

States to decide who they were going to cover. So for those 37 million Americans who now receive Medicaid payments or Medicaid benefits, all of a sudden, some of them may not receive it, and it would be up to the States to decide.

President Clinton has asserted that it is crucial to maintain a Federal guarantee for Medicaid for those 37 million people, and that is one of the reasons he is going to or is likely to veto this bill, because it does not guarantee their coverage. Basically, what the doctors are saying, what the AMA is saying, is that they are concerned that States, because of the budget crunch, because they may not have the money to make up for the loss of Federal dollars that are going to come to the States in a block grant under the Republican proposal, will simply cut back on the number of people who are eligible, or on the quality of care. Basically, what they are saying is that because of the budget crisis that States face, they are going to have the same problem and they are not going to be able to actually cover all of these people.

The AMA said today in *The New York Times* that the Federal Government should establish basic national standards of uniform eligibility for Medicaid, and should prescribe the minimum package of benefits that would be available to poor people in all States, basic standards of uniform, minimum, adequate benefits of Medicaid recipients.

So what they are saying is that there should be a Federal standard, there should be a Federal guarantee for who is eligible for Medicaid, who gets the health insurance, and what kind of quality care will be provided for those low-income people.

The trustees of the AMA also said, there needs to be an appropriate balance between States interest in securing increased flexibility in light of fewer Federal funds for Medicaid and the very real needs of the people the Medicaid program is intended to serve, most of whom have no other means of access to health care coverage.

One of the arguments that the Republican leadership have put forth is that Medicaid should be more flexible and that is why it should go back to the States. However, what the doctors are saying is, it is very nice to have flexibility, but we have to make sure that the people who are covered by Medicaid now do have health care coverage. I know that that is going to be an important consideration for the President during these negotiations.

BUDGET REQUIRES GOOD-FAITH NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey

[Mr. PALLONE] just gave some figures, and although I know he is well intentioned, I think some of the information that he gave out is not quite accurate.

I would like to give a few figures to the people who may be paying attention to my colleagues. For instance, the earned income tax credit. In 1995 we are spending almost \$20 billion on the earned income tax credit, and my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], the head of the Theme Team, points out that it is going to go up to \$25.4 billion. That is a 28-percent increase.

They keep talking about cuts.

□ 1830

It is an increase of 28 percent. The School Lunch Program is going from \$4.5 billion to \$6.17 billion. That is a 37-percent increase. Student loans, they keep saying we are cutting student loans. They are going from \$24.5 billion to \$36.5 billion. That is almost a 50-percent increase.

Medicaid, they beat on Medicaid all the time. Medicaid, we are spending \$89 billion, it is going to \$127 billion. That is a 43-percent increase. And Medicare, they are trying to scare the senior citizens to death in this country. Medicare, we are spending in 1995 \$178 billion and it is going up over \$111 billion. That is a 63-percent increase over the next 7 years.

Think about that. All we hear is how we are cutting, and we are increasing all of these programs from 28 percent up to 63 percent. Medicare is going up from \$178 billion to \$290 billion. So do not believe all the baloney you are hearing from my Democrat colleagues.

Let me talk about something that I think is extremely important. On November 19, 2 weeks ago, President Clinton, in writing, agreed to negotiate a 7-year balanced budget using Congressional Budget Office figures. He agreed to that on November 19.

On November 20, the next day, his chief of staff, Leon Panetta, said that maybe we could reach an agreement on 7 or 8 years and he went on to say, "But I don't think the American people ought to read a lot into what was agreed to last night." In other words, he was starting to back away from the agreement the President signed the day before.

Two days later, on Wednesday, Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin began talking to reporters about a 9-year budget. Three days before the President agreed to a 7-year budget and he agreed to use Congressional Budget Office figures. Here we are, 3 days later, his Treasury secretary said, "I think our 9-year budget is every bit as valid as their premise. I've never understood how 7 years got canonized."

But the President already signed the agreement, Mr. Secretary Rubin. He had signed the agreement. Yet 3 days later you are saying, "Well, it's not really that important."

Then on Tuesday, November 28, the Washington Post reported "a senior ad-

ministration official said yesterday" that an outcome without a reconciliation bill, balanced budget act, preserves our priorities and not theirs. Once again they are moving away from it.

The Post went on to say even President Clinton in two interviews this month made the case that operating the government under reduced spending bills and leaving the big budget issues until 1997 would not be a bad outcome. In other words, he is not going to negotiate a 7-year balanced budget agreement as he said he would because he said it would be better to run the government on short-term spending bills through the elections in 1996, I guess for political reasons, because he thinks it would be good for him.

But then let us see what the head of the Federal Reserve said, Alan Greenspan. He testified before Congress in November and he warned that failure to reach a balanced budget agreement would lead to higher interest rates, higher home mortgage rates, and that the economy would go downhill and suffer.

So as the President made this agreement for a balanced budget in 7 years using CBO figures, he and his staff knew that it was just to get over the hump that we had caused by closing down the government. He did not really mean it. That is why they are not negotiating in good faith. They have not sent up anything.

Chairman KASICH of the Committee on the Budget has held up our agreement time and time again on television saying, "Here is our proposed budget. Where is the President's?" And it was a blank hand he held up in conjunction with that.

We need to have a proposal from the President to get to a balanced budget in 7 years, as he agreed to, using CBO figures, and cut out this politics. If we do not do it, according to the Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, we are likely to see people buying homes having to pay much higher monthly payments, much higher mortgage rates. Interest rates on everything would go up. As a result, sales and the economy will go downhill.

Mr. Speaker, if the President does not begin negotiating in good faith, the budget talks will break down. This will lead or could lead to another Government shutdown. It could also cause severe economic problems. If this happens, the American people should and I hope will hold President Clinton accountable.

COMPREHENSIVE ANTITERRORISM ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today I am, along with my Judiciary Committee colleagues, BILL MCCOLLUM, LAMAR SMITH, and BOB BARR introducing a revised antiterrorism bill.