

thought we had that agreement, the White House did not respond with Congressional Budget Office numbers, and instead came back and said, well, no we have what is called a rosy scenario, we think everything is going to be better. Indeed when you cannot even agree on the parameters, it is very difficult to have negotiations if one side comes to the table with apples and the other side comes to the table with oranges, and you cannot figure out why you cannot have any type of negotiation. I think it is probably because the two sides have come to the table with different measures of what they are talking about.

That is why I think that resolution, the continuing resolution we have voted for, was so important, and I would call on the White House to go back to its agreement and say please live up to your agreement. If you do not like the budget that passed the House and Senate, and that is your option, please submit your own balanced budget using the same estimates. If you do not want any tax cut, take the tax cut out. If you do not want any defense spending, take defense spending out. If you want a lower amount of defense spending, put in a lower amount of defense spending. But please submit your own balanced budget so we can have a comparison and we can actually have legitimate negotiations.

Now a lot of people say, well, the Government shut down at least some departments; is that not the fault of the Congress? Well, the President was sent the appropriations bill for the Interior Department, and he vetoed that. That was his option, but if he had signed it, the Interior Department would be open now. The President would sign the appropriations bill that covered the Veterans Administration. If he had signed that, the VA would be opened now. He choose to veto it. The President was sent the appropriations bill for Housing and Urban Development. He vetoed that bill as well, and HUD remains closed. He was sent the appropriations bill for the Commerce Department. He vetoed that bill, and Commerce is closed. Also with the Department of Justice and the Department of State.

I would call on the President to submit an honest balanced budget so we can balance the budget for our children's future. That is the most important thing we can do.

HOLIDAY SPIRIT IN THE CONGRESS; WHERE IS IT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I would remind our colleagues in the spirit of Christmas and the observation of Hanukkah there are certain words or feelings that come to us. There are feelings of joy. In fact, the whole religious experience of being a Christian is the advent, is the spirit of expectation, look-

ing forward to something. Also we have feeling of caring and feeling of responsibility, feeling of families and friends. I would just ask you, what joy is there to the more than 250,000 Federal employees who we are holding hostage this Christmas because of our failure to pass budgets? Why should we make them victims of the fight that we have going on? Certainly does not seem to be in the spirit of Christmas, it certainly is not consistent with religious feelings of that.

In terms of responsibility, who is responsible for the situation? One would say that, well, the President is the only one standing between American people and a balanced budget. Truth be known, as far as the shutdown, it is Congress' responsibility. On October 1 we were to have a budget, and we did not have that budget reconciliation. It is our fault because we could not come to that.

What is this debate about?

□ 1545

What is this debate about? It certainly is not about what the Republicans will say over and over again: "It is about balancing the budget, about balancing the budget in 7 years." It could not be about that because the majority have already agreed upon that.

Why do they repeat that? Simply to confuse or to persuade the American people that the debate is not about real issues, is not about who wins and who loses, it is not about our commitment to compassion, it is not about whether the wealthy succeed at the expense of the poor. It is not about our lack of commitment or commitment to the environment or education. They would rather have you think of this principle that they are willing to die on the sword for and say, "We promise, now, and we are going to keep our promise, come hell or high water."

What they are saying to you, Americans, is that "We will allow you to die on the sword. So we get our provision, or what we perceive to be, we are willing to allow 250,000 employees to have no Christmas." That is what they are saying. They are not standing up for principle. They are saying, "It is my way or no way." No compassion in that position, and certainly nothing to be lofty about.

This whole idea that a balanced budget is sacrosanct escapes me. A balanced budget is because it makes sense to balance the budget, but we balance the budget how? I was told if I want to make a good living, I want to be honorable. I can make a living several ways, but I would rather do it in an honest way. It is as important how we balance the budget as to balance the budget.

It is important in my sight if those Americans who are senior citizens have the opportunity at the end of their lives to make sure that they are not frustrated and in pain because of lack of health care. It is important in my life to think that I would like to prepare for the future, and the future

means we want to invest in education. I hear my colleagues get up and say, "You know, I want my grandkids to grow up in a society where they do not have to pay all of this debt."

I have three grandkids too. I want my three grandkids to grow up so they do not have to pay for a lot of debt, too, but I also want my grandkids and other peoples' grandkids—I happen to be privileged, and have been not because I came to Congress, but because I just happened to be, but I know there are those who are not. America is not just great because of its defense, its technology. America is also great because it makes a place for those who are least among us. We are also great because we have a sense of compassion.

I would say to you, I do not know a better time to show compassion other than in the Christmas season. Surely, there is no compassion in closing down Government. Veterans may not get their checks, welfare mothers may not get their checks. Surely there isn't any compassion with those Federal workers who will not know whether, indeed, they will be paid.

I think, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues need to know the spirit of Christmas is the spirit of joy, caring, and responsibility. We have been ill responsible, and I certainly know we have not been compassionate.

THE SPIRIT OF GIVING, AND THE DIFFICULTY IN MAKING TOUGH BUDGET DECISIONS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is a season to be very conscious of giving and what we can do for other people. It seems to me that the President and some of the Democrats feel they are gaining politically by calling Republicans mean-spirited in their efforts to whether we are going to reduce the growth of Government and end up with a balanced budget. It is easy for the President, I think, and some of the Democrats to say they want a balanced budget, but it is hard to come up with the specific cuts and reductions in growth that are necessary to achieve that balanced budget.

If we are going to give a present, it seems very, very important that we start considering the tremendous obligations that we are putting on our kids and our grandkids by spending the money today to satisfy what we consider our today's problems with money they have not even earned yet, so we are obligating them to pay our today's bills. I think all of us, collectively, must believe that their problems are going to be as difficult and as great as our problems today, if not greater.

It seems to me that there are two things that are going to have to happen before we can break this budget impasse: First, the President is going to

have to stop playing politics, and doing what is right for the future of our country. I think that is sort of what he is doing. He sees his poll numbers gaining by saying, "No, I am not going to allow these cuts."

I think here is the other second option, that the American people spend some really tough, hard studying time learning about the budget of the U.S. Government, and what it is really doing to their future, what it is doing to their future standard of living, what it is doing to their obligation they are going to have when they start paying off this debt.

Mr. Speaker, it has been politically damaging to many Republicans to go home, because the PR battle has probably, there has been greater success on the part of the Democrats in saying that, "Look, Republicans are taking away school lunches, they are going to put poor people out on the streets," and so when we go home, it is politically damaging.

Let me tell you, Democrats, Mr. President, if we do not succeed this go-around in achieving a balanced budget and start living within our means, my guess is there are not going to be politicians willing to even try it again for the next 15 or 20 years. It is not easy. On the other hand, it is so easy for the President and some of the Democrats to say, "Look at these mean-spirited Republicans as they try cutting this program and cutting that program and reducing the growth in this other program." It is not politically easy to reduce the growth in Government.

The bottom line is this: We either do it now, or we are going to wait until the baby boomers start retiring, around 2011 to 2019. Then we are going to have to do it. If we wait that long to make these decisions, those decisions are going to be drastic.

Let me just give you one example that sort of puts it in perspective, the difficulty of making these decisions. If it was easy, we would have made the decisions a long time ago. If you go back to after World War II, there were 45 people working for every 1 Social Security retiree recipient. Today there are three people working for every one retiree. People are living longer. The ratio of those working to those retired is becoming greater, and therefore, more difficult to charge more to those working in taxes to pay for some of the benefits of those that are retired. We have increased the FICA tax 29 times in the last 21 years, in either the rate or the base, so we continue to tax those that are working more and more to pay for our overspending.

The interest on the national debt this last year was \$320 billion, the interest on the total debt, subject to the debt limit. That is the largest expenditure of the Federal Government. We cannot go on, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to overspend and run this country deeper and deeper into debt, and jeopardize the success, the economic success of the future.

Mr. Greenspan, our top banker in this country, came to our Committee on

the Budget. He said: "Look, if you guys and gals do it in Congress, if you balance the budget, interest rates will be going down 1½ to 2 percent." Such a dramatic increase in the economy.

Let us do it now. Let us stick to our guns, if we have to stay here every day. I am hoping I am going to spend Christmas Eve and Christmas with my family. Other than that, I say, let us stay here every day, negotiate, get this done, have a budget that balances, and gives our kids and our grandkids a good Christmas present.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of issues that I think need to be focused in on. The first is that the outlays in this year's budget are virtually the same between the President's budget and the Republican Congress' budget. Would the gentleman agree with that? The gentleman agrees with that. So what we are doing is we are shutting down Government on no difference; a 7-year difference, but in the meantime, we are causing injury to American citizens.

On the other hand, what we could simply do is what we have done in the past, to say "Government will continue to operate even at a lower figure than either the Republicans or the President has asked for, and we will continue to negotiate."

Why are we having this impasse? The impasse is because the Republicans believe that they cannot give up their tax break; that everything else ought to be discussed: that student loans for kids ought to be cut, or worse than ought to be cut. On student loans, their proposal shifts billions of dollars to bankers, and makes it harder for kids to go to school by ending the direct loan program.

They say that seniors ought to pay more for health care; that poor people get no health care at all, possibly; that seniors get thrown out of nursing homes; that the environment is degraded. But let me tell you something; one thing they will not talk about is why we cannot shrink the tax break for billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, \$245 billion in tax breaks, that is what is holding this process up. The difference between having people go to work and people not working is whether or not the tax break is sacrosanct. Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen here? Some 3.3 million veterans who have their checks due on December 29 may not get them. We are having problems in the Northeast with cold weather and snow. Programs that help the needy are going to be cut and stopped so that the greediest among us can be benefited.

Let us think about how you run a family. If you have a family and there is a crisis, you call the family together. You do not tell the kids they are not

eating for a week until mom and dad can get together on a decision. You sit down and you start talking and you talk until there is a solution, but you also do not say "Well, our youngest son just got married. He has a mortgage, he is in trouble. We are going to cut him. Our two other kids in college, we are pulling them out. Our oldest kid is in Beverly Hills, living in a \$10 million mansion. Do you know what we are going to do? We are going to send that child a little extra money." That is not how you run a family, that is not how you run a business. The responsibilities that we have in this institution are not simply to take our ball and go home if we do not get it our way.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My understanding is that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] say everything is on the negotiating table except a true, real balanced budget in 7 years.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is that the one place your side has refused to budge on is the tax break. We have even said, bring the tax break down to working families. Get rid of the guys at the top, the people who make \$200,000, \$300,000 a year, and then we are closer. "No, we want to protect them," is what the Republicans say.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], you had an opportunity to do that yesterday. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], who has been the most outspoken advocate of a balanced budget on this floor in either party, I suggest to you, and in fact it was the Stenholm constitutional amendment that passed this House this year, as the gentleman knows who got up on the floor yesterday and said, "Let us defeat the previous question, put the coalition budget on the floor with an open rule."

The coalition budget, as you know, cuts more money than the Republican budget that we passed. It has less of a deficit. Next year, the year after, as a matter of fact, as you know, your budget has a very substantial deficit in the first 2 years. It does not cut taxes. It preserves, as the President has indicated, Medicare and Medicaid at numbers that the President, I believe, could sign. It is a cut, as you know, substantial, more than some on my side could support, but the fact of the matter is every Republican Member voted against allowing that on this floor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is not true. Some Republicans voted for it. Only 60-some Democrats voted for it.

Mr. HOYER. I stand corrected, it was four.