

I know the gentleman from Georgia remembers the State of the Union Message where the President stood here behind us at the podium just in front of the Speaker's rostrum and offered a very curious type of family tax cut for families making only \$75,000 a year, so a family making \$76,000 a year I guess did not qualify as a working family, but also perhaps the gentleman from Georgia remembers the curious provision of what the President talked about at that time. Do you remember what that was? It was this, that the tax cut would only apply to children before the age of 13.

So, in short, the President's idea back in January was to penalize anyone who succeeded who made over \$75,000 a year and not only to penalize people who succeed but to penalize their children for growing up.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think maybe the President's idea was to put them all in the national service league so they could get paid for volunteer work. When they are 14, they do not need the money anymore. It was typical of this administration to come up with a complicated middle-class tax relief plan. It looked a little bit to me like Mrs. Clinton's health care revision last year, just a chart of dots and arrows and boxes and squares going this way and all over the page and that is their idea, I guess, of simplification and so forth. That is, I think, why the American people are getting a little leery of it.

My 2-year-old, actually 3-year-old, sings a song, did you ever see a laddie go this way and that way and this way and that way. That is what we have got going on. We all know that. One day you are for tax cuts; the next day you are against them. One day you cannot balance the budget; the next day you can.

#### MORE ON THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we will continue the colloquy, as I enjoy the comments of the gentleman from Georgia and appreciate the enlightening nature of the same.

It is curious tonight, again, to see this sea change from the White House. And again, reminiscent of that children's song—

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman think that maybe since the marriage of James Carville and Mary Matalin there will be cross winds going on at the White House weather vane?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would not care to speculate on the society status or where one might go on in terms of policy formulation at the White House, but I do find it curious that those members of the former majority, those guardians of the old order who would accuse the new majority of governance

by polls find themselves tonight foisted upon a new pole, the Chief Executive finding now that the American public does want to see a semblance of fiscal responsibility. The reason I use the term "semblance" is because, once again, the President says, well, it would be nice to have a balanced budget but let us not do it in 7 years, no, no, let us stretch it out over a decade, over 10 years.

Now, by my calendar, as I check it, and the gentleman from Georgia perhaps can bear me out on this, that would be the year 2005. In the interim, according to the Medicare trustees report, which three of the President's own cabinet officers signed, Secretaries Reich and Rubin and Shalala, the Medicare trust fund goes broke in 6 years.

The fear I have, even as I welcome the President, albeit late to the table and to the recognition of the necessity of reducing the growth of the size of government, is, again, an inability to own up to the stark reality we face. And I cannot fathom why that is.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things that I find, and I am sure you do in Arizona when you go home, is that people are saying, stay the course, cut the budget, and I am sick and tired of it. Get the Government out of my life. Reduce the regulations, reduce my taxes, make it work and stay out of Washington as much as possible.

With that in mind, what has happened here, suddenly somebody over at the administration has figured, wait, they did not tick off people when they actually carried through with their campaign promise of balancing the budget. Let us get in on this bandwagon. So now they are going to join the fray. But to do something a little differently, they have to say, let us do it in 10 years.

If you look back at the Grace commission, the Gramm-Rudman, the balanced budget amendment, every time we do something, it is always far off, it is not this year, not this budget. We did pass a budget that puts us having a balanced budget in 7 years, but even that is a long time.

And I think what the American people want is yesterday, not 10 years. And they are not even real happy with 7.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, what I believe the American people want is not only civility in political discourse but straight answers. It is borne out in the frustration of an unrepentant liberal, the ranking member on the minority side of appropriations, who says of his party's own standard-bearer, and again this bears repeating, for those who have just joined us, according to the Associated Press, the gentleman from Wisconsin, DAVE OBEY, "I think most of us learned some time ago that if you don't like the President's position on a particular issue, you simply need to wait a few weeks."

That is reflective of a frustration born of a failure of this administration

to rest comfortably with the mantle of leadership upon its shoulders.

Now, good people can change their minds from time to time on the issues. But I believe my friend from Georgia will bear me out, as he visits his district there along the beautiful Georgia coast, the fact is that people are highly suspicious when public policy is predicated on the prevailing winds akin to a weather vane.

Mr. KINGSTON. However, if the President of the United States is serious and wants to balance the budget, as we can only hope that he is, the Republican Party welcomes him and his administration, open arms, let us get in the arena, let us figure it out together and let us work for the good of America.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, we can say this tonight in the wake of the President's speech. He says now he wants a balanced budget. Let him work with us to achieve it in 7 years instead of a decade hence.

#### GATT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the GATT implementation legislation late last year was supposed to put into place the legal framework for trade policy that was required by a trade agreement that had been hammered out among the various nations of the world. That was what it was supposed to be. The only problem being a major change in the U.S. law was snuck into the implementation legislation, even though it was not required by the GATT treaty.

So what I am talking about tonight is something that was snuck into law late last year and is just now being implemented as the law of the United States of America.

What was this mysterious provision that magically appeared in the GATT implementation legislation? Oh, it was nothing more than just a little old change in the patent law, just a little change in the patent law that if allowed to stand will cost American inventors and American investors billions of dollars, if not corrected.

□ 2145

Something may be happening that is very sinister here in Washington, DC, or it might be very innocent. Whatever it is is going to result in the transfer of billions of dollars from one set of pockets to the other set of pockets. Why was this change, this change that actually redirects the money flow, why was it accomplished through the GATT implementation legislation?

This Congressman, along with a majority of my colleagues, voted for the GATT fast-track authority. What that did, it gave the administration the