

a basic disagreement with many of my colleagues on the other side because I believe the differences over this budget between Democrats and Republican, even if you compare the coalition budget to the budget that the Republican majority passed, the differences are significant. They are going to take weeks to work out. This is not something that can be worked out at the stroke of a pen.

There are differences over entitlement status of Medicaid; over standards that are going to be applied for Medicaid for nursing homes; difference over environmental protection. I think in many ways it is sort of naive to suggest that somehow this can be worked out in 48 hours or 72 hours or a week or even 2 weeks.

So, as these negotiations go on, and we eventually reach an agreement that both sides can live with, it makes sense to keep the Government open. There is no way this is going to happen overnight.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON]. I have a stopwatch on my wrist that counts down in 5 minutes, so what I would like to do is yield the gentleman 5 minutes and he will control that 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Has that been CBO scored?

Mr. DEUTSCH. It is my cheap little plastic watch.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up on the discussion of the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Arizona. I think it is relevant.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the Democrats are fond of saying, and, Mr. LOWEY, I hear it said all the time, is that we are behind on the appropriation process. I would say that is accurate, but I would also say it is a lot more difficult when we are trying to reduce and consolidate government than when we are spending or renewing "as is" with a 10-percent increase.

But let us say the Committee on Appropriations is very much guilty as charged. Why are you not as equally outraged then that the President of the United States is not guilty of not submitting a balanced budget when on June 4, 1992, he said, "I will have a budget balanced in 4 years"? And we had all kinds of speeches where he said: I am going to support a balanced budget. I am or not. But he has not.

One thing about these freshmen who get kicked so much is that they came here with a contract, albeit not everyone may have liked it on the other side of the aisle. But they said what they

were going to do and they did it. They made it clear they were going to balance the budget. When did we first pass it? October? Where is the President? Where is his budget.

Mrs. LOWEY. If my good friend from Georgia would yield, I think we can go back, you and I are on the Committee on Appropriations and we can talk about the \$7 billion increase in the military budget that the Pentagon did not ask for. We could talk about the cut in afterschool jobs and heating assistance for the elderly.

Let us talk about where we are today. It seems to me from all accounts, from personal accounts and talking to my colleagues, from reading the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, and Democrats and Republicans both, I do not know that we all respect it but we certainly read it, the President is very engaged in the process, as my good colleague from New Jersey said.

Mr. KINGSTON. But where is his budget?

Mrs. LOWEY. Let me finish this. What we are saying is that there are real differences of opinion in how to resolve Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, among other issues. There are real differences of opinion.

So, why can we not continue this debate? And the President is involved. He is involved in the discussion. He has been there all day, I understand, working around the clock, and this has been going on for more than a week. Why can we not open the Government?

My good friend from Georgia, one other point. I still cannot understand why we cannot continue this debate, talk about how we reform Medicare, and the gentleman mentioned welfare. I had a welfare reform bill that I worked on 2 years ago, because I understand welfare is not working. I want to shake up the system, but I do not want to close down the Government and put all these people out of work, hurt our economy irreparably.

These businessmen who have contracts are not going to get these contracts back to make up for all the lost opportunities they have and the damages to their business. I hope they can stay in business. So why can we not open the government up, continue our discussion about welfare, Medicaid, education, and the environment?

We may still differ, but that is the democratic way. Why should we have a constitutional crisis where some people are saying, "If you cannot do it my way, it is no way"? That does not make sense to me, and I know my good friend and I could sit down and iron out our differences. Let us all do that together. Open up the government and let us continue this discussion.

Mr. KINGSTON. If I could have 10 seconds, I want to say one thing, just to nitpick. The President was on a golfing junket over New Year's at Hilton Head. He was not negotiating.

Mrs. LOWEY. President DOLE was campaigning.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I would say that is very optimistic thinking by the gentlewoman, and we welcome her to our side.

Mr. DEUTSCH. The gentleman from Georgia still controls 1 minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate both gentlemen for yielding. There were a couple of points that I think needs to be closed on and then we could move to what we could do if we were negotiating the budget ourselves to present to the American people potential consensus.

But the first and most fundamental point is why can we not do this while the government continues? That would be under a continuing resolution, and there is nothing to prohibit a continuing resolution to last an entire year.

If my colleagues remember, I do not know if they were here for that moment, but President Reagan brought to the table when he gave a State of the Union address a continuing resolution and he slammed it down and he said, "Do not send me any more of these."

□ 2145

That was after the Government had run for almost a year under continuing resolutions. So the flaw in the gentlewoman's argument is this: If we give a continuing resolution this week for another week, it could easily run to 52 weeks, and it is not made up because we have precedent from the Reagan Administration that it does run that long, and that means we postpone by 1 year, frankly, until the presidential election what needs to be done within 7. That is a substantial reason why the gentlewoman's suggestion is not, in my judgment, practicable.

Mrs. LOWERY. If I could respond to the distinguished gentleman from California, what I perceive as a flaw in your argument, if we believe that there are serious differences in how to reform Medicare, how to reform Medicaid, how deep a cut there should be in environmental programs, what are EPA's responsibilities, what we should be doing with the Department of Education, these are serious issues which we have discussed in Appropriations. We have discussed in the authorizing committees.

If we cannot resolve these differences within the next month or the next 2 months, and the President has made it very clear that he is determined to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, then we may have to continue this debate into the next election. I would hope that we can resolve it before, but it may not be possible to resolve it. Then the American people may have to decide.

But I just do not understand the view of the gentleman from California that we should keep the Government closed and we will not use the word hostage, keep the government closed while we are having a very serious debate about our priorities.

One of the gentlemen mentioned before that the President has vetoed some bills, and in fact the bill, Labor, Health, Human Services, has not even come to his desk. I am on that subcommittee, and that is the bill that funds the Department of Social Services, the National Institutes of Health, where critical research is being done, and the reason that bill has not come to his desk is because the Senate Republicans and Democrats would not support it as has come through the House. So we are having a serious discussion about priorities in this country. Let us continue that discussion.

The President is engaged. But why do we have to close down Government?

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate your yielding. I think the gentlewoman's comments are candid and, in that sense, extremely helpful. I do believe there is a significant sentiment, whether the gentlewoman is of that view or not, this matter ought to be put over until the November election. But I watched with care and listened with care to the words that the gentlewoman used. She pointed out if the budget crisis continues, then perhaps, I think it was correct, the gentlewoman said perhaps, the matter would have to be kicked over until the presidential election. Then the people could decide.

I think, by the way, it is amusing, the Member of the other body characterized as the leading contender for the nomination on our side also proposed a continuing resolution under the theory it would be in his interest to have the matter put over until the presidential referendum. But in that candid concession by the gentlewoman, we have, I think, exactly why the proposal of a continuing resolution is not acceptable, and that is that it will postpone for 1 full year from October, when the budget was due, to November of next year when a presidential election take place, and we do not have a year to waste.

Second and last, in response to the gentlewoman, I said that it might be useful to discuss what can be done. If this body were to put forward a budget, and I think there is potential, great potential, for give, just speaking for myself, I always thought the tax cut was the least part of a budget balance, and I also, with respect, believe that the Budget Director, Mr. Panetta, my former colleague from California, had it right 4 years ago when he said that the growth of the entitlement had to be restricted if we were ever going to balance the budget, and my former colleague from California proposed \$400 billion to be taken out of the growth of Medicare over an 8-year period. It makes it difficult, it seems to me, for him to speak now that a \$270 billion reduction from the growth of Medicare over 7 years is Draconian.

So, suppose our side were to give something on the tax cut and the President's side and the minority side was to give something regarding the

necessity to restrain the growth of the Medicare entitlement, I believe agreement is possible. And in that sense, we then would not need to have the Government shut down 1 day further.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If I could respond, let me respond, I think this really has been very healthy. I think there are some of us on our side, and hopefully there is a realization for some of you on your side as well, that as hard as we work as individuals and collectively as a body, that at the end of the day there might not be an agreement, that although there are general areas of agreement, that disagreement in terms of Medicare, your proposals, and what most of us want to see happen are really totally different. We see the problem differently. We, many of us, see the problem the same way you do on welfare reform, but there are some areas where we do not, and I guess my question to you is that I think you as individuals and collectively need to come to a realization that there might not be a point, I mean, we are hoping and we are working, we are up late at night tonight, and hopefully they are still at the White House working to come to that agreement, but if those agreements, if those disagreements are such that there cannot be a compromise, I mean, I absolutely believe that the approach to try to leverage President Bill Clinton is just not going to work.

I mean Bill Clinton, you know, whatever someone might think of him, is not someone who is going to be intimidated by pressure, by threats or by anything like that. I think a lot of people on your side think that he is going to be. I think you are totally misreading the man, and because of that there is a possibility that this might last not 12 months, as the gentleman has said several times at this point, 10 months, and I guess what I still do not understand is what is the big deal about the 1-month period, and then maybe at that point we have 9 months.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The big deal is we do not have the time left. The clock is way past midnight on the budget and the debt of the United States.

The gentleman has been candid, as the gentlewoman was candid, about saying they expect the possibility, I am not trying to put unfair words in the gentleman's mouth, but expect the possibility, it might be that we do not have a resolution for 10 months. Well, dating it from October, when the budget was due, it is 13 months.

The point is we cannot afford that amount of time when we have 7 years to the halfway point before the baby-boomers start retiring.

But it is a candid admission, and I believe that, Mr. Speaker, that large numbers of my good friends and colleagues on the minority side would be willing to live with that, would be will-

ing to live with why do not we just cool it, postpone it, let a year run, let the people decide.

But the problem is it will only be worse in 1 year, and we also have an obligation. The question was asked by the gentleman what harm from reopening the Government while the discussions continue? There is no harm in reopening the Government while the discussions continue. The harm is the expenditures under the continuing resolution that it would take to keep the Government open for a period of 12 months.

Almost, although I am glad my comment caused such a response, I will be pleased to yield, and I will just finish my comment. The dimension of a continuing resolution of the nature to take us to the November elections, which has certainly been discussed by the gentleman from Florida and the gentlewoman from New York, would postpone for 1 year any structural reform. There is no dispute about that.

I put to you, from the experience of the Reagan years, it would not last for 10 months if it did not maintain present expenditure levels.

Mr. PALLONE. If the gentleman would yield, I simply disagree with what you are saying about a continuing resolution.

First of all, I would point out that when you talk about a 7-year budget or a 10-year budget or whatever, you are basically guessing, if you will, about what is going to happen beyond the first year. The bottom line is that you could, first of all, let us point out we are only talking about certain agencies of Government maybe about half of the appropriation bills or half of the agencies right now.

If you were able to craft a continuing resolution either for a day or a month or right until October 1, that basically appropriated funds at the level that you anticipated in your, in the first year of your 7-year budget, you would accomplish that goal, and there are many people who maintain, there are many people who maintain the only real part of a 7-year or even a 10-year budget is the first year because that is the only part that you really have specific control over.

So I would maintain that if you craft the CR so that it is exactly like what you are proposing in the first year of your budget, then your concerns disappear, and we continue to operate and try come to an agreement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate it, the observations of the gentleman from New Jersey elucidate exactly why the continuing resolution is so dangerous, because everyone knows the real money is in the out years, and that is true in the Coalition budget, it is true in the Republican budget, it is true in the President's budget, although the latter did not score under CBO numbers. So it would be the easiest thing in the world to say we will agree to the first year, because the first year has no

pain. If we have a budget agreement, we have a structure in place which gets us to zero. The easiest thing in the world is to make it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield further, I think my friend from New Jersey would remark upon my restraint during the course of this. I thank the gentleman for the time.

The question came, why do not we let this go, why do not we let the next election be the referendum on this, and I would respectfully suggest that again that is a postponement of what was decided in November of 1994, and we affirmed last month in a special election in California.

We are certainly in this representative form of Government in this republic to make those decisions, not to go, to use the metaphor that I used in my previous life and have been in another walk of life, to go into a 4-corners offense and delay and delay and delay the work that should be done now.

Mrs. LOWEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I just would like to respond to my good friend from Arizona. There are various interpretations of the last election. Some feel it was mandate. Some feel it was a mandate for a revolution.

In my district, I think most of us feel we had one revolution in this country, that is enough. There was frustration, there was anger. People wanted change. Yes, they wanted welfare to be changed. Yes, they felt that there are too many people without health care.

So I think this debate is very healthy, and we all have differences of opinion within our own party and also among parties. So what we are saying is let us have this healthy debate. Let us put in place a continuing resolution. Let us open the Government.

But I still do not understand, and I know we have been debating for over an hour, why we have to deprive researchers at the National Institutes of Health from getting the resources that they need to fight breast cancer, to fight Alzheimer's disease. I do not understand why we have to say to someone who is turning 65 today, "Happy birthday, but, sorry, you cannot sign on for Social Security."

Let us open the Government. Let us not stand in the corner and say unless you do it my way I am going to turn blue. Let us open the Government and continue this very serious debate.

Many of us in this room have similar priorities, but there may be real differences in priorities among us, and the American people deserve to hear those differences, but not close down the Government.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I want to respond actually to a couple of things because I have been taking notes, and this really is a dialog, and I would really like to respond to a number of things.

The gentleman from California, I think, made a good point in terms of saying that the out years really are more difficult than the just the first year. The first year is difficult as well

in terms of cutbacks that are taking place, real dollars levels less than, not inflation-adjusted or anything else, real dollars less than the previous year, I mean bottom-line reductions in a variety of programs.

But I think what you obviously understand and what people need to understand is next year's Congress can change this budget. I mean, we can only obligate ourselves legally for the year, for while we are here for this year, we cannot obligate ourselves for next year. We are putting a framework in place, so I guess the reason why I bring that out is that your concern, and I am not arguing for a continuing resolution at all and I think you know, maybe it is a realization on our part, that we might not come to a resolution, and that is one of the reasons why, if we were under a balanced budget amendment, we would not be having this debate because that would be the sandbox that we were playing in. And by one vote, we are not having a balanced budget amendment in this country.

This House overwhelmingly supported a balanced budget amendment.

So, again, I guess, let me just really focus in on that point just a little bit more and to say to you that, you know, we are 10 months away from an election. You know, we are having this debate now, and we are not going in circles yet but we are getting close to the point of going in circles, that when we look at what is happening to the economy in this country today on a micro level, whether it is a small city next to Yosemite Park, whether it is a business that cannot get a EPA inspector to inspect a site in Houston, TX, and people get laid off because of that, whether it is a motel in Flamingo, FL, in my district, those are things that are adding up and happening.

You keep saying, and we have heard it now, that you do not want to do the continuing resolution because it sort of frees things up.

□ 2200

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me throw that question right back at you: If we cannot lock in forever and this whole thing is going to be reversed in 10 months, then why can we not reopen the Government by you guys voting for the appropriations bills? It is that simple. You want to reopen the Government? Vote for the appropriations bills. We have already passed 12 out of 13. The one we have not passed, we introduced the Washington, DC continuing resolution today, and it was objected to by one of your Members, and only because of the delicate scurrying around and our high regard on both sides of the aisle did we go back and reopen that we could do a CR for Washington, DC. I am just saying if you want to reopen the government, fine. Vote.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Reclaiming my time, that is also a very good question that needs to be responded to.

Let me talk about the Constitution for a second, because I think the Speaker, speaks of the Constitution and he is a historian of the Constitution. He is a professor. He speaks as a professor quite often.

The Constitution has a role in all this debate. We go back to that. What is our job? Our job is to appropriate. That is our power, going back to the Magna Carta. How many times have we heard the Speaker talk about the Magna Carta? That is our job. We are appropriating. There is a whole process set in place in the Constitution.

The President has a role in our system of government. He has a role in the constitutional authority to veto appropriations bills that he finds objectionable and give to us those reasons. We have the constitutional option at that point, which is to override his veto or to send him another bill.

But one of the questions which your side has not really answered, and, truthfully, it is disturbing, is that all of sudden you as the controlling part in this Chamber have now put into the Constitution a third option which really does not exist in the Constitution, which is what is going on now.

What should be happening is going back and back, because I will tell you absolutely the truth, and I speak with absolute certainty this will happen: If you kept sending the President veto messages, eventually you will get a two-thirds veto override. I guarantee that will happen.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for 5 minutes, when really 10 seconds is needed. Just for the sake of pointing this out, when we talk about the extra-Constitutionality or the implication is that somehow these endeavors are unconstitutional, I would simply point out nowhere in this document do you see the phrase "continuing resolution." Nowhere in this document is it explicitly delineated that above all costs, government will remain open through the process of continuing resolutions.

Good people can disagree about the intent of the Constitution and the dynamism of it and how it can be stretched and pulled and turned or interpreted in different manners. But I think it is worth noting that this is not some sort of sanctified notion that is somehow noble that we go back simply to business as usual and not deal with this question at this juncture in our history, for now the time draws here.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I might, to take up more on this point, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I think his point is very well taken. I wish to respond to the question of the structural change.

The gentleman from Florida, if I could have his attention for a moment,

the gentleman from Florida in debate raised a very good question I think, Mr. Speaker, and that was since next Congress can change, why is it so critical that we put in train now a seven-year plan?

The answer is in order to get to a balanced budget within seven years, we have to change the structures, everybody agrees on that, particularly the structures of the unconstrained growth of entitlements.

Now, we can pass a bill today and it will become law with the President's signature that will begin to restructure those entitlements. It would then take affirmative law to undo it, which is a whole lot different than saying we are going to postpone it for 11 months through a series of continuing resolutions.

So just as a logical point, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Florida would agree that there is a huge difference between having to undo legislation which sets in process structural reforms, and working with essentially no change over the status quo, which is what the continuing resolution does.

I have one last point in my never ending attempt to see if we can work out a budget agreement here on the floor tonight.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Truly historic it would be.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Indeed, I am given great hope by the gentleman from Florida's suggestion that sooner or later if the President keeps vetoing things, we will have two-thirds in this body. God speed the day.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Send him some more budgets.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am game. I am game to stay here to do it. If the gentleman might espouse, I think some constructive debate could be had, and there is value in trying to analyze how we got here, so I am not saying what has been discussed heretofore does not have that value. It does. But if the gentleman from Florida believes that there might be two-thirds support for something that the President does not agree with, boy, am I anxious to hear it.

Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted and yield whatever time I might have on this or future special orders to hear the dimensions of a budget understanding that would get two-thirds.

I happen to believe that that is one increasingly likely option. I laid out at least in broad outline what the dimensions of such a deal might be, with give on our side and give on your side. Mr. Speaker, I would be very interested if the gentleman from Florida might at some point or his colleagues from New Jersey or New York, put to us some dimensions of a budget deal that would get two-thirds, the objection of the President notwithstanding?

Mrs. LOWEY. If I could respond to the gentleman?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Before my friend from New York begins, my friend from

Florida raised a point, he mentioned the balanced budget amendment. Did all three of you join with the majority to vote for the balanced budget amendment?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Two-thirds of us.

Mr. HAYWORTH. You and the gentleman from New Jersey, and the gentlewoman from New York had problems with it.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to respond to my good friend from Georgia and then California in talking about the appropriations process. I would hope all listening tonight would understand that if the appropriations bills had been completed by October 1, we would not be in this predicament now. I would assure my good friend, who is the Chair of the Foreign Operations Committee on Appropriations, who is totally frustrated because extraneous provisions are constantly being tacked on that cannot get through the Senate, and instead of the normal process where people could agree to drop it, they are standing firm, and that is why aid to Israel, aid to other critical parts of the world, again, I hate to use the word, are being held hostage to those who want to eliminate all family planning. That is just one example.

There are other extreme provisions that have been tacked on, and I know many of us feel, although I am an abortion advocate, I do not want to have to debate this on the floor anymore. Abortion provisions are being tacked on to appropriations bills. So if you are saying that the President has to be held hostage and agree to some of those extreme provisions or we cannot open the Government, I would just say to my good friend, that is wrong.

I would suggest that you perhaps go back to your caucus and say take off some of those extreme provisions, and then send the appropriations bill to the other body, who will not even deal with Labor-Health-Human Services, as you know, because they do not agree with what the leadership wants to do with it, and let us get some agreement and then send it to the President. That is my first point.

The second point that I just wanted to make, I do not believe that our forefathers, if they were here today, would say "Let's have a debate. But if we cannot agree, let us shut down the Government." I do not think that provision is anywhere in the Constitution either that provides for shutting down the Government if there is sincere differences of opinion between Republicans and Democrats or between the administration and this body.

We have to have a serious debate, we have to continue the discussion, but let us open the Government.

One other point I would like to mention to my colleague from California, which follows up on what my colleague from Florida said: I was with a group of businessmen this week talking about the budget and talking about options, and I would like to say there are serious people on both sides trying to come

to some kind of compromise. These were CEO's of major corporations that meet with me regularly and give me advice. They said, "We can't be sure of economic conditions one year from now or two years from now." I think we could all agree on that. So we have to respect differences of opinion.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I am going to be really fair and assume that I took over that 5 minutes. Actually, let me take about 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman from California's question. I think it is a very serious question and a very good question.

I would tell you, I really believe there is a middle ground that unfortunately, I will be honest with you, I do not think either party represents. I think what the President said privately, I do not believe he said it publicly, he wants a budget that 100 Republicans and 100 Democrats will vote for. But the truth is in this Chamber, the way this process works, we are never going to have an opportunity to vote for a budget that 107 Democrats and Republicans will vote for, but we might.

Let me follow through on that thought, because something is going to give. What is going to give is either there is going to be a two-thirds, or it might not, projecting the way this thing is going to play itself out.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the gentleman would yield for a moment, I wanted to respond to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Please, to the extent you have the President's ear, and I believe you have more of it than I, let him offer exactly that deal that will get hopefully 109 and 109 on each side, and let him offer it through a Member of the minority. I would look at it with a very open mind. I really can call that an offer, and I know the gentleman from Florida is sincere in making it. If it gathers 109 votes on each side, let us put it on the table.

It is not profitable I think to cast any more blame. Let us say from this point forward, what can we do. If the President will, however, say this proposal, let us say it becomes the one of the gentleman from Florida, is the one I will sign, it has got tremendous possibilities. The difficulty with the coalition budget and others, is we never knew and still do not know if the President would sign it.

So I would urge the gentleman to the extent he has the President's ear to do exactly that. I for one will view that proposal with a very open mind.

Mrs. LOWEY. If the gentleman will yield for 10 seconds, we have reinforcements here. I just want to say that if we are not looking back and we are looking forward, the President is working very hard with your leadership, working in a bipartisan way, to see if we can work out some of these difficulties. So I would just like to say in closing, let us in good faith continue the serious discussions, try and work out

our differences, but please, let us not have any more pain and suffering among taxpaying citizens. Let us open the government tomorrow, let us vote for the resolution that 198 Democrats support. All we need is 20 Republicans. Support that resolution, open the government, and I pledge, and I think we all pledge, to continue to work with the administration, with the Republicans, to work out our sincere differences.

I respect the differences in opinion. I do not deny anyone their honesty, their sincerity. I respect those differences. So let us respect each other, continue to debate, but open the government tomorrow.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I did want to respond to two things. Number one, we only need about 30 Democrats to reopen the government, because we can get some of these vetoes overridden and we can pass some more appropriations bills. So we hope that we can pick up those votes so you all will allow us to reopen the government. Just as much as basically you want to do it your way, we want to do it our way. But I do think that reasonable people can prevail, reasonable thought can prevail.

But I wanted to get back, you mentioned what would our forefathers do. I think, number one, they would pray, and I know that it is politically incorrect to say that, but if we look at the example of Benjamin Franklin and the Constitutional Convention, I think it was significant that authors in history wrote down his speech about let us pray, because we are obviously at a deadlock. We are not doing that as an institution. We know that.

Number two, I think they would look at the example of their mother country, England, which was a country of revolutions and counterrevolutions for over 1,000 years, going back to the Roman Empire, and particularly 1650, right after the English civil war, where they beheaded King Charles and Oliver Cromwell and the military ran the government and kept dismissing parliament after parliament over and over again. I think if our forefathers were here, seeing those examples, knowing those examples, what they would do is they would say wait a minute, you are telling me you are \$4.9 trillion in debt, you are telling me you pay \$20 billion a month interest? You are telling me you have a man who serves in the White House who promised to balance the budget and since he has served, we have paid \$480 billion in new interest on the debt? And you are quibbling about 1 more month? For crying out loud, let us go in there with a machete and start cutting and slashing. What is this crazy stuff about a 7-year balanced budget? Can you people not do it in 1 year or 2 years?

□ 2215

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield, and it is always interest-

ing to speculate on what our Founding Fathers might have done. I think, in retrospect, they probably would have included language that would have offered the balanced budget amendment that we now need, because the gentleman outlined a severe problem of always wanting to expand, for oft-times noble purposes. I do not question anyone's sincerity. Indeed, Dwight Eisenhower said of our political adversaries, "Always presume they, too, want the best for this Nation."

But it has been so easy over the last half century to say worthwhile, you bet you. Some we need to do, absolutely. But we have expanded the role of this Government to the point that we have conferred upon it a status that is illegitimate to this extent. It seems to suggest the notion of infinity with reference to resources, and these resources are finite.

There will be disagreements as to the emphasis, as to the direction, but if we agree on nothing else tonight, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let us agree in a constructive way to acknowledge these resources are finite and the consequences are great for American people living today and those generations yet unborn, and let us move together to solve the problems, because that is the most important thing that we can do.

I yield my time to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman has been a true gentleman from Kentucky. He has not said a word in 20 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I want to also take a minute to respond to the gentlewoman from New York.

The CEO's that said we cannot tell what the future is going to bring as far as the economy is concerned, that is true. But we know for a fact that if we continue spending the way we are spending, if we cannot slow the rate of growth in our spending to \$12 trillion over the next 7 years, if we fail to balance the budget, as the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] was talking about earlier, that we have to do it now, we have a window of opportunity to do it now, if we do not do that, I mentioned a while ago in the year 2012 every tax dollar will be consumed by interest on the debt in entitlements.

In the year 2030, when my 13-year-old daughter is approaching my age now, the deficit for 1 year, we know, projected out there, the deficit for 1 year would be over \$4 trillion. That is a deficit for 1 year approaching what our debt is now.

The Lord only knows what the debt would be then. We will never reach that point. We will be facing economic destruction in this country if we do not get control of our spending. We have to do it.

Now, what we have to do is say, here is \$12 trillion over the next 7 years, now what are our priorities? How are we going to divide the pie up? We need to get around the table and to make

those decisions. We have to slow the rate of Medicare, because if we do not, we will lose Medicare in 7 years. We are going to have to control Medicaid or we are going to lose it.

All of the programs that are so important to this Nation and to the people of this Nation we have to slow the rate of growth or we lose it. I have parents that are 78 years old. I want them to have Medicare in 7 years from now. I hope they are still living then; I hope there is Medicare for them. I hope that for my sister and for my other relatives, and for Members of this House, myself, that there will be Medicare one day, but it is not going to be there if we do not act responsibly now. We do not have time to delay it. We have to make some tough decisions.

It is about today. It is about the next generation also. But I am concerned that there are those who are looking at it as the next election. We cannot worry about that. We have to worry about it today, what is good for this Nation and for the people of this Nation.

Mrs. LOWEY. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I am going to control the next 5 minutes and I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Well, I will respond and say good night again, but since the gentleman referred his comments to me, I want to respond again to make it very clear that I support the efforts to balance the budget, and I think all of us in this debate do as well.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. My question is when, though.

Mrs. LOWEY. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], we have been in meetings with the same people who talk fancy rhetoric about balancing the budget. We will give the Pentagon \$7 billion more than they asked for. Now, it is a matter of priorities. I will fight for after-school programs for children, for Head Start, for the National Institutes of Health, for breast cancer research, where I think we can make cuts in other areas. I feel strongly we have to reform welfare. We have to reform Medicare and Medicaid. There are serious discussions going on with the President and leadership of both parties.

All I am saying, in conclusion, is let us balance the budget, let us continue to work to reform these programs and see if we can get together on a methodology, be it in Medicare or Medicaid, that makes sense, and my colleagues and I know there are some people in the Republican Party that do not even want to see Medicare continue, so I am happy we agree on that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is just not true.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to conclude by saying let us continue the discussion, but let us open the Government, and let us not have people suffer anymore,

because these are taxpayers. They work hard. They should not have to be suffering with the Government closing down. Let us continue this debate.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. May I respond?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I want to give the gentleman from Illinois a chance [Mr. POSHARD], a fresh voice, who maybe will clear everything up.

Mrs. LOWEY. Maybe we will continue tomorrow night. Thank you very much.

Mr. POSHARD. I want to thank my colleague from Florida for the time, and I have been watching the debate here, and let me say how much I appreciate the people that are on this floor right now. The gentleman from California, TOM CAMPBELL, has been one of my dear friends for many, many years; I have gotten to know the gentleman from Arizona, J.D. HAYWORTH, and the gentleman from Georgia, JACK KINGSTON, this year; and the gentleman from Kentucky, RON LEWIS, and I think they are all very positive contributing Members. But let me throw my 2 cents in on this.

I appreciate the tenor of the debate here, also. I am not one to point fingers and to place blame. I voted for the coalition budget. I helped, to the extent that I could, the Members of that coalition put their budget together. I believe it is the best budget that is before us. But moderate Democrats that have supported that from the beginning and helped put it together would believe that way.

I believe very strongly in the entitlement reform commission's report and the Medicare trust fund board in saying that, knowing that entitlements consume 48 percent of our budget today, that interest on the debt consumes another 20 percent, that that is 68 percent of our budget today that goes to entitlements and interest on the debt. I do not think anyone could look at our budget and not conclude that we have to do something with respect to slowing down the growth of entitlements if we truly want to get to a balanced budget in 7 years.

I do. I want to use CBO figures, and the President has agreed to do that at this point in time, as have many Democrats on our side of the aisle. I also agree that we ought to push the Medicare trust fund balance from the current 6 years that it has slid to out to the 10 years that we normally maintain the balance of that fund.

So the end objective of what we are all about here, I find no disagreement. I, for one, have concluded a long time ago that we need to accomplish those two dual objectives, and so have, I think, most Democrats on our side. But let me tell my colleagues where we, where at least I differ with the way things are going.

When I hear folks stand up and criticize the President for not being, or for maybe being disingenuous about his attempt to balance the budget, then what I want to do is just share this with

them, and I am not here to place blame or argue or anything else, but here are where things kind of break down for me.

I have been here 7 years now, and in 1992 we were running a \$310 billion deficit a year in this Government. That has gone down to \$260 billion, to \$200 billion, to, this year, \$161 billion. Under this President, in less than 3 years, we have decreased the deficit by \$140 billion.

Now, when we look at the conference report, the Republican budget, the conference report, it goes down next year from \$161 this year to \$151 billion. It goes back up the second year to \$158 billion, \$158.8, and then it goes down to \$126 billion at the end of the third year.

So when I look at this and I say, well, we have accomplished \$140 billion deficit reduction plus in the last 3 years, and at the end of the second year of this budget we have only accomplished \$2 billion of deficit reduction and we have accomplished less than \$30 at the end of the third year, I do not believe that any of us can accuse the President of being disingenuous about wanting to balance the budget. We have accomplished significant deficit reduction here in the first 3 years of the administration, much more so than what the Republican budget would accomplish, or even the coalition budget.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I yield the gentleman 5 minutes that he is not going to control.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I welcome my good friend from Illinois, and I appreciate, almost, the technique of Cicero in not assessing blame or bestowing credit.

Mr. Speaker and my colleague from Illinois, a couple of points. First of all, as we know, history does not occur in a vacuum. Many factors entered into this temporary valley in deficit reduction. Indeed, if we looked at the projections for the President under the former majority, we also noted an exponential rise in deficits following a few years.

It is this point. To achieve the goal that is laudatory in the abstract, this President decided to levy the largest tax increase in American history on the people of this country. Again, good people can disagree, and the gentleman does correctly point out, I think, an opportunity for improvement in the plan offered by the new majority. And, indeed, that is why I was pleased to join with 70 mostly newcomers in voting for a budget plan offered by my friend from Wisconsin that would have balanced this budget in 5 years and paid off the debt in 30, because I believe we owe future generations that much.

The point is, and this perhaps is a difference of philosophy that may exist among us here, I do not believe we solve anything, I do not believe we are more and more responsible by adding more burden to the hard working people of America; indeed, the same people that this President said he wanted to offer tax relief as a candidate in 1992.

I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. POSHARD. And I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I voted for that budget 3 years ago. It had \$247 billion of tax increases in it, 4-percent increase basically on the highest income levels in this country, 1 percent corporate income tax, and a \$4.5-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax, half of which went to deficit reduction and half of which went to our transportation system in this country.

So it did have those tax increases in it, and it hit the upper income bracket with the 4 percent increase mainly because that bracket had seen a decrease in their taxes, and an unconscious taxation rate of up to 78 percent at one time, which I certainly never agreed with, and I do not see how anybody could ever agree with that, but they had seen a tremendous decrease down to 28 percent, then up to 31 percent of that bracket.

□ 2230

So, yes, there was a tax increase in that budget. But it also had \$253 billion of Government spending decreases in that budget, which no one ever wants to talk about.

Here is the other thing: In my district, as I am sure it was true in almost all districts throughout this country, I had thousands of people under that budget that became eligible for the first time in their life for the earned income tax credit, which when I was a member Education and Labor that was TOM PETRI's bill. TOM, you were here. That was TOM's bill. TOM was the one that brought the earned income tax credit to this Chamber.

I still say for the working, and I will yield in 1 second to the gentleman from Georgia, but I still say that was one of the best measures to help the working class people in this country or low-income people, to keep them off of welfare.

So, yes, that did help reduce the deficit, the combination of those two things, but I think over the long haul, my friend from California, they were appropriate. In any case, I have to believe that my President and your President is not being disingenuous here. I believe the President wants to balance the budget. I believe we have real differences about the process in getting to the end goal of achieving those two objectives, but we can get there.

Now, back to the other issue with respect to my friend from California, I will say, because, TOM, I listened to your testimony earlier, this is the most confusing thing to me as to why we cannot pass a continuing resolution here and continue to resolve the procedural differences in getting to that balanced budget. I understand what you folks are saying. I understand where you are coming from. But it seems to me that the Federal workers should be separate and apart from our differences on how to achieve this balanced budget.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. DEUTSCH. There are 8 minutes left, and if we just give ourselves 4 minutes each side to sort of close and J.D. wants to use a minute.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Florida and Illinois for being involved. I yield 1 minute to my friend from California in response.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I appreciate it. To my good friend from Illinois, the reduction of the deficit under President Clinton is a point in his favor. It is also responsive to the economic recovery. I would have to say it is at least as much the latter as the former. Therefore, we must plan for the economic downturn. It is insufficient to say we are OK as we are going now.

Second, the gentlewoman from New York said that some members of our party are opposed to Social Security in concept. Mr. Speaker, I consider that inaccurate, and I would challenge the gentlewoman on the next opportunity to state for the RECORD what Members of the majority party wish to abolish Social Security or are opposed to it in principle.

Last, to the gentleman from Illinois, it is a privilege to serve with you, and I commend to the readership of this country a very fine article in Washington Monthly that describes your personal religious commitment and how that affects your role in public policy. I think we share that, and from that I hope that people as reasonable as you might prevail upon the President to respond to compromise constructively.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Our dear friend from New York truly did take a parting shot. We could go back and play historical revisionism and infinitum. The question is not who created a program, but who is willing to save and sustain it. I know no one in this majority who is willing to abandon Medicare or willing to abandon Social Security. I know no one in this new majority willing to abandon Medicaid as a goal, but of course we have offered alternatives, and upon that good people may disagree.

To my colleagues from the minority, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues from the majority and those who have joined us this evening nationwide on C-SPAN, I think it is important to note that we may engage in constructive dialog. Indeed, it is our hope that that constructive dialog that occurs in this Chamber, where so many great debates have gone on through the years, is also occurring at the other end of Pennsylvania Ave., and let us work together to save this Nation by making it economically sound. With that I yield to my friends from Kentucky and Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I just want to close by saying I appreciated the remarks from my friend from Illinois. But I think we have to look a lot at what the President presented as a budget this year, the first budget, the second budget, the third budget, and the fourth budget. None of

those balanced. I think what we have to look at is where those budgets take us into the future, where we are going to be 10 years from now, 7 years from now, 5 years from now. Those deficits start to return and start taking us toward more debt and increasing debt.

So, it is great that the deficits have gone down. That is a little help toward looking at the future. But we have to get serious about what we are going to do in the next 7 years, and that is the President needs to give us a balanced budget now, one that will preserve and protect the future generations. That is all we are asking for, and I hope that the President will be forthcoming, be very serious about a balanced budget and just cut the rhetoric, just do the job.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the President has been in office over 2 years now and he has not submitted a balanced budget. To the gentleman from Illinois, I was here when the President passed his budget in 1993 with much fanfare about seriously attacking the deficit, but since then he has not been back in the debate.

We need a balanced budget. If he will submit a balanced budget, I believe we can resolve this. But more importantly, if we can get some Members on your side to join us in passing some of these appropriations bills, we can reopen the Government. I am not a hardliner about let us keep the Government closed, let us hold these folks as hostages. But it disappoints me when I hear you all need to reopen the Government. It was your President who vetoed the bills.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] to close, and then I will take the last 4 minutes.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would like to say that with respect to Presidential budgets, I was here for the 4 years under President Bush, and I do not think that even the Republican Party ever voted for one of his budgets, and most of the time they were not presented. That is the normal around here. We usually iron this thing out over here anyway.

The other thing is with respect to my friend from Kentucky, the deficit goes up in whatever budget we pass here on the table at the end of the 7 years anyway. We are going to have to go through this again, or whatever Congress is in session then is going to have to do this all over again at the end of our budgets if we want to continue to work on the debt at that point in time.

The other thing is, I guess, again to my good friend from Georgia, on the appropriation bills, the appropriation bills flow from the budget itself. And the President is saying "I disagree with the overall budget that you folks have presented here. And so, therefore, I cannot really sign appropriation bills that conform themselves to that budget, if I disagree with the budget overall."

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, let me take the last minute. This is just a little bit—

Mr. HAYWORTH. That about HCFA, not about Medicare. That is about the Health Care Financing Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] controls the time.

Mr. DEUTSCH. The gentleman does not control the time, so regular order. This is what the Speaker of the House said, and people can read it themselves.

We don't get rid of it in round one because we don't think that is politically smart and we don't think that's the right way to go through a transition period, but we believe it's going to wither on the vine because we think people are voluntarily going to leave it.

That is not historical revisionism. And some of the statements by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] in his book and other quotes, that is not historical revisionism.

I will respond quickly regarding saving Medicare. Twelve of the 30 years the Medicare Program had left less of an actuarial life than it does today. Some of the tough votes we talked about when I was in Congress the first year, we did one of those adjustments. We cut Medicare \$68 billion that I voted for and that my colleagues over there did not choose to do.

We do not save Medicare by destroying it. And it is so disingenuous that the \$270 billion cuts would not stay in the trust fund. There is no reason not to do a CR in an hour and a half

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, is not it true that the Republicans would have the next hour, should we want to do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is up to the majority leader to make that determination.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes; 1 minute for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] and 1 minute for our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot recognize a unanimous-consent request in the special orders period.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, just so I understand, is there any process now for us to proceed or are you suggesting that we do not have one?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can only recognize at the present time speakers pursuant to a list provided by the majority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Does that mean, therefore, that we cannot continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Absent a request by the majority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if I could just ask for some time to thank everyone.

CONCLUDING REMARKS  
REGARDING BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 10 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank everyone tonight for participating in this. I know it has been going on now for about 2 hours, or maybe more, and I think it has been very productive and I just wanted to thank all of my colleagues.

I have to be honest and say that all of my colleagues, particularly those who have been here debating like this now for on a regular basis during special orders for months or maybe it is almost a year now, they should understand that from my perspective, and I know it is true for my Democratic colleagues that, we have the utmost respect for you because you have been willing, as have many of us, to come to the floor and debate some of these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I thought this was very productive and I really appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if there is no other agreement this evening, I welcome the gentleman's very constructive statement and sentiment of gratitude.

But let me say in candor to my friend from Florida, Mr. Speaker, that it is distressing to use partial quotes that are, in fact, the product of historical revisionism to try and score debating points.

Here is the exact quote from the Speaker of the House, as misquoted by my friends in the minority. Quote, "You know, we tell Boris Yeltsin, 'Get rid of centralized command bureaucracies. Go to the marketplace.' OK. What do you think the Health Care Financing Administration is? It is a centralized command bureaucracy. It is everything we are telling Boris Yeltsin to get rid of. Now, we don't get rid of it in round one because we don't think it is politically smart. We don't think that's the right way to go through a transition. But we believe it is going to wither on the vine because we think seniors are voluntarily going to leave it." Voluntarily. End quote.

It refers, Mr. Speaker, to the Health Care Financing Administration, and not the program known as Medicare. And to my friend from Florida, and, yes, I am a bit passionate about this. If free people are to debate, if free people

are going to reach resolution of problems, this points out what I was saying earlier this evening. We have to agree on broad parameters to define the debate; not partial quotes; not trying to imply that those in the majority would take away these programs; not trying to imply as has been the case as has been called by liberal publications medigoguary to scare seniors, to claim we want to have our children drink unclean water, to get rid of school lunches. We all know that to be false.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Florida to check his facts.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. And, indeed, to retract what has been used here as a mantra from the minority.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman will yield, I will be happy to respond.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will suspend.

□ 2245

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The Chair will remind the gentleman from Florida that he is here under the rules of the House. The Chair has ruled that all Members will suspend for a short period of time. The Chair would like to inform the Members that the gentleman from Kentucky controls time, and he may yield time to Members as he wishes, and only those Members may speak.

The gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. In a moment I will yield to the gentleman from Florida. But I would like to say this is exactly why we cannot have a good, honest debate. This is why it is hard to put trust and faith in our colleagues when there is rhetoric that is so accusatory.

As I said, all evening I sat back here and listened to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] say that we disliked Federal employees, we disliked Government, we even disliked the military. One gentleman said that we were lunatics, that we were extremists, that we are out of control. That is not constructive debate. That is getting it down to a level where I think it is every destructive.

I think misquoting our Speaker is another area of being very destructive in trying to reach a good debate and a good dialog.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I would be happy, first of all, I have seen a video of his statement. This is a letter from the Speaker to the editor of the Washington Post which does not have the full context of what was said, and it is actually a quote from the transcript of his speech, not a transcription of the speech itself. So, I mean, this is somewhat questionable in terms of its accuracy.

As I mentioned to the gentleman from Arizona, I will be happy to supply

him with a videotape at that point in time.

If we want to spend the next 5 minutes, the next 6 hours, I will be happy to discuss the issue of Medicare with my Republican colleagues because I think that is one of the areas of fundamental disagreement. I think, and the gentleman from Kentucky, I think sincerely stated that he believes that the Republican proposal would save Medicare, and I believe that it would destroy Medicare, and that is a fundamental, 180 degree difference in how we view the specific policies of that, and we can go into it, because I serve on the subcommittee that the bill went through.

The trustee report talks about a \$90 billion cut. It is a \$270 billion cut, and I would just close very quickly on the point of Medicare. It is a \$270 billion cut, which, if it really were to save Medicare, and this is a fundamental question, why does it not go into the Medicare trust fund? I mean, how did that \$270 billion number, how did it come up?

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, I want to yield to the gentleman from California for just a minute. I think he made some instructive, gave us some instructive information a little while ago about Mr. Panetta and his proposal. I think if you look at Mr. Clinton's proposal, you know, I do not think we are that much different.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

This is important to understand and to be fair about. Both sides agree that the unconstrained growth of Medicare will wreck the budget of the United States. All sides agree with that. In 1992, our former colleague, presently the Budget Director, my colleague from the California delegation, proposed a program of \$400 billion, that is a "b," cuts in the rate of growth of Medicare over an 8-year period, and that was a part of what I considered at the time a very straightforward and honest attempt to save Medicare. It was not to take what was rightfully the seniors' and give to others. No. It was a good-faith effort by our colleague from California, the former colleague from California, to save Medicare for those who needed it. He realized at that time that Medicare was growing at better than twice the general inflation rate.

If I may, I will be very brief in concluding, the number, therefore, of \$270 billion in 7 years is much less, and what the trust fund trustees recommended by their own admission would require revisiting the issue within 5 years. What is being attempted by Mr. Panetta in 1992 and the Republicans now is a longer term answer, one that will guarantee Medicare is there for those who need it many years from now.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I want to make a point now that the passion has left the voice but the sentiment remains.