

have from the President today does not, I repeat, does not, balance the budget in 7 years. That makes it unacceptable.

Let me put this another way. In the 7th year of the President's proposal, he proposes that we spend \$106 billion more of the taxpayers' money and he proposes that we collect \$36 billion more from the taxpayers of this country. So he proposes that we spend \$106 billion more in the 7th year, and he proposes we collect \$36 billion more in taxes. That leaves us \$70 billion over in the 7th year.

Let me just finish, because this gets much better. The Republican plan that is currently on the table, the Republican plan on the table today, proposes that we spend \$11.948 trillion of the American people's money. That is to say, \$46,000 over the next 7 years for every man, woman and child in the United States of America, \$46,000 per person. The President wants to spend \$400 billion more than that.

I have a problem with that, because back in my district, they think \$46,000 a person is enough spending.

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

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. I would just note that the CBO numbers show that the Republican budget, the deficit goes back up in the years 2003, 2004, and 2005. Would the gentleman be willing, if I might finish, given his passion for balancing the budget, which I respect, to say if that happens, we should reduce some of the deep tax cuts in that budget so that we can balance the budget?

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is very important to look very seriously at the budget proposal we put out of our office earlier this year. We put forth a plan that balanced the budget, we had 5 years, but, OK, let us do it in 7 years as we have all agreed to in this House. After the 7th year, we would allow spending to increase at a rate 1 percent slower than the rate of new growth.

We need to go back to the plan as proposed in our budget proposal out of my office earlier this year, because what that will do is require that we start building a surplus so we can start paying down this debt, so we can give this Nation to our children without this huge debt. When you start talking beyond 7 years, the reality is we do not have much of an opportunity to work out those numbers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the time has been allocated.

MEANS OF CALCULATING BUDGET NUMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I guess the question I have this morning is when will our Republican friends propose a balanced budget? Yes, that is right, when will they propose a budget that is in true balance?

You see, they think that a balanced budget can be balanced using a calculator; that is the only tool that you need to see whether the numbers add up, whether you can add, subtract, divide, and multiply them. But a budget is more than a collection of numbers. It is a statement of a country's priorities, and not everything in that budget can be measured with mathematical accuracy.

How do you measure in mathematics what it costs to deny one young child the opportunity to participate in Head Start, to get all the education that he or she needs in order to be a productive member of this society and share in the American dream?

How do you measure with a calculator what it means to a family to be ripped asunder when suddenly they have the burden of having to care for a senior who has to be placed in a nursing home, and, under this Republican plan, you reach down and dip into the resources of the middle-class family that is already struggling to make ends meet to pay for that senior who has to be provided nursing home care?

How do you measure with mathematical accuracy the burden on the senior who has to choose between health care and being able to eat?

Those are the questions that have to be raised when you look at balancing the budget. Yes, it is an important objective to be sure the mathematics balance, but it is critical that any balanced budget have true balance. And that is what this is all about, because our Republican friends think as long as you take from those who are on Medicare and give to those corporations more tax breaks, do not ask the corporations to sacrifice, do not ask the wealthy to sacrifice, just ask the young children, just ask those who want clean air and clean water, just ask our seniors to sacrifice, put all the burden on one side, that is not a balanced budget.

I say it is time for our Republican friends to come forward with the first balanced budget, because all the ones they have given us up to now may add up in the numbers, but they do not add up when it comes to the future of America.

FACTS ON THE BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to talk about the balanced budget and to talk about some things that may be educational to people who watch this.

First of all, I think the attacks on the majority fail to recognize the total picture. If you follow the rhetoric that you hear in attacking the Republican majority in their effort to balance the budget, if you follow their line of reasoning, we could never balance the budget so long as there was one individual out there who may not be served to the same extent that some think they should.

You ask the American people how they feel on these different issues, and we all know that it depends on how you ask the question. But the one thing that we are aware of and that has come through loud and clear is that when you ask the question "should we balance the budget," the American people say yes.

Yes, we will have to make choices. Yes, we will have to rearrange how we do business. Otherwise, some day the house of cards will come tumbling down.

It has been 30 years almost since the Federal budget was balanced, and the new Republican Congress has the opportunity to make this happen, with some support from the minority side. They say they want a balanced budget. Let us see some support from them to get that done. Or, if we fail, I think the American people will say "business as usual." We will not revisit any of the hard decisions between now and the next two decades if we fail this time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the morning paper which I think was very interesting and might be very interesting to all of us and to the viewers at home. There are two categories of Government spending. One, where we purchase things for use by Government; and the other is transfer payments, and that is where we take from the middle-class family and transfer it, transfer it to somebody else, because they are not working or do not work or cannot work. And you have to address that problem, because it is now almost 20 percent of the Federal income that goes to transfer payments, and it is growing at an enormous rate.

So the discussion about the budget just is not crunching a few numbers and the President giving here and the Congress giving there. It is about how we do government and how we spend the money.

□ 0930

REPUBLICANS SHUT DOWN GOVERNMENT BECAUSE THEY CANNOT GET THEIR OWN WAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up on what my colleague from the other side, from Wisconsin, said before. He talked about differences over the budget and the numbers over the budget, but the problem is that while we are arguing over these budget differences, whether it is the numbers or the priorities, the Government should remain open.

It is the Republicans, it is Speaker GINGRICH who wants to shut the Government down because he cannot get his way in terms of what he thinks the budget should be all about. That is not fair. That is the reason the Government was shut down 2 weeks ago, because Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership did not get their own way.

Now, everyone knows that the majority in this House and in the Senate is the only body or the only group that can bring up a continuing resolution to keep up. The Speaker, last Friday, the Speaker yesterday, and so far I have heard nothing today about bringing up a continuing resolution so that this Government can continue to operate. That is what is causing the crisis. That is what is making everyone around the country so aggravated.

That is the reason, I believe also, why we had the problem with the stock market yesterday, because while we are discussing and negotiating this budget, the Government should not be shut down. The Republicans should not make this into a crisis situation by shutting down the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have major differences over the priorities here. We have differences over the numbers, we have differences over the priorities. The Democrats have been saying all along that Medicare must be preserved, Medicaid must be preserved, that the Republicans are giving huge tax breaks primarily to wealthy Americans and to corporations and that money for those tax breaks should be put back into the budget so that Medicare and Medicaid, the environment and education programs remain solvent. That is what I think the goal should be.

The President has been articulating all weekend the fact that he cannot accept the Republican priorities because he feels very strongly, and he is right, that Medicare, Medicaid, the environment and education must be preserved. So far the Republican leadership has not come up with anything, not put anything on the table that would preserve those priorities, and, in the meantime, they tell us all we are going to shut the Government down because we do not get our own way.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ARE INNOCENT VICTIMS IN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Ms. Speaker, I have lost my voice but I have not lost my will here.

Quite frankly, if the President had signed some of the appropriations bills on his desk last week, we could have kept the park system open and a number of other agencies. I think he was saying my way or no way. I think both sides need to get together and keep talking.

What bothers me about this is that a month ago the President signed a resolution saying a balanced budget, 7 years, CBO numbers, and a month later he has not submitted any plan that does that. Hopefully, he will put that on the table, we can get both sides to pass a continuing resolution, and we can move ahead at that point and negotiate out the differences. And there are honest and sincere differences, but we need to move ahead. The American people are relying on us to do this. Certainly the markets are at this point.

I wanted to bring up something else today, and that is the innocent victims of this whole thing, and that is the Federal employees. Federal workers today have been undergoing a lot of stress. They have been undergoing downsizing efforts by both the administration and this Congress. Benefit cuts. Many have been proposed that have not gone into effect, but some have in the agreements that have gone through as well. So they are undergoing downsizing, benefit cuts and now furloughs at Christmas time.

The tragedy for these workers, who we are asking everyday to do more with less, is they cannot even, under Federal law, go get a second job. They cannot even work as a store department Santa Claus under Federal rules. So we furlough them, we do not let them have another job, and now we have Members saying, well, we cannot pay these people because they are not working. But they want to work, they want to be out doing the job that we have asked them to do, but the Federal law does not allow them.

These people will miss their Christmas paychecks. And to suggest that they should not be paid, when it is no fault of their own and they are unintended victims of this, is outrageous.

We have to recognize that if Government wants to attract the best and the brightest, and maintain these people in our Federal work force, so they can get the job done as we cut the budgets and ask people to do more with less, we have to bring their morale around and we have to incentivize them to do that, and we are not acting in a way to do this. If we were a private company and were undergoing downsizing, with the stress that we have, we would never threaten our employees as we have done in this particular case.

Of course, they should be paid, when this is all over and the resolution is done. It has happened every time be-

fore. For Members to suggest otherwise, and who say, well, it looks stupid to pay people for not working, it is not their fault they are not working. They want to be there. The only reason they are not is because we have not reached agreement with the President of the United States.

We will never get good people to come back into Government to serve the Government. As President Kennedy said, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country. We will never get that spirit when we start treating workers in this shabby a manner.

I would hope the President will put a balanced budget on the table, as he promised a month ago. It will not meet the priorities of the Members of my side, but we can pass a continuing resolution, work out our differences, get these people back to work, let them perform the functions of Government and give the American people a Christmas present of a balanced budget.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IS TO AID IN DISMANTLEMENT OF MEDICARE AND TO CUT AND REPEAL MEDICAID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full time, but I wanted to come to the floor this morning to echo the message that some of my colleagues have been giving, and that is basically this: The Speaker of the House, Speaker GINGRICH, has closed down the Government again for the second time, and in order to do two things: To dismantle Medicare and to cut and repeal Medicaid.

My colleagues do not have to take my word for it. I want to refer my colleagues to two reports; one that was issued by the Consumer Union. This is a group of people that puts out a publication called the Consumer Report. America knows about the Consumer Report. It is a publication that one goes to when one wants to buy a car or one wants to buy a television set. It has enormous credibility. Listen to what they say.

"What Congress isn't telling you: Families of nursing home residents may face financial ruin under Federal Medicaid bill."

They estimate that 395,000 long-term care patients are likely to lose Medicaid payments for their nursing home care next year if this Republican repeal of Medicaid goes through. They go on to talk about some of the effects of this proposal by the Republicans.

If someone is in a nursing home in the family, it costs about \$38,000 a year. That is more than most families in America make today. And they go on to point out, in this report, that adult children may be held financially liable for nursing home bills of their