

agreement and that used Congressional Budget Office figures as the building blocks, as the revenue projections, the inflationary effect and so forth.

The President vetoed this bill. That is the President's prerogative, not only constitutionally, under the Constitution of the United States, of course, but under the agreement which also said there would be adequate funding for certain programs and if the President felt that the increases that that budget included for Medicare and Medicaid were not sufficient, then the President could go ahead and veto.

But the Congress has then made a very reasonable requests: "Mr. President, if you feel that our budget does not adequately protect certain priorities, show us your budget under the exact same framework. Put forward a budget under the exact same framework. Put forward a budget that is balanced in 7 years and uses the Congressional Budget Office economic projections and is shown to be balanced in 7 years under the CBO numbers, and show us how exactly you would protect your priorities."

□ 0915

If you want to spend more on one program, what do you propose to spend differently, or how do you propose to have a different tax structure in order to pay for it? The point is that if the President of the United States is going to veto the congressional budget, which again is his privilege, he should then put out his budget on the same framework.

Further negotiations I think are impossible unless we are dealing with budgets that are put together under the same measuring yardstick, apples to apples if you will. Unless the President puts forward a budget under the same yardstick, there is no way we can compare, well, this is how we funded a certain program and this is how the President would fund the same program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to comply with our agreement and come forth with a budget.

PEOPLE ARE BEHIND THE BUDGET FIGURES

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, there has been much name calling, there has been rhetoric, there has been invective as we face the second Government shutdown of this year with really no end in sight, and as previous speakers have talked, the first one was the longest in the history of our Nation.

I think the President made a very valuable and very important point yesterday when he talked about the fact that there are people behind these figures. When you talk about cuts in Med-

icare and you talk about cuts in Medicaid, when you talk about adult children being held responsible for paying the nursing home bills for their parents, taking money out of the funds they would use to purchase a home, taking funds that they would use to send their children to college, we may be balancing the budget in the short run, but in the long run, our Nation will be much weaker. Those children of the adult children will be less educated.

I can remember back in the early 1980's when a Republican President named Ronald Reagan was pushing the same kind of idea, that somehow these massive tax cuts for wealthy individuals and wealthy corporations were going to trickle down and were going to help those of us that were on the lower side, those of us that were working individuals.

Let me tell you what happened in my area of southwestern Pennsylvania during that period of time. We lost in 13 counties 155,000 manufacturing jobs. No one ran away with those tax breaks. The rich corporations and the rich individuals did not reinvest that money in this country, and they are not going to do it now.

We are talking about taking money out of Medicare, taking money out of Medicaid, making adult children pay for the care that their working parents paid for with their tax dollars over the last 30 years, since 1965, when Medicare and Medicaid were passed in this House and were signed by President Johnson. They are taking that money and giving it away to the wealthy corporations of this Nation.

That is what it is about. It is about a transfer of wealth. It did not work in the 1980's, it blindsided our working people, and it is not going to work again in the 1990's, and President Clinton is very correct when he stands up and says that he will veto this.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to sit down and rebalance our priorities, not just balance our budget.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, good morning to my colleagues and good morning to America. It is clear now that we have a congressional majority that lacks the maturity to govern this Nation's budgetary processes. We have arrived again at an impasse in which the Congress has failed to pass a budget and the spending bills necessary in an acceptable enough form in which the President of the United States would sign them, which is the responsibility of the Congress.

It is perhaps a good thing that the President is attempting to work with congressional leaders to help them figure through a shared approach to the

budget, but it is the Congress' responsibility to pass a budget as outlined in the U.S. Constitution. We have arrived at a point today at which the seemingly clear set of circumstances lead us to believe that the House Republicans, NEWT GINGRICH and his colleagues, are the single stumbling block to us arriving at a budget agreement.

We have the President, we have Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats who want to find a way to get the country back on the right track. House Democrats are prepared to work. But we have House Republicans who seem to in a childish way want to hold fast to their own particular viewpoint of how the budget ought to work out, a viewpoint that the American public has soundly rejected in every single poll that has been done over the last few months.

They keep pushing something that no one else is buying. The American public says "We don't want to cut education, we don't want to cut Medicaid, we do not want to see these programs eradicated. What we want to see is a more responsible approach that would lead us away from tax cuts, lead us away from increasing defense spending when it is not necessary, when it is well over what the Pentagon has even recommended." The American public has said no to the Republican budget, but yet NEWT GINGRICH and the House Republicans keep wanting to sell us something that no one is buying. That is why we have arrived again at this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that as we face this new day here in the Congress, that some common sense would come to the majority, that they would stop acting in immature ways, because I think they really threaten their very majority in the ways they are acting now.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, the problem we are facing today is not a discussion between spending priorities. The problem we are facing today is that the President's budget leaves the Federal checkbook \$70 billion overdrawn. I have a chart with me that shows me where we were last week in terms of deficits. This bottom line is where the deficits were over the last week.

You will notice in the year 2002, all of last week we had a Presidential proposal that left us \$115 billion overdrawn. On Friday of last week, the President brought us a new proposal. Here is what it did. It took the \$115 billion deficit and it reduced it to a point where it was a \$70 billion deficit. The problem with this is that it is still \$70 billion out of whack in the 7th year.

Let me make this as clear as I can possibly make it. The proposal that we