

Tate scored a touchdown and the game, as it is often said and this time never more true, was history.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], for graciously honoring our friendly wager by awarding our team this Nevada Wolf Pack sweatshirt, which I intend to present to the team at an appropriate moment, for it was they who won it fair and square.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Rockets, because I know many of them are listening, and as this particular T-shirt indicates over here, are undefeated champs of the mid-American conference. Our newspaper had a complete front page headline: "Toledo Rockets Win Vegas Bowl." We are so extremely proud of them and their hard work.

Go Rockets and Go Toledo and thank you, Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

NOW IS NOT TIME FOR BUSINESS AS USUAL

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, I thank the Speaker and I thank many of our colleagues for joining us here on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], and indeed would offer in the spirit of bipartisanship, congratulations to the Toledo Rockets for their great victory. I am sure I am speaking for my colleagues from the great State of Nevada. She was more than happy to supply the Tee-shirt and she is equally proud of the Wolf Pack of Nevada, Reno, even though they came up on the short end of the score.

Mr. Speaker, again, on that bipartisan remark, let me address the remarks of my colleague from Ohio and other remarks in this Chamber earlier today with reference to what is transpiring here in Washington, DC, and indeed throughout the country.

There has been a plea from the other side of the aisle, a request to go back to business as usual. Indeed, this morning, my dear friend from New Jersey, who is also here on the floor, basically said that in his opinion, what is transpiring now is not the way a majority should govern in the United States.

□ 1515

Let me simply offer these thoughts. It is precisely because of business as usual and the constant drumbeat of taxing and spending and spending a little more and making special accommodations and spending more and more and more and more that we never come to grips with the central issue we must confront. And that is we are committing fiscal suicide upon this Nation and upon future generations if we fail to stand now and respond to the clarion call of the American people who say enough is enough. Balance the Federal

budget now. Put into place the framework today is that in 7-years time we can have a balanced budget and start to eliminate this national debt that will suffocate generations to come.

There is nothing moral about taking the money from generations still to come simply because they do not have a vote. Good people may disagree, and my good friend from Massachusetts is here on the floor, and I am sure he will get a chance to speak here in a few moments. Good people may disagree on how money may best be spent. But for the executive branch of this Government to walk away from a public commitment and, moreover, a public law, signed 30 days ago by the Chief Executive, committing this Nation, committing this Government as terms of the previous continuing resolution to use the framework of a commitment to a balanced budget in 7 years using the honest numbers of the Congressional Budget Office, but for the President to walk away from that statement, to walk away from that public law is absolutely patently wrong.

Now, others may try to massage the wording, and there may be countervailing philosophies, but the undergirding part of that public law was a commitment to work for a balanced budget within 7 years using the honest, non-partisan numbers of the Congressional Budget Office.

Are there differences in philosophy? Of course, but there should be no difference on that board bedrock of principle.

Mr. Speaker, I freely acknowledge that good people can disagree and, indeed, we are here to debate those differences. But surely, certainly the bounds of common decency suggest, that, even though good people may disagree, there should be a basic framework upon which to work out the disagreement. Now this White House and this administration and regrettably some others in this Chamber want to walk away from that basic agreement.

Much is made of the holidays. Much is made of the hardship that many Americans face. But again, Mr. Speaker, the greatest Christmas present that we can give the American people is to make sure that we have a Nation fiscally sane and sound, morally responsible for generations to come, saving the health care system for our grandparents, ensuring fiscal responsibility and no to business as usual, trying to find a way to always tax and spend and spend some more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO AARON FEUERSTEIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as we face a kind of conflagration in Washington, a meltdown, a fire storm that seems to be taking place both on the House floor and in Washington in general tonight, the truth is that there was a real fire that took place in the State of Massachusetts last week that I think can act as kind of a moral for all of us in this Chamber to take some advice and some lessons from.

I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable man in Aaron Feuerstein. Aaron is the owner of the Malden Mills in Methuen, MA. He saw his family business go up in flames last week. Over 2,400 families worked in that company.

Against all odds, Aaron Feuerstein built up a company in Massachusetts that has for the last several decades lost tens of thousands of mill jobs to other countries. Tens of thousands of mill jobs have moved down to the South and have left Massachusetts because of high wages, because of the high cost of energy. But while others were abandoning the State, Aaron Feuerstein was building up the State. He pays union wages. Ron Alman, the head of the International Ladies Garment Workers, has nothing but kind words to say about Mr. Feuerstein.

Mr. Feuerstein, at a time when his company and his life savings were burning, stood and made a commitment to his workers that he would continue to pay them through the Christmas season, would continue to pay them on into next month and committed himself to rebuilding that plant. Maybe the Congress, maybe the President, maybe the House and Democrats and Republicans can learn a little something about Mr. Feuerstein's commitment to this country, to his community.

This is an individual who employs immigrant workers as well as people that have lived in this country for generations. He has invested in their education. He spent millions of dollars of his own funds to teach people English, to give people job training. He has worked with the Government. It is through that kind of partnership and commitment that he has built up his company. He has made a recommitment to making certain that we in this Nation can have the kind of high wage, high skilled jobs that mean the future of America is going to be safe.

Yet, as that goes on in Methuen and Malden and other parts of the State of Massachusetts, what we see is divisiveness and name calling and a tearing apart of the future of this country. We are saying, as this guy is standing in Boston making certain that his workers, when he has no income, are going to get paid. We are saying, we are going to cut off the workers in this country today.

There should be a lesson that we all take about how we can try to get

along, how we can try to make this country grow and prosper in the future by recognizing that these companies do not have to just line their pockets with their profits. We do not have to measure our degree of growth in our country just by how Wall Street does, but we can look at how American workers do and how families do and whether we build up communities. That is what this individual is doing.

That is why I hope that the Congress of the United States would join with me in honoring Aaron Feuerstein and his legacy to the company that he has built, that his workers have helped him build. That means that there is going to be a happy Christmas, a happy Chanukah, a happy holiday season for so many families in Massachusetts that last week looked like they were burned out and had no hope and no future. His commitment means they do have hope, they do have a future, and all of us can learn something from his example.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman and his words, as one who is not even close to Massachusetts, but I saw it on the news. The gentleman stood up and said: All of my employees are going to continue to receive their wages, even though the plants are not operating, and we are going to start up some of those plants—I think it was—within 30 days.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is exactly right.

Mr. VOLKMER. Then soon thereafter they were going to be in full production. It is such a positive mode, just the opposite of what we have here today. This is a negative mode that we have here that we are going to reduce the Federal Government. We are going to shut it down if we do not have our way. He did not have his way. He got burned out.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. VOLKMER. I think it is a very good example of the differences in the way we just think about things.

GRANTING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just wondered if there are others that are waiting to be heard here on the floor. And those of us who are not on the list anymore, I lost my turn, I am willing to wait until all the rest of them are finished.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do, under unanimous con-

sent, is to agree to have alternating speakers, is all.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is just filling in for the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw by reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I just came upstairs from a Republican conference meeting, and it was very discouraging. There seems to be a whole lot less progress on this budget than we thought would be there.

This President has said on so many times that he was in favor of a balanced budget. During the campaign it was 5 years. Later it was 10 years, and then 8 years, and then between 7 and 9, and then 9 years, and then 7 years. And last night our leadership believed, and the press reported, that the President was prepared to put his numbers, his specific numbers for spending on the table for discussion using Congressional Budget Office numbers.

Subsequent to that, this morning the Vice President goes live on C-SPAN at the press room of the White House and, when asked that specific question, when will you have a budget, the Vice President responded, well, we will put all the budgets on the table, our OMB-scored budget, the Congress's CBO numbers, and other budgets that may be offered. And under insistent questioning by the media, he was asked, are you going to do what was said last night, put a budget on the table with CBO scoring numbers? And the Vice President said no.

This is very, very discouraging. If we cannot even get in the same rules, play in the game with the same rules, we cannot get to the end of this. Each of us would like to be home with family for Christmas and New Year's and the work that we have to do in our districts during January. But I believe we are prepared to stay through Christmas until this is done, that what we insist happening is that we are going to not go home until we have a balanced budget now.

The interesting thing about this is that we are not all that far apart. For all the talk we have heard about Medicare and gutting Medicare, we wanted to spend in year 7 on Medicare \$289 billion. The President wants to spend \$294 billion. That is not a large difference. It can be bridged easily.

We want to grow the spending in this budget by 3 percent. The President wants to grow it by 4 percent. We want to use numbers that presume an increase in revenues of 5 percent. The President wants numbers that would

presume an increase in revenues of 5.5 percent.

None of these differences are too broad to sit down at the table and just cut a deal and go home with their families for the holidays. No, this is not about numbers. This is not about numbers. This is about a basic philosophy, because we believe and have believed all year that Medicaid and welfare can be handled more efficiently and more effectively by the States. So do the Governors, including many of the Democrat Governors.

We want to take that money that we have been spending and turn it back to the States for them to handle in the community person to person, face to face. We think that welfare and Medicaid ought to be more in the form of caring than caretaking. The President disagrees. This is all about who decides, who chooses on behalf of others, who sets the power.

In 1958, John Kenneth Galbraith published a book entitled *The Affluent Society*. I always thought it was ironic that 7 years after he published a book entitled *The Affluent Society*, he enlisted in the War on Poverty. But in his book in 1958, the entire book was essentially this. It is not that Americans have too little or they have too much. But they make bad choices with their dollars. And it is the obligation of an educated government to tax those dollars from them and make better choices on their behalf.

□ 1530

I submit that is what the issue is about.

The first 2 years of the administration the budget, welfare, health care, virtually everything proposed, was for more taxes, more Federal bureaucracy, more deciding on behalf of the American citizens. Indeed Mrs. Clinton said in the house of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] one evening, "We have an obligation to make better choices on our citizens' behalf."

That is what it is about, the left versus the right. The left thinks that we should decide for the future and shape a future that our children and grandchildren will be secure in; it will be fair and warm. The right says if you gave us every lever of governance tomorrow, we would not have the slightest idea of what to do. I could not satisfy 10 percent of the Members of this House because we all come to the table with different hopes, and dreams, and aspirations.

I do know this: I could build a future that my daughter would love and my son would hate. So our side says return those choices to the people, let them keep more of the dollars in their pockets, and 260 million Americans acting in their own behalf hundreds of times every day will shape the future, and it will be one with which most of them will be happy, Mr. Speaker.

This is not about money. It is about the direction in the country. It is very