

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