

I was elected many years after Claude Pepper was elected, in 1982. In March of 1983, we had to restore the health of the Social Security Program. What happened in that election year of 1982 was, the American public saw that, with the election of large numbers of Republicans in 1980, the Social Security Program was again threatened. Claude Pepper stood on this floor, and there was not a dry eye in the House when he finished. We passed a bill in March 1983 to restore, restore the health of the Social Security Program.

So I find it somewhat ironic when I hear the crocodile tears from the other side of the aisle all of a sudden being real interested in trying to save Social Security and save Medicare, when the Republican Party has fundamentally never supported the two most popular programs that have been enacted in this century.

Now, in fact, if it had been up to the Republican Party, we truly know those programs would not have happened. If we look back to the Medicare program, consider this: From 1952 to 1965, 13 years, the Republican Party used every delaying tactic possible not to allow a Medicare bill to get on this floor. It was bottled up in committee for over a decade and a half. When the bill finally emerged, 97 percent of Republicans voted against Medicare in 1960. In 1962, 86 percent voted against Medicare. Then in 1964, thank God for Lyndon Johnson, 85 percent of them voted against Medicare.

So tonight we have got the entire Government of the United States shut down. Seniors in my district are not being served. Seventy a day are being turned away, over 400 phone calls, 400 visitors, people we have not been able to serve in Toledo, Ohio today because of inaction by the Republican Party. Now we hear these very same people telling us, oh, they really want to save Medicare. They really want to save Social Security. Please, do not deny history.

From the very beginning, what has the Republican Party stood for? It has stood for voluntary plans, voluntary plans with no guaranteed financing and no guaranteed benefits.

So tonight we have watched people—I know their offices are being called because seniors all over this country know what is happening—stand down on this floor and act as though they have had this change of heart. I do not think there is any change of heart at all. It is the same old struggle that we had from the time of Franklin Roosevelt. That is the struggle on whether you truly believe in the integrity of these programs, that these are a contract of trust between generations, or what are they trying to do?

In the resolution that we are stuck on and we cannot move out of this Congress, they are trying to increase Medicare premiums. They are trying to change the program to what Speaker GINGRICH calls a Medicare program that will wither on the vine by making

the program a program that does not keep the integrity of the system, because it gives people so many choices to operate out and go into other plans that in fact you lose the insurance base, the universal insurance base of the current program.

So I can just say that this Government shutdown is absolutely unnecessary. A thousand Federal workers in my district today were furloughed. As a result, three of our local Social Security offices are operating with a skeleton staff. Telephone calls are going unanswered today from in our district. Collectively, these offices could have served hundreds of people.

I do not see why we have to wait around here until Friday. What is wrong with the Republican Party? It's the same thing that has been wrong with the Republican Party since the 1930's. They have never believed in the Social Security and Medicare Program for all of our people.

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

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

#### BUDGET RECONCILIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to simply take a moment and answer some of the many calls and concerns that have been expressed by all of our constituents, frankly.

The gentleman from Florida preceded me and offered a whole litany of calls that he may have received and letters that he might have received. And I think the American people need to themselves stop for a moment, for there is certainly a great deal of ire, if you will, and anger about this process. I am not sure if they heard clearly in the colloquy that was between the leader of the Democratic Party and the majority leader, indicating that this Congress would be in possibly Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

Clearly, let me emphasize that many of us voted last Friday to remain in session, I for one to continue this process. But if we would look at the order of things, in actuality, the Republican majority did not follow the stated schedule of the House, and that is to complete the appropriations process in September of this year.

For all of the debate and all of the dismay that is being cast about, this dilemma is caused specifically because we do not have the appropriation bills before the President of the United States of America. So when a constituent writes, please tell the Member do

not follow NEWT GINGRICH, everyone followed him and they could not turn back, and she is an elderly middle-class lady. No name is given. NEWT GINGRICH and ROBERT DOLE, their proposal is cruel and disgraceful to senior citizens, and it is terrible what they are doing to this Government. It is criminal. These are not words that their Congressperson has put in their mouths. It is what they are perceiving and what is happening in this debate that is such a loud and irreverent sound.

It is important then for the facts to be laid upon the table. I voted for appropriation bills: transportation, agriculture, the legislative appropriation bills, the bills that were put before this Congress have been voted for by many of us.

The problem is that they have not on the Republican leadership gone through the Senate and reached the desks of the President of the United States. In actuality, some of those areas that are now shut down, 800,000 employees across this Nation, including the 18th Congressional District, could be operating if those appropriation bills that were passed by this House that many of us voted for had gone through the process, and now were facing, are before the President for his signature. That did not happen.

That is not the fault of the Democratic minority. That is actually the fault of the process of the House of Representatives under the leadership of the Republican Party simply not working. What do we have now?

On this day, November 14, 1995, we have a simple proposition for all those who are still dismayed about this discourse.

The simple proposition is to pass a simple continuing resolution. Would you realize that now in the heat of debate that the Republicans who foisted this upon us last week have now dropped all of these provisions. Were they that important? Should we have slid them under the table to devastate Medicare, to keep Catholic Charities and the Boy Scouts from lobbying the Federal Government? They got Federal funds to undermine the environmental protection system that we put in place, to undermine the criminal justice system? All of that requires healthy and separate debate but not on a continuing resolution. That should be clean and simple to keep the doors of this Government open so that the Social Security offices are open, the veterans offices are open, the IRS offices are open, so that the people can work for the American people. Then to lift the debt ceiling so that we can reasonably discuss the budget and we can decide whether we want to go toward the 21st century by cutting education so drastically, by increasing Medicare premiums from \$43 to \$53.

I would venture to say, if the American people got a chance to participate in that, they have already said it with some of their voices, they would argue

that they would not want to see that occur. That should be separate from the crisis that we face today because the appropriation bills have not been passed.

But the commitment has been made on the floor of this House. We will be here Friday, Saturday, Sunday, because the Members of this House, those of us who have voted against this charade, want to make sure that, one, we put people to work for the American people. That is the key. As this letter said, grow up, I say, act like responsible adults we have all mistaken you to be. Doing the right thing can be summed up in one simple word, compromise.

To that constituent, we have willing on the House floor and in committee to compromise. We were willing to vote for a clean streamlined continuing resolution and to lift the debt ceiling so that we can confront the issues of budgeting and balancing that budget in a fair and bipartisan manner.

□ 1930

To my Republican colleagues the real question is:

Are you prepared to do that, to answer the American people, and be able to handle this in a manner that serves us well as we move into the 21st century?

I will be here to work; will my colleagues be here to work?

Mr. Speaker, I must rise today to express my profound disagreement with the legislative process surrounding two bills: The consideration of the continuing resolution to provide temporary funding to keep the Government functioning; legislation to extend the debt ceiling in order for the Federal Government to meet its debt obligations.

Our Federal Government is in crisis today because the House leadership focused all of its energy during the first hundred days on a Contract With America instead of making sure that the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1996 were on schedule to be considered and signed by the President before October 1, 1995, and avoid disrupting the Government, Federal employees and the American people.

At this time, only three appropriations bills have been signed into law. Those bills are Agriculture appropriations, Energy appropriations, and military construction appropriations. I voted in favor of those three appropriations bills. The President vetoed the legislative branch appropriations bill because he thought it was improper for Congress to fund its own operations before making sure that executive agencies were funded. The House and Senate passed another legislative branch appropriations bill and that bill and the Transportation appropriations bills are waiting to be cleared and sent to the White House. I also supported the latest version of the legislative branch appropriations bill, the Transportation appropriations bill and the Foreign Operations bill.

I am concerned about the process on these two bills because the Congress traditionally has passed continuing funding resolutions and debt ceiling extension legislation without adding extraneous provisions unrelated to the purpose of the bills. Some of the extraneous matter that was added to these bills included an

increase in the Medicare Part B premium, a restriction on political advocacy by certain non-profit groups, provisions relating to regulatory reform.

In addition, the resolution would reduce funding levels for certain programs such as the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program, the Goals 2000 school reform programs, the AmeriCorps Program, and the Community Development Financial Institutions Program to 60 percent of the fiscal year 1995 allocation.

With respect to the debt ceiling legislation, the House leadership inserted provisions that would prevent the President from having the flexibility to manage various Government funds to enable the Government to meet its debt obligations. The results under the pretense of saving Social Security, this effort would gut Medicare. I want to save both programs. This has also caused our Government to lose credibility in international capital markets.

In addition, the majority Members of this House propose legislation today that would endanger the Social Security trust funds. I opposed this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can produce a clean continuing resolution and a clean debt ceiling bill. It is the right thing to do.

#### 87 VERSUS 83

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, before I joined this body, I had been an engineer all my life, practicing engineering. Engineers are good at dealing with the facts and numbers because numbers do not lie. What I like to do tonight is not attack anybody, just present facts, exactly what is happening, why the Government has to be shut down, and I leave up to your judgment. I wish the people in California listen to me carefully tonight.

There are two problems. One is so-called Medicare part B premium. It is cutting too deep; in other words, raising Medicare part B premium to subsidize tax credit to rich people. That is the whole idea. I am going to talk about that, break it into two parts. Let me explain to you what is exactly happening in Medicare part B.

The Medicare plan has a part A and part B, two sections. Part A is to pay for all the hospital costs. It is financed by payroll taxes, 1.45 percent by employee, and employer match. Then money will be deposited into hospital trust fund. Then money will be spent for all the hospital costs. That is an issue for some reason.

Part B is an issue. The whole argument is part B. What is it? Part B is all the expenses outside of hospital costs such as doctor's bill, such as outpatient, and et cetera. That is paid by the senior citizens from their own pocket and then the rest of them subsidized by the Government.

Let me tell you exactly what happens now. Used to be the 50 percent paid by the senior citizens, the other half sub-

sidized by the Government. It is now a little bit more than two-thirds subsidized by the taxpayers, one-third paid by the beneficiaries, senior citizens.

Who are these folks? Those are people working right now, some of them making only \$50,000 a year, supporting children, sending them to school. Tough. They cannot even afford to have their own medical care, but they have to support senior citizens. That is what it is, one-third by senior citizens, two-thirds by the rest of the taxpayers.

Next year, 25 percent paid by the beneficiary, 75 percent paid by the other taxpayers; one-quarter, three-quarter relationship. Eventually, year 2002, 18 percent will be paid by the beneficiary, remaining 82 percent paid by the other taxpayers. All we are trying to do is maintain the same ratio, one-third, two-thirds relationship, because we cannot afford to have this kind of relationship. There is no money to subsidize this any more.

Medical costs keep going up, so we all have to pay a little more. Senior citizens have to pay a little more, a few dollars a month more. The remaining taxpayers have to pay a little more to subsidize this. Let us take a look at the second to see what is happening.

Why are we having this trouble? Let us take a look at this. The senior citizens paying \$42.50, \$46.10 a month. That is all they are paying. Actually costs about \$150. The remaining balance is subsidized by the other taxpayers. This was the Republican plan, keeping one-third to two-thirds relationship because the hospital costs keep going up. Eventually we are going to ask senior citizens to pay a little more each month. By the end of the seventh year, end up paying \$87 a month.

They say, "My God, it is a huge increase." Let us take a look at Mr. Clinton's plan.

His plan is at the end 7 years \$83 a month, only \$4 difference. Eighty-seven versus eighty-three, this is such an important issue so that Government has to shut down?

Let us take a look at the second, how to pay for these things. Interesting. Take a look at the second. Mr. Clinton proposed actually next year that the senior citizens premium will go down and go up again. Why is that? It is a question of it happens to be election year.

I am not accusing anybody. I want to take a look closely at what are the big differences here. Eighty-seven versus eighty-three; is that really critically important to shut down the Government for this? Why do we lower the next year premium and then raise it again? Why? This is exactly what happened to part B.

I want to take a look at this, make your own judgment. Let us talk about the second issue.

The rich people do not pay their share, and we are taking advantage of them at the expense of poor people, putting all the poor people out in the cold to pay for huge tax cuts.