, should live under the same laws as everyone else in this country.

I salute my friend from Connecticut for spearheading that fundamental tenet of self-government so vital to this House and so dominant, indeed being the cornerstone of reform as adopted in our rules package when we were sworn in here earlier this year. I applaud his cooperative spirit. In fact, I would say that that cooperative spirit is what we hope to build upon in the days ahead, and we call on our good friends across the aisle to end the discourse and move forward in the constructive debate.

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

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

#### LEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 58 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I would like to talk tonight about a subject which has gotten some attention in this country, and these days we see it perhaps grabbing more and more of the attention not just of this Congress and of legislators, but of the American people, and it is a subject which is dear to my heart and which I believe needs more clarity and

more discussion, because it affects human beings and it affects Americans.

The subject is that of immigrants. Not immigrants who come into this country without permission, without documents to be here, not so-called illegal immigrants, but legal immigrants, those who have come in through application, waited, in some cases 10 or 15 years, to come to this country, and have now received the permission of this country to come and reside and make this their home and ultimately become U.S. citizens.

These are the lawful permanent residents in this country, and we have approximately 9 million residing in this country, some who just got here and are waiting the 5 years before they can become U.S. citizens, others who have been here for decades and working and doing what most people in this country do, and that is paying their taxes and abiding by the laws and raising their families.

I would like to discuss legal immigrants because it happens that in this process here in Congress of discussing reforms and in discussing the Republican contract on America, one of the proposals, a welfare reform proposal, proposes to use legal immigrants to fund the cost of this reform proposal within welfare. I think it is important not only that my colleagues have a chance to hear and understand more about legal immigrants, but quite honestly, the greater public should have a chance as well.

So I would like to do a little bit here by discussing legal immigrants and perhaps do some personal discussions as well as some factual discussions and providing some data as well.

Let me begin by giving a couple of examples of people who I happen to know in some cases, others that I know of and have been told about, and I think are worth sharing with you today.

Mr. King Tam and Mrs. Tsui Kung Tam are two legal permanent residents in this country. Both came into the United States back in the 1960's. Mr. Tam and Mrs. Tam came from China, Mrs. Tam actually from Hong Kong, and as they arrived in this country they found right away they had to retrain themselves for jobs here in the United States. Mr. Tam went from a cabinetmaker to a cook, Mrs. Tam from a salesperson to a seamstress. They have lived their entire life and they still do in Chinatown in Los Angeles, CA. They have raised three children. All three have graduated from college; David from UCLA as an engineer, Linda from Cal State University of Los Angeles with a business degree, and Mai Li from Cal State, Los Angeles, with a degree in finance.

Each one of them had a chance to undertake the opportunity to go to college, they had a chance to receive some student loans and some grants, and they worked every year while they