

some of these items could be put on the table. Whether or not they are adopted, it would at least make the elderly couple who has to pay more of their Social Security check for Medicare coverage or the working family that has had to assume the nursing home costs of an elderly aunt feel that the decision that they should sacrifice was not made before other possible options were explored.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER.
DAVID R. OBEY.
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

P.S.—Another option that you might consider in examining what you might do to help with the budget deficit would be to refrain from deducting from your corporate federal tax payment the advertising cost associated with these ads. Some taxpayers might feel that the advice you are providing on the sacrifices that they might make should be paid entirely by you rather than billing 35% of those costs to Uncle Sam.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO SIGNED LETTER
TO CORPORATE CEO'S, DECEMBER 22, 1995

1. Hon. George Miller.
2. Hon. David R. Obey.
3. Hon. Richard A. Gephardt.
4. Hon. Dick Durbin.
5. Hon. Alcee Hastings.
6. Hon. Rosa DeLauro.
7. Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy.
8. Hon. John Lewis.
9. Hon. Cleo Fields.
10. Hon. Melvin Watts.
11. Hon. Bill Hefner.
12. Hon. Nancy Pelosi.
13. Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy.
14. Hon. Albert Wynn.
15. Hon. Major Owens.
16. Hon. Sam Gejdenson.
17. Hon. Maxine Waters.
18. Hon. Ronald V. Dellums.
19. Hon. Jesse Jackson, Jr.
20. Hon. Tom Foglietta.
21. Hon. Louise Slaughter.
22. Hon. Ron Coleman.
23. Hon. Chaka Fattah.
24. Hon. John W. Olver.
25. Hon. Karen L. Thurman.
26. Hon. Cynthia McKinney.
27. Hon. Eva M. Clayton.
28. Hon. Pat Williams.
29. Hon. Bobby Rush.
30. Hon. Bill Richardson.
31. Hon. Marcy Kaptur.
32. Hon. Lynne C. Woolsey.
33. Hon. Barney Frank.
34. Hon. John Joseph Moakley.
35. Hon. Patsy T. Mink.
36. Hon. William L. Clay.
37. Hon. Jim McDermott.
38. Hon. Lane Evans.
39. Hon. Pete Stark.
40. Hon. Bernie Sanders.
41. Hon. Donald M. Payne.
42. Hon. Maurice Hinchey.
43. Hon. Peter A. DeFazio.
44. Hon. Patricia Schroeder.
45. Hon. David Bonior.
46. Hon. Neil Abercrombie.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 20, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE STATUS OF THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

The negotiations between Congress and the President over a balanced budget are now entering a critical phase. Hoosiers tells me they want to get these budget issues resolved. They want Congress and the President to work together to get the government's business done. They do not want government furloughs and they see the threat of default on the national debt as very much to be avoided.

The President and the Republican leaders in Congress agree on the need for a balanced budget in seven years. There are very good economic arguments for a balanced budget, which will reduce interest rates and free up capital to enhance America's global competitiveness, but the real political passion for fiscal responsibility flows from people's opposition to saddening their children with a huge public debt.

Medicare continues to be a major sticking point in negotiations. Congressional leaders have proposed cutting back Medicare by \$270 billion, raising premiums and reducing consumer protections for beneficiaries. The President has proposed \$124 billion in cutbacks and more modest changes in the program, consistent with the recommendations of the Medicare trustees. While we should go after cutbacks in Medicare in a serious way, we should preserve Medicare to protect older persons.

MEDICAID

Medicaid is another crucial battleground. Medicaid is the insurer of last resort in the health care system today, providing services to poor families and children, and nursing home care for the elderly. The Republican leadership wants to replace the Medicaid guarantee with a block grant; cut projected federal spending sharply on the program; and let the states decide how and on whom the money would be spent. The President wants to preserve the guarantee, but would cut projected costs by capping the annual increase per beneficiary.

Medicaid must be preserved to protect the vulnerable, while made more efficient and effective. The alternative would be more poor people uninsured, and the poor, the states and hospitals that serve the poor would all be stranded.

WELFARE

The current welfare program embodies a federal guarantee of aid to needy single parents and their children. The congressional leadership has proposed eliminating the 60-year-old federal guarantee and turning the program over to the states as block grants. The President apparently supports this basic reform, but has said that the Republican plan bites too deeply into cash assistance, child nutrition, child care and food stamps. He accepts the principle of allowing states to set eligibility requirements and benefit levels, but he would maintain the federal entitlement for the poor.

I support welfare reform that rewards work over welfare and encourages responsibility. Welfare reform should limit the time families could remain on welfare, require parents to support their children, and provide the states with flexibility to set eligibility and benefit levels.

Welfare reform has stalled in Congress because of differences between GOP leaders in the House and Senate over the school lunch program. I agree with those in the Senate who want to keep the entitlement status of the school lunch program. The House leadership, in contrast, wants to turn the program over to the states.

TAX CUTS

Congressional leaders propose to cut taxes by \$245 billion over seven years, \$140 billion

more than the President proposes, but they are now hinting they might be willing to trim the level of cuts and target them more to low and moderate income families, rather than the well-to-do. My preference is to cut the spending first. I would defer a tax cut until the budget is balanced or the deficit is neutralized, and would not increase taxes on the working poor, as proposed in the congressional leadership budget. One other problem with GOP tax cuts is that the revenue losses explode after the seventh year. No sooner would the budget be balanced than the tax cuts would threaten to unbalance it all over again.

SPENDING PRIORITIES

Both the President's and the Republican proposals call for significant savings by cutting domestic spending. I agree with this approach, but also believe that the spending cuts favored by congressional leaders are much larger than needed in order to finance large tax breaks to the well-to-do. I oppose laying the burden of deficit reduction largely on poorer Americans. Other problems with the current proposals are that too much of the savings come from unspecified domestic programs and come late in the seven-year process.

We must exercise care in where we cut. The idea behind eliminating the budget deficit is that savings and investment count—that a balanced budget raises savings which in turn fuel investment. But just as business invests in machinery and equipment, the government must invest in education, research and development, and infrastructure to boost growth in a world of fierce international competition. That means that investments in human and physical capital are necessary and vital ingredients for faster growth in the American economy.

This Congress is not being tough enough in reducing "corporate welfare." The mining industry still gets a huge discount on mining federal lands. California's agribusiness has access to very low-cost federal water. The timber industry enjoys subsidies for cutting in federal forests. And livestock owners, particularly in the West, benefit from minimal grazing fees on federal lands. We need to reduce or eliminate these subsidies, particularly when budget proposals today are clearly skewed against poorer Americans.

CONCLUSION

The key now is that the two parties work together to fashion a compromise that balances the budget in seven years, but in a way that does not devastate key federal programs, particularly Medicare, Medicaid and education. I believe a decent deal is within reach. I have staked out a position with other moderate and conservative House Democrats to achieve these goals, and my sense is that the President and congressional leaders have been moving toward this position. All differences may not be settled before the end of the year, and those which can't be resolved ought to be taken to the voters in 1996. But, in the interim, we should work to compromise in areas where we can.

A POEM DEDICATED BY LYNN
MURPHY OF PRINCETON, WV, IN
TRIBUTE TO HER FATHER

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have received thousands of letters and other manner of communication from my constituents in southern

West Virginia in recent months and recent days, expressing concern over the budget impasse. More recently, their communications have dealt with the Government shutdown and their fears not only for themselves who are Federal employees, but the fears of those who are not, but whose family members rely upon earned Social Security and veterans benefit checks arriving on time.

One such person—Lynn Murphy of Princeton, WV, wrote to voice her concern over the worry she could see in her father's eyes when report after report told him that his Social Security disability and veterans benefit checks might be delayed or fall short of the total benefits due as a result of the budget battles and the longest Government shutdown in our history—a battle still raging in Congress.

While we were able to vote on a measure that assured Social Security and veterans benefit checks would arrive on time and not fall short of their total amount due, when Lynn Murphy wrote her letter and accompanying tribute to her veteran father in the form of a poem, neither she nor her father knew for sure and they were worried.

In Ms. Murphy's poem, she not only pays homage to her father, but speaks to each of us as Members of the House concerning our need to get it together and put a stop to scarring the elderly, our veterans, and others who depend upon benefits of one kind or another for their daily necessities. She calls upon Congress not to forget her father and others like him as they continue to debate a balanced budget.

On behalf of Ms. Murphy's deep and abiding love for her father, I am privileged to commend the poem she wrote in tribute to him and his life, to the reading of my colleagues and all who have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as we try to make some progress on coming to an agreement to fund the U.S. Government.

Mr. Speaker, the untitled poem by Lynn Murphy follows:

My father fought in two separate wars and still come out with life.
He then worked for the mines, and took my Mom to be his wife.

With my Mom came a family, and my Dad wanted it that way.

No matter how bad my Daddy felt, He was still at work every day.

Finally, my Dad retired at the age of Fifty-five

And with all my Dad has endured in his life, his is lucky to be alive.

So Congress, when you make your decisions, the way you need to do, remember my Dad risked his life, for others, and for you.

Why shouldn't he get his disability checks from Social Security and the VA?

Those checks pay the bills for he and Mom; he doesn't throw his money away.

I've watched my parents do without to see that us kids had.

And they both were on their feet each day, Although often they felt so bad.

My Dad deserves an honorary award for he is the greatest Dad in the land.

I hope he will always get his checks, and I hope you will understand.

Look to God for answers to questions, that may arise on Capitol Hill.

And think about my Dad who still strives to do God's will.

Let God ease the problems. Have faith and you will see that everything seems to work out, if it is God's will for it to be.

NEBRASKA CORNHUSKERS:
COLLEGE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, last night the University of Nebraska Cornhuskers firmly convinced all of America that they are still the No. 1 college football team in the country.

The Huskers' complete domination of the University of Florida Gators in the Fiesta Bowl for a 62 to 24 win was truly one of the most impressive displays of offensive and defensive talent in college football history.

It is also important to note that this awe-inspiring victory was Nebraska's 36th win in a 3-year period, establishing a new record.

The Cornhuskers, under the extraordinary coaching and steady leadership of Coach Tom Osborne, demonstrated remarkable persistence and consistency in their drive toward a second consecutive national championship. Their committed efforts show that the reward of success is won by dedication, teamwork, exceptional conditioning, high motivation, and the superior efforts of Coach Osborne and his coaching and support staff.

As an alumnus of the university and the Representative in Congress from Lincoln, the home of the Huskers, this Member enthusiastically congratulates the University of Nebraska Cornhuskers and Coach Osborne on another well-deserved national championship.

CONGRESSMAN BARNEY FRANK
ON "DEMOCRACY REAFFIRMED
IN ISRAEL"

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1996

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an article written by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, BARNEY FRANK. It appeared in the Boston Globe on December 25 of last year.

Barney has given an outstanding analysis of how Israel has dealt with the emotional and political aftermath of the tragic assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. His analysis is particularly significant—not only for democratic Israel, but also for industrial societies such as our own and for developing democratic societies in the former Soviet Union and in the Third World—who must deal with the relationship between terrorism and democracy, between violence and freedom. As he said: "For nearly 50 years, Israel has been the most persistent and successful in demonstrating that democracy is not a luxury to be enjoyed only by societies that are wealthy, secure and well insulated from outside attack, but is a recognition of the fundamental right of men and women to govern themselves freely."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the entire article by Mr. Frank be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues read it and give it thoughtful and careful attention.

DEMOCRACY REAFFIRMED IN ISRAEL

In the emotional aftermath of the searing, tragic murder of Yitzhak Rabin, Israeli society has understandably been deeply engaged in a debate over the role of dissent in a democracy. But the most important aspect of this debate—both for Israel and the rest of the world—is what is not being discussed. No significant elements within Israel are arguing that there should be any serious curtailment of the vigorous, open democracy that has characterized Israel since its beginning. It is significant that Israelis are not questioning their commitment to democracy at this terrible time.

In many societies, the murder of a popular leader in the midst of a delegate set of negotiations involving the security of the Nation would have led to widespread repression of elements in the opposition party, whether or not they were connected to the murder. The sad fact is that in most societies facing the kind of overwhelming physical threats to their existence that Israel has lived with since 1948, democracy would never have flourished in the first place. The mature, pained, thoughtful response of Israeli society to this murder is a reminder of something that would be a grave error to overlook: every condition that has been put forward by repressive rulers in the post-war world to justify the suppression of democracy has been present in Israel since its inception, and the experience of Israel is an eloquent repudiation of the notion that democracy is a luxury to be indulged only by those nations that are prosperous and secure.

From its birth, Israel's existence was threatened by attack from the overwhelmingly larger hostile forces which surround it. While fighting to defend its right to exist, Israel has also coped with the difficult economic problems of a new nation, compounded by the military drain on its resources and its unshakable commitment to absorb large numbers of Jewish refugees from oppression elsewhere in the world. Through all of this, Israel has maintained a commitment to a flourishing, vigorous democracy, governed by leaders chosen in elections as free as those held anywhere in the world, amidst untrammelled—often raucous—free speech.

Among those who have enjoyed the rights of free speech and the ability to participate fully in free elections are members of the Arab minority, some of whom reject the very legitimacy of the state of Israel. But that rejection has never been used to prevent them from participating fully in the electoral process on a one-person/one-vote basis, and those they vote for are seated in parliament with full rights to vote, debate, etc.

There should be nothing remarkable about these facts, and in the United States or much of Western Europe they would not be. But among those nations which have come into being since the end of the war, this pattern is an exception. And it is especially exceptional in nations that have faced severe external threats from heavily armed enemies, have been struggling simultaneously with the difficult task of economic development, have been severely divided internally over some fundamental issues involving the security of the nation and have undergone the difficult social process of absorption of large numbers of migrants, many of whom come ill-prepared at first to deal with the complexities of modern society.

In fact, Israel has now become through the peace process an exporter of democracy in the Middle East. The elections that will soon