

This could be one of the greatest Christmas gifts that we could give the American people, my children, and our future grandchildren, and the children of the gentleman from Arizona, to get this down so that they can be liberated and free.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, because he makes an incredibly valid point that really should be the foundation of our labors in the days to come. As the controversy continues to surround this new direction in which we are heading, returning to those values which made us great, it is worth noting that in the spirit of the season, the greatest gift we can give to our children, we can give to our grandparents, we can give to our parents, and we can give to generations yet unborn, is a stable environment in which this constitutional Republic can flourish, and individual initiative can be rewarded.

So, that is the challenge and that is the great gift and the great opportunity that we trust our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us in giving the American people this season of the year.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield just a moment, because the gentleman from Arizona has been deeply involved in, and started, what has been called the Constitutional Caucus. I would ask the gentleman if the Founding Fathers were alive today, does the gentleman think they would find that we have a constitutional government existing and operating in Washington?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming the time, I thank the gentleman for the question. I think they would find a government that has become a hybrid, and I do not mean that in a good sense. I know the gentleman has great background in agriculture. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say a mutant, constitutionally mutated from this document here, which is our cornerstone, read and reshaped and stretched oftentimes beyond recognition from its original intent to fit the explosive growth of an evermore centralized bureaucracy, a bureaucracy that spends even more.

So, we have stretched it out. It is our mission, and that is why I am so glad to have our colleague from Kansas to join in restoring constitutional government, recognizing the legislative branch has every bit the role of self-examination and introspection that the judicial branch is afforded through the notion of judicial review, that the executive branch uses, that we together, with those other two branches, can restore constitutional government. That is exactly the challenge to use this timeless document as we confront the next century.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I think it also ties into this overall issue of the budget debate. If we would get back to what the Founding Fathers had envisioned of a limited Federal Government and saying this is a limited government of lim-

ited powers, the Federal Government would not be 22 percent of the economy. It would not be the burden that it is today. We would not have as much centralization; we would have much more decentralization and things out amongst the people where they could control them closer to home and closer to them.

That was the original design, and I think we have gotten away from that to our peril. The gentleman has a particularly good effort going on, that before any bill is introduced, before it is taken up on the floor, that the constitutional basis for that bill would be discussed.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming the time, and the purposes to which we must reaffirm ourselves, to which we must devote our attentions, for just as we take an oath, as we took an oath in this Chamber collectively, just as the newest Member, the gentleman from Illinois did today, taking an oath to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States, it is more than lip service.

Mr. Speaker, good people may disagree and we champion those disagreements and we want to have open, honest debate on different priorities, but I think the gentleman from Kansas really hit the nail on the head when he discussed the Jeffersonian ideal, the ideal of the one whom our friends on the other side of the aisle claim as their ideological benefactor, one of their Founders.

□ 1615

When Jefferson called for limited and effective government, that is the distinction, not that Government should be reduced beyond recognition so that the people are not empowered, that Government has a rightful role in society, but it is a limited and effective Federal Government which makes the difference and to which the gentleman from Kansas has devoted his energies, indeed as part of this new majority. I thank him for all the efforts he has made in so many different ways to realize that dream for our children, for our parents, for our grandparents, and, indeed, for the American Nation.

Again, it is worth noting and we again issue the challenge. To those who disagree with us, Mr. Speaker, to those who offer the endless mantra of disinformation about so-called Draconian cuts with reference to the Medicare Plus Program, again, Mr. Speaker, we ask them, show us the mathematical operation that takes an increase from \$4,800 of spending per Medicare beneficiary this year and over 6 years time increases it to \$7,100 per beneficiary, show us where that is a cut, and \$1 million will be paid to them.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would not this. I cited Benjamin Franklin earlier. Will Rogers offered an update in the mid-20th century before his untimely death: "The only thing certain is death and taxes, but death does not get worse every time Congress meets."

#### THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I would like to again call attention to the fact that as of 3 o'clock this afternoon, the Nation's Federal debt, official debt, is \$4,988,313,115,981.39. Very interesting, this is again an additional decrease of \$126 million, actually almost \$127 million.

As a new Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I did not come here with all of the answers, and very frankly I am not sure I even understood all of the problems. But one of the problems that I want to bring to my colleagues' attention today is that a member of the Committee on the Budget asked me earlier in the week whether this number was accurate. Under his recollection, the national debt limit was actually \$4.9 trillion. As we can see, the number before us today is \$4.988 trillion plus \$300 million, or literally \$4 trillion, \$988 billion, \$88 billion more than the official national debt.

Frankly, that caused me to go back to my office staff and question whether we had appropriately researched the number. Well, lo and behold, we have researched the number, and this is the correct number because, in addition to the \$4.9 trillion of Federal debt, we have authorized another \$88 billion of debt that does not count against the limit.

As if that were not enough, earlier in the week, Mr. Speaker, I addressed this Chamber on the basis of a New York Times article from Wednesday, December 6, 1995, wherein it indicated that the administration, since November 15 of this year, has actually borrowed another \$61.3 billion on top of the \$88 billion that does not count as part of the national debt. In addition to the \$4.9 trillion that is the national debt, the administration borrowed that \$61 billion from the Federal Civil Service retirement accounts and that apparently that was permissible under law. I hope that in the earlier vote in the afternoon that we are able to pass a measure that will preclude that.

The point I want to make today is that, the more I as a new Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, learn about the nature and the extent of the problems with Federal spending, the more alarmed I become. Literally, just in the last 3 days I have found \$88 billion of debt that we were not counting against the national debt. That is on top again of another \$60 billion that has been borrowed out of Civil Service retirement accounts. That is over \$150 billion. We were not even counting it. We are not even counting it. This is over and above the congressionally authorized limit of \$4.9 trillion.

I have to mention this afternoon that another bit of information came to my

attention. That is that the new budget, Mr. Speaker, that has been submitted by the administration is actually not going to balance within 7 years. This is a serious issue because we came to a solemn agreement about 3 weeks ago wherein the administration and the Congress agreed that we were going to balance the budget in 7 years and use Congressional Budget Office numbers. Again, there was an issue of debate over whether we should use CBO numbers of OMB numbers.

To be perfectly honest, I do not care whose numbers we use, but we owe it to the children of this country and to the public to use the most conservative numbers. If we are going to meet the goal of balancing the budget in 7 years, I think we should take the most cautious course to get there.

The issue in Washington, in this body, Mr. Speaker, is not whether we are going to balance the Federal budget, because we are going to balance the Federal budget. The question is how. That is where partisan debate is appropriate, where Republicans can present their version of how to balance the Federal budget; Democrats can present their view of how to balance the Federal budget. And together, like all of the households in my district, including Republican households, Democratic households, Independent households, all of whom have to take responsibility for balancing their budgets, and they may do it differently. That is what is wonderful about America, is that we do have a lot of differences between us, but we need here in this body, as Republicans and Democrats, to come together to balance the Federal budget.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that over the next 24 hours as we approach tomorrow's deadline that we will once and for all be able to work together, Republicans and Democrats in this body, with a Democratic President who will keep his word and submit a budget that will balance in 7 years.

#### THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by following up on what the previous speaker said about tomorrow. As many of us know, tomorrow is the day when the continuing resolution expires. This was the agreement that both Democrats and Republicans, both Congress and the President, agreed a few weeks ago that they would extend operations, Government operations and not shut down the Government while we continued to try to work toward a budget agreement.

It is unfortunate that tomorrow is about to arrive and we still have not worked out that budget agreement. But I think the most important thing is that the Government not shut down

again and that tomorrow, even if a budget agreement is not going to be reached, which I do not think is likely at this point, that we pass another continuing resolution so that the Government continue to operate.

I was very upset this morning when I read that, although President Clinton had offered a continuing resolution to continue the operations of the Government for at least another week or possibly beyond, and although the Republican leadership in the Senate had agreed to a similar continuation, that Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership in this House had not. I would hate to see, once again, that after tomorrow the Government shuts down.

I would urge the Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership in this House, along with what the Senate has decided and what President Clinton has decided, which is that we should put our differences aside and not use the Government shutdown as leverage toward trying to pressure one group or the other into its own ideology. My view is that the Government should continue to operate while the President and the Congress, while the Democrats and the Republicans try to find common ground on the budget.

Let me also add that as the previous speaker said, there really is no disagreement anymore that we should achieve a balanced budget or even on the timetable of approximately 7 years. But there are still major disagreements over the priorities. I would suggest that part of that agreement a few weeks ago on the continuing resolution to keep the Government open specifically said that the priorities would include Medicare, Medicaid, the environment and education and that these programs, particularly Medicare and Medicaid, would continue to be viable and cover the people who are now eligible for them in a manner which ensures quality health care for Medicare and Medicaid recipients.

The President put forth a 7-year balanced budget within the last week or so that made sure that Medicare and Medicaid, the environment and education were properly provided for and guaranteed that those programs would continue to cover everyone and that quality health care would be ensured for seniors and low-income individuals under the two Federal health care programs. But the Republican leadership has not come back with a similar proposal. So far they have not put forward any compromise plan that would not only achieve a balanced budget in 7 years but also put sufficient funds in the Medicare and Medicaid programs and provide a guarantee that those people who are now eligible for Medicare and Medicaid would continue to be provided for.

I want to stress today in the time that I have allotted to me the problems that would occur, particularly with regard to the Medicaid program, if the budget that was passed by the Repub-

licans in this House and in the Senate and the one that was vetoed by the President were to take effect. We now know that this budget is not going to take effect because the President has vetoed it. When he vetoed it in his message he specifically said that Medicaid was a major reason for the veto and that the major problem he had with the Republican Medicaid proposal under this budget was that it failed to guarantee health care coverage for those people who are now covered by Medicaid. When we talk about Medicaid, we are talking about health insurance for low-income people in this country. Most of those are either senior citizens or children or the disabled or, in some cases also, pregnant women.

Right now under Federal law people below a certain income who are not covered by any other health insurance are eligible for Medicaid. The Federal Government guarantees them that as an entitlement, as we say. And they are also provided with certain standard coverage. In other words, not only are they guaranteed health insurance but they are given certain things as part of an overall health care package which is similar to what most Americans get, although in many cases maybe not quite the same quality or the same extensive coverage. It is a pretty good health care package.

The problem that the President has with the Republican budget and the problem that I and most of the Democrats have is that this Medicaid program under the Republican proposal would basically be turned over to the States. The money would be block granted. It would be up to the States to decide who would be eligible and what they would be eligible for. So for the first time in probably 30 years since Medicaid was enacted here in this House, for the first time you would no longer have an entitlement or a guarantee that the people who now receive Medicaid could continue to have the coverage.

If we block grant the money and the amount of money which is allocated is significantly less, which it is under the Republican proposal, it is a cut of about \$163 billion. Then we are not only not guaranteeing coverage for a lot of the people who now have Medicaid coverage, but we are also making sure that because less money is going to the States in real terms, that the States will have to cut back on who is eligible or perhaps cut back on the kind of benefits that are provided to those who they plan to cover under Medicaid.

This is a major problem. It is a major problem because what it ultimately would lead to is that the ranks of the uninsured in this country would grow. Right now we estimate that there are about 35 to 40 million Americans who have no health insurance, many of them working. If we are now going to increase the ranks of those people and add 5 or 10 million more people to the