

□ 2115

I know we seem to be inconveniencing the gentleman from Ohio. I am really sorry that, the 800,000 people that twist in the wind. But I would like to know whether or not the bills are going to be sent down?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I fear we have tried the patience of some of our colleagues.

The Treasury-Postal bill is, in fact, available for the President and these discussions we have been having with the President, this is one of the topics. Again, we would hope that the President would find a way to agree to sign legislation that could get us by this impasse. We continue talking to the White House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I will urge the President to sign both the Treasury-Postal and the legislative bill, if they are sent down there. They have not been sent down there. As I said at the Committee on Rules, I do not blame your side any more than my side, because I think it has been sort of mutually agreed. But my point is, there are 200,000 people affected by those two bills, over 200,000.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's point. I truly do. We will continue working.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order in place of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### BUDGET CRISIS

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I seek recognition this evening to say that in about 30 minutes there is going to be a very important discussion on this floor. It is going to be a discussion led by and participated in by the freshman Members of the Democratic Party. There are not many of us, but we feel that this is worth taking extra moments to talk about. That is, the need for us to stay here to work out this budget impasse.

We feel that as freshmen we have been elected and sent here to make sure that we move forward the process of government.

We feel that it is clear that with a 2-hour, 3-hour session on Saturday and nothing on Sunday, not until late in the afternoon on Monday, we are making a mistake.

It is not a question of how we spend time with our families or how we worship. We have the opportunity to worship at many fine houses of worship within walking distance of this building. We have the opportunity, those of us in Chamber who worship on Saturday, to worship close by in this building.

But remember, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we have hundreds of thousands of Federal employees across this country who are uncertain. I have spoken to people in my district who work for the Federal Government who are uncertain, people in my district office who are on furlough, who do not know if they will be able to make their mortgage payment, who do not know if they will be able to pay their rent with the check that is delivered to them for their month's work for November.

Mr. Speaker, I think when we face a problem like this, that we should stay in until we get it done.

I want to spend time with my family, who are home in Louisville this minute, just as much as anyone in this body, just as much. But I think we owe it to the American people to stay at this job to get it done. If it takes staying here until we get tired of looking at each other to the point that we resolved our differences, that is what it will take.

So in about 30 minutes, you will see a discussion on this floor led by the freshman Members of the Democratic Party who will say in no uncertain terms that we stand unified in our commitment to keep this body working throughout the weekend, on through to make sure that we resolve these differences. We owe the people of this country nothing more and nothing less.

#### BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic debate that we are having about balancing the budget, however I am disappointed by the words from the White House today that there will be no commitment to balance the budget in 7 years and that our attempt to continue funding for the Government will be vetoed even though it received bipartisan support.

That we have come this far in putting forward a plan to balance the budget is a great achievement, but we must not let up. The future of our children and grandchildren is literally at stake in the actions that this Congress and the President take in the interest of bringing fiscal responsibility to Washington.

The citizens of my district and I'm sure many others recognize this and

they have been calling in record numbers to tell us not to back down. These folks recognize that the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 is the single most important piece of legislation that we will work on this session.

They know this because the benefits of getting the Government out of the red are painfully obvious—lower interest rates, greater savings—we have a negative savings rate—and by lessening the burden that we pass along to our future generations. But the President says he won't budge—he says he won't work to balance this budget in 7 years—and he won't accept what the Congressional Budget Office says is a real and viable plan to balance the budget. So what do we do?

We listen to the people back home and we stay here to work to deliver a balanced budget. We don't listen to some phony, half-baked platitudes about the advantages of deficit spending. Not when the calls are coming in from the districts, 9-1 in favor of saving America's future. American's are asking us to do what is right for the country and their children.

They know that the interest in the 5 trillion dollar debt will cost every baby born today over one hundred and eighty thousand dollars and if we continue along this path the country we leave behind won't even be recognizable as the America that we inherited from our parents.

So we've got to start taking some initial, honest steps to bring fiscal sanity to Washington. The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 does just that. With this budget plan we eliminate the budget deficit in 7 years—we do not leave our country with chronic \$200 billion deficits per year, with no end in sight, as the President's out of balance budget does.

We save Medicare from bankruptcy and increase, yes Mr. President increase, what each Medicare beneficiary receives from \$4,800 to \$6,700 while allowing for more choice in the types of health care people receive. But saving Medicare isn't the only benefit we get from balancing the budget.

In fact, all Americans will benefit in the form of lower interest rates—this will save individuals and families hundreds of dollars per month in home mortgage payments and car loans. With lower interest rates this will result in more money being put into our economy to drive production and create over six million new American jobs.

That's right—a balanced budget will create over six-million new jobs here in America.

Mr. Speaker, the future of the country is at a crossroads. We can take the path that Americans historically have when there is a crisis—they look the problem in the eye and tackle it head on. Or we can succumb to the demagoguery, half written budgets and phoney numbers that the White House is peddling and continue to plunge the country deeper into debt.

The American people have spoken to us—they want a balanced budget and

they want it now. For their sake and our children's sake—we should override a Presidential veto of a 7-year balanced budget.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman a question. There has been a lot of discussion about the government shutdown. My understanding is that the minute the President agrees to balance the budget in 7 years according to the reasonable numbers of the Congressional Budget Office, a strong bipartisan majority of this body and the Senate will send him a continuing resolution and open up the government. Is that not your understanding?

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, that is correct, as I recall, the vote on this floor was 277 to 151.

Mr. TALENT. All the President has to do is indicate he will agree to a balanced budget in 7 years according to the budget numbers of the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. ROYCE. That is correct.

#### GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to address some of the issues that were raised by the previous speaker.

First of all, with regard to the government shutdown and with regard to what some of the freshman Democrats have said, I am very much in favor of their position. I think that we should stay here. We should not be going out of session. We should stay here through Sunday, obviously, in order to see what we can do to work out an agreement so that the Government does not have to continue to be shut down or slowed down as it is right now. I have a lot of Government employees in my district, and I think that is the only right thing for us to do.

The other thing I wanted to mention with regard to the previous speaker is, I do not really think the issue here is a balanced budget because most of the Members in this body on both sides of the aisle feel that we should have a balanced budget. Obviously the President feels that we should have a balanced budget. But what is happening here is that Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership are essentially holding the government hostage to their view or their ideology with regard to a particular type of balanced budget.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, that is not fair, and that is certainly not what has happened here in the past. That is the major difference, if you will, about what is happening in Washington right now as opposed to previous years. In previous years, when there were dis-

agreements about the budget between the two parties or between the President and the Congress, they allowed the Government to continue, they allowed operations to continue, so Americans were not hurt in any way while they argued over their differences about the budget. That should be allowed to occur here now, that is what President Clinton has been saying, that is what most of the Democrats are saying, but that is not what happens because basically Speaker GINGRICH wants to hold the Government shut down, if you will, hostage to his particular ideology about the budget. It is not fair.

I wanted to speak a little bit, if I could, about this, about this budget that was considered today which I was very much opposed to. What I would like to say basically is that the budget that was adopted today and which I did not support, essentially what it does is it takes a huge amount of money from the Medicare Program, from the Medicaid Program, and essentially hurts seniors and those people on low incomes who receive Medicaid right now, and it cuts those programs and really hurts the people that take advantage of those programs in order to provide these hefty tax breaks primarily for the wealthy. If we were to eliminate the tax breaks for the wealthy, we would not have to cut Medicare or Medicaid as much as is being proposed, and at the same time, and even worse, we are asking seniors to even pay more for essentially less health care coverage.

I just like to give some examples of how this plays out in a little more detail, if I could, in the time that I have left. First of all, we have information that shows that the average tax cut for those in the top 1 percent of taxpayers who get a tax cut would be about \$15,000, but for 99.7 percent of all taxpayers in the bottom fifth, they would actually have a tax increase or see no change at all. For those in this group who have a tax increase, their taxes would go up by an average of \$173 a year, so this is only a tax cut for wealthy Americans, it is actually a tax increase for a lot of the taxpayers at the bottommost part who are also working and paying taxes.

With regard to the Medicare Program, because you are taking so much out of the Medicare Program, what essentially happens is that the reimbursement rate to hospitals, to doctors, to health care providers, becomes so much lower in overall terms that it causes them to cut back. Hospitals will close, particularly in my home State, because so many of them are Medicare and Medicaid dependents. A lot of doctors just will not take Medicare any more because of the reimbursement rates, and even more importantly, what they do with the Medicare Program, what the Republican budget does with the Medicare program, is that it changes the emphasis on the dollars towards HMO's and managed care and

against the traditional fee-for-service system where the senior had the opportunity to go and choose their own doctor. It does that in a very insidious way, by saying that the growth that is allowed, if you will, in funding is more in the HMO or managed care side and less on the traditional fee-for-service side where you choose your own doctor, and then, even worse, if you look at this conference agreement on the budget, it says that if they cannot save the \$270 billion in cuts that are proposed in what they propose by moving so many seniors into managed care, then what they do is they have what they call a fail-safe mechanism that basically makes even more cuts again in the traditional fee-for-service system. So what you are going to have is a lot of seniors that cannot find a doctor of their choice.

THAT IS BILL CLINTON SPEAKING,  
NOT NEWT GINGRICH

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is very timely for me to speak at this point particularly regarding the issue of Medicare. As a physician I previously took care of many seniors in the Medicare plan. Before I get into some of the comments that have been made today about the Medicare issue, I do want to just stress to all my colleagues that we can get out of here if the President will sign our continuing resolution that simply calls for a 7-year balanced budget with CBO numbers.

Mr. Speaker, the President himself has said that we should balance the budget in 5 years, not 7 years, and the President himself has said that CBO numbers are the more accurate numbers, and to stay here, and stay here, and legislate, and legislate when the problem is at the White House, I think is fully inappropriate, and I really want to talk about this Medicare issue because there has been in my opinion—well, let me just say this. Let me quote from the New York or Washington Post which I think said it very well, what is going on with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle as well as with the President?

The Washington Post said, Bill Clinton and the congressional Democrats were handed an unusual chance this year to deal constructively with the effect of Medicare on the deficit, and they blew it. The Democrats, led by the President, choose instead to present themselves as Medicare's great protectors. They have shamelessly used the issue, just as we have seen tonight, and demagogued on it because they think that is where the votes are and the way to derail the Republican proposals generally.

Now I would like to go back in time about 2 years, to a day in April 1993 when President Clinton was addressing