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 maintain 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 temproe. 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