

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