

According to a recent article in the New York Times, the Medicare cuts will shift more than \$11 billion in costs onto small businesses and American workers. That is because if people wind up having additional people wind up with not having insurance, once more, as our current situation indicates to us, that those people who are without insurance, if they do get health care, and they will, that those costs do not just fall into an abyss, into a vacuum. Those costs get picked up by all those who, in fact, are currently paying health care costs. We will just add to the number of those who are uninsured, and those additional costs will have to be borne by those who are currently picking up health care costs today.

That is a burden on individuals, and it is a burden on our businesses today and our workers that they simply cannot afford.

The GOP Medicare proposal is fundamentally flawed by controlling spending, but, by not controlling costs, it ensures seniors will be forced to pay more out of pocket while health care costs continue to rise. That would mean a giant step backward for America's seniors. That is not the way to balance the budget. That is not the American way.

#### CLAIMS VERSUS TRUTH

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, the last few months the congressional Democrats have tried to scare the American people, using all kinds of scare tactics and disinformation with twisted rhetoric.

I would like to point out to you a typical example of how wrong it is. First one Medicare, my golly, I just heard the story that this is gutting Medicare cuts, and the dangerous Medicare cuts, et cetera. Let us take a look because I would like to have the American people make their own judgment.

It seems like the argument is Medicare part B. Part B is to pay for a doctor's bills, et cetera, long-term care. The way it is right now, senior citizens pay about one-third, \$46.10. They cost Government three times more than that.

So what happens right now, one-third is paid by the senior citizens, two-thirds paid by the other taxpayers, younger generation. The other ones subsidize senior citizens by this ratio.

Take a look at this. Starting next year, our friends want to do this one-quarter paid by the senior citizens, three-quarters by the other taxpayers. We said "no" because in good time perhaps, maybe, but we do not have any money. We would like to keep it one-third, two-thirds relationship, continuing the next 7 years so we can balance the budget.

Where is the cut? This is what they call a cut. They would like to spend this much. We said "no." Let us main-

tain present situation. They call that a mean-spirited cut, deep cut, all kinds of rhetoric.

Now, even though maintaining this relationship, because hospital costs have gone up anyway, everybody has to pay a little more. Senior citizens have to pay a few bucks more a month, and their younger generation has to pay a few dollars more to subsidize.

Let us take a look at the next chart. Starting \$46.10 a month, eventually at the end of 7 years it is going to go up to \$87 a month. Mr. Clinton's plan is \$83 at the end of seventh year. Strangely enough, next year, did it to less payment, I do not know why, perhaps election year, then go up. Eventually we are talking about \$87 versus \$83. The American people knows this. That is what is the difference in the Part B premium than what the Republicans propose and what Mr. Clinton proposes. It is about the same.

Let us take a look at the next one. I mean, hearing this rhetoric that we are trying to put all of this poor working family out in the cold, they are talking about earned income tax credit. Many people do not know what is earned income tax credit. What it is, if you make money, you have a family, but not enough to support family, then Government pays you money. Look at what happens. This time, about this year, the Congress passed a law so you do not have to have children. Anybody can be eligible to receive the Government paychecks without having any children. That was different than original intent. Guess what happened here? Zoom, thousand percent increase.

What we are trying to do is slow down a little bit. The blue line here, slow down by eliminating waste and fraud, and also we are trying to go back to the original intent that if you do not have any kids, if you do not have any children, you are not going to receive any EITC paychecks anymore from Government. That is all we are trying to do.

Where is the cut? Where is the mean-spirited cut here?

Let us take a look at the next example. Next one is a lunch program, taking food away from the mouths of children. What a grotesque twist of rhetoric. Actually, we are spending more money, to be exact, 37 percent more, from \$4.5 billion in 1995 to \$6.17 billion in the year 2002. Is that the cut? 37-percent increase is a cut?

All we are trying to do is, there are so many programs right now, we are trying to consolidate into one program, also eliminate the middle man—in this case, Federal bureaucracy—so the local school district can get more money, in a sense, the children can get more money for their school lunch program.

Tell me where the cut is.

Finally, now they are trying to scare students. My God, they say we are cutting student loans and other educational aid.

Let us take a look at this. Starting from 1995, continue going up at the end

of the seventh year the budget shows student loan, \$36.4 billion, 48-percent increase. The student gets 48-percent increase in student loans.

Is there a cut? I think we should stop this rhetoric.

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

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

#### SIESTA FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today we gain new insight into what this new Gingrich-ite majority meant when they said they would give us a new Congress, and we can see it right here on the floor today. They have brought an entirely new institution to this Congress, not new to other countries of the world. It is known as a siesta.

You see, at a little after 1 o'clock today, when most Americans were out working hard trying to make ends meet, the Gingrich-ite leadership declared a siesta in the Congress. They said at 1 o'clock, after they had paid to bring back Members of Congress from all of the 50 States to pass a bill this morning that could have been approved last night with ease, to suffer a major defeat today on a piece of legislation that would take money away from veterans' care, they said at 1 o'clock, "We do not have any more business today. We do not want to work any more." And unlike some of our friends in other countries in the world who might take a 2- or 3-hour siesta around noontime, this new Gingrich-ite majority proposes to extend its siesta until midnight and well into tomorrow.

It is as if they did not hear the message of the American people that I heard over the Thanksgiving break, a message that said, "Stop your antics. Get to work." The message that said, "We do not appreciate Speaker GINGRICH wasting somewhere between \$500 million and \$800 million, so zealous with his extremist agenda that he would pay Federal workers not to even work for a week, at the expense of the American taxpayer."

But instead of coming back to work and actually working through these appropriations bills, they declare a siesta.

And is there work left to be done? Well, indeed, if they had not been sleeping on the job or something, we would never have had a Government shutdown in the first place. You see, they had a responsibility to pass some 13 appropriations bills by September 30.

Did they do it? No. They passed 2 of 13, a failing grade where I come from down in Texas. Have they done it

today? Have they even gotten half of these bills passed? Well, now, as we begin to approach Christmas, having completed Thanksgiving, they have yet to send to the President's desk almost half of the appropriations bills.

Let me review what pends here as these Republicans enjoy their siesta today:

The Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bills have not been presented to this House for action.

The District of Columbia appropriations bill, it says in the latest report that conference was continued on November 17, and it is still continued. We do not have the bill out here to act on.

The Committee on Foreign Operations, the latest report says the conference deadlocked on November 15. That means that the Senate Republicans and the House Republicans cannot agree on the same bill. So it is not out here for us to act on.

The Interior bill, that is the one we defeated just before the Thanksgiving break because of that giveaway that the Gingrich-ite majority wanted to give to the mining companies to take public property and use it for private gain.

The Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bills, they failed to begin floor debate over in the Senate at the end of September. It has not even passed the U.S. Senate.

Then the Veterans' Affairs, Housing and Urban Development legislation which was taken up and defeated today, recommitted for the second time, the second time that this House has recommitted that bill, the first time because our Republican colleagues wanted to bind and destroy law enforcement against pollution with some 17 binders, and so it was rejected. They came back kind of with their tails between their legs, saying, "We really did not mean to do so much damage to the environment as we did."

Today this House said "yes," but you are doing damage to the veterans that secured this country. You are taking \$213 million out of their health care that ought not to be taken out of that health care, and this House soundly rejected and recommitted that bill.

We have got half the business and well over half of the appropriations of the Government of the United States that have not been signed into law, and these folks take a siesta for the rest of the day.

They say they want a balanced budget. Well, they do not have much balance to the way they are getting that budget. The problem is they do not have any balance in the budget that they propose.

I believe in a budget that is balanced. I come from the pay-as-you-go approach of Texas. I want those figures to balance so that we do not leave our grandchildren with debt upon debt.

But how about a little balance for the people that are affected by that budget? Oh, yes, they say we have got

to sacrifice. They said this morning that those veterans had to sacrifice to the extent of \$213 million out of their health care.

But what sacrifice do they demand of the most wealthy of our citizens? They said, "Could you, please, pretty please, take a tax break at the same time we cut the rest of America?"

That is wrong, and so is this siesta.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET IN 7 YEARS

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

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not rise to defend this Congress. But I can vouch personally for the fact that the overwhelming majority of Members of this body are working quite hard, thank you.

I did want to speak and address some of the remarks that were made by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] because I think he has raised a very important point relative to the role and interaction of the Social Security trust funds with the deficit. I do not have the precise numbers, and I am sure I am going to be looking forward to the Members' discussion over the next several days and weeks. But I would be interested to know the extent to which the Social Security trust funds actually comprise a significant percentage of our \$5 trillion national debt.

I would suggest that there are clear implications to that which relate to how, in fact, we are dealing with balancing the budget and whether, in fact, we are using the type of honest numbers we have come to expect.

I have confess that, having spent the Thanksgiving weekend, frankly, with two of the most important people in my life, my two children, I have got maybe a little bit of a different perspective of what we have been doing over the past several months, particularly as it relates to the deficit. Again, I think we all agree there is no issue that is more important than balancing this country's budget once and for all.

I for one was very pleased to see that the President agreed just about 2 weeks ago to the concept that we are going to work together, Republicans and Democrats, to come up with a 7-year plan to finally once and for all balance the Federal budget.

But I have to confess that I think the public expects an awful lot more of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle with respect to how we work toward that objective, and specifically I was very distressed to know that barely was the ink dry on the agreement when the President's chief of staff made the comment that, well, he was not sure we were really going to balance the budget in 7 years, that it might take 8 years or longer.

□ 1415

Then over the weekend, Mr. Carvel, the President's chief political strate-

gist, made the comment that from his perspective, the President might just as well drive a hard line that would result in a continuing resolution or even a Government shutdown until November of 1996, almost over a year from today.

I have got to say there is no more important issue in this body than our once and for all coming to grips with many of the petty, partisan differences that stand in the way of our doing the work that the people elected us to do, which is to find a way to honestly get the Government spending under control so that we can move in the direction of a balanced Federal budget.

Again, I respect the points that are being made by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and I would suggest that they are very much factors that need to be considered in how we go about doing it. But the bottom line is that we need to work toward balancing the budget, and that means making tough decisions relative to cutting spending.

Yesterday, again, the chief of Staff of the White House made the comment that the White House was not going to be willing to agree to any 7-year plan to balance the budget unless we obtained the support of 100 Members of the Democratic side of this House. While as laudable a goal as that is, I think what it is suggesting to me is that, frankly, we may be wasting our efforts, Republicans and Democrats, attempting to work with the White House, and perhaps it is the responsibility of this party, this body, to come to grips together as Republicans and Democrats, to finally get the heavy lifting done on the budget, because I interpret the Chief of Staff's comments yesterday as a suggestion that the White House, frankly, is not really serious about working together to get to a balanced Federal budget.

When we cannot even agree on the number of people who are participating in the negotiations, I would suggest that this is a major embarrassment on everybody involved in the process. As I said, I think the public expects an awful lot more than they are receiving. When we have a government that over the next 7 years is going to spend in excess of \$12 trillion, some \$3 trillion more in the next 7 years than we spent in the last 7 years, and that is using the numbers from the Republicans budget, then I think that we need to take serious stock of where we are and how seriously we are committed to making the tough decisions that need to be made.

I was pleased this morning to be part of a group from my side of the aisle of Republican Members who are going to be trying to work with Democratic Members, with the Coalition, to try to find a common ground that we need to finally get the type of accommodation, the type of agreement, that will allow us to make the serious decisions we need to make.