

the American taxpayer. Debt is debt is debt is debt. The Clinton Administration only wants to speak in terms of the publicly held debt going down.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton and his administration are misleading the American people when they say the public debt is going down. They are telling half a truth. The President and his administration are correct in saying the public debt will go down over the next few years, but what they are not telling you is that the debt held by the Social Security and other trust funds is going up, and that it is going up at a faster rate than the public debt is going down, which means the total debt goes up by, yes, \$1.3 trillion over the next five years under President Clinton's budget. No matter if debt is held by the public or in the various trust funds, it is still debt, and must still be paid back at some future point.

The Clinton Administration is doing future generations no favors in this budget. It is dishonest and disingenuous for the Clinton-Gore administration to tout huge surpluses on the one hand, when on the other their budget places even more debt on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress and this President have not achieved true fiscal discipline and responsibility until our total national debt begins to go down.

Furthermore, as if forcing \$1.3 trillion in more debt on future generations was not enough, the President's budget called for a net tax increase of \$45.8 billion and requests \$150 billion in new spending over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of this Congress to stop this assault on our future generations and all taxpayers. I urge my colleagues to reject the President's budget.

#### PRESERVING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend my time this afternoon talking about Social Security, one of America's great all-American programs. It is in a class by itself, except for Medicare, of course. But, like so many programs, its beneficiaries vary according to race, sex or class, even given the universality of this extremely popular program.

When people say that they think it will not be there for them, they also say that they do not want it changed much because they want it to be there for them.

There are proposals floating around for private accounts where people would invest in equities in the stock market themselves. In considering these proposals, I ask only that this body consider that women are hugely, disproportionately affected by whatever we decide to do to Social Security. Twice as many women who live past 65

are poor as men, and so, in its wisdom, the Congress has structured the Social Security program to reflect this basic reality.

Proposals for private accounts thus far do not take into account two characteristics that are unique to women: One, that they have less earnings over their lifetime, much of it due to discrimination, some of it due to family responsibilities; and, second, that they simply live longer. Personal savings accounts would, therefore, adversely affect them, because they have had less time in the workforce and because they have had lower earnings when they have been there.

So what does Social Security do? Recognizing this feature, instead of giving a benefit that looks the same for everybody, we have created a progressive Social Security benefit structure. The higher benefits go to the lower earnings, and I do not think there is anybody in America who would want that any different.

Let us look at two groups of women so as to make my point, housewives and widows.

Let us take a woman who has spent her life taking care of her family and has not gone near the workforce. She will get 50 percent of her spouse's benefit. She has never had and could never have a personal account in the stock market, no matter what we do for her.

Let us take an older woman whose husband dies. She gets 100 percent of her husband's benefit. Now, the majority has typically shown particular concern for these women, women who have taken care of their families and have not gone in the workforce at all, and older women whose husbands have died and do not have any income. These are the women that must be in our mind's eye if we toy with the Social Security System.

The great majority, 63 percent of women over age 62 have their own income, as to opposed wives and widows who get pensions. Thirty-seven percent have had no earnings history at all, no personal savings account of their own, and cannot control what a husband shall have done with the personal savings account that he may have. They are in our hands, and we have taken that responsibility through the Social Security system.

I ask this body to measure any proposal that comes before it, not by looking at the American population as if they were some big glob, but to look at who is likely to be most affected by whatever we do. Overwhelmingly, those most affected are going to be women. It is women who have the most to lose. It is women who are most vulnerable.

I ask the majority who call to the floor any discussion of changes in Social Security, especially discussion of personal savings account, to call to the floor the women whose lifelong work has been for their families and the women who have only their husband's pensions. Those women are in our hands and are dependent upon our

doing the right thing with Social Security, bearing in mind that any personal savings account is not in their lexicon, has not been in their lives, and they need us to remember that salient fact.

#### FEDERAL FUNDING FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the issue of federal funding for biomedical research. Over the past four years, this Congress has led the effort to double the budget for biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health and other federal agencies which do scientific research to help cure diseases.

This effort has already begun to show results in areas such as Parkinson's disease, cancer, Alzheimer's's disease, and many others. It is a worthwhile undertaking for our federal tax dollars.

Now, while the President wants to take credit for this research effort, unfortunately his budget would severely impede the progress we have made and would jeopardize future advances.

The NIH budget has begun to grow exponentially, because it is the right thing to do for people who are sick with chronic diseases. For the next fiscal year, however, the President has requested an increase of \$320 million, or 2.1 percent, for the National Institutes of Health.

Now, by comparison, last year this Congress increased NIH by \$1.99 billion, or 15 percent, and that is still inadequate funding when you look at all of the opportunities for research grants that come before the NIH and those which are able to be accepted. There just is not enough money to do all of the good research that needs to be done.

The President was recently reported to have remarked to a member of the other body, a Democrat, the President said, "Don't worry about our budget. The Republicans will increase NIH funding." Well, certainly we will. So much for honesty in the President's budget.

A 2.1 percent growth rate is two-tenths of a percentage point less than the projected rate of inflation. That is a growth rate less than inflation, which is in the President's budget, for attempting to cure our Nation's diseases and improve the lives of millions of Americans who suffer from disease.

What the President does under this budget game is put in a low number for NIH and put a high number for other spending, new federal spending programs that he puts in to satisfy special interests, and then criticizes those of us who say "no" to such excess spending, for budget-busting spending, and then politically the President seems to want to take credit. In reality, the President's budget says to people who