hopefully, into the next year. And perhaps as we carry out this effort to balance the budget by the year 2002, we are going to achieve these goals on our route to a balanced budget and securing our future.

Mr. Speaker, people have said why should we balance the budget, and we have told people it is important because of our children, and I think that is true. And the reason I do is because our debt is so significant. I brought another chart just to list the amount of the Federal debt.

As of November 8, our Federal debt, this is November 8, 1995, our Federal debt is $4,985,913,011,032.65. Now, that is a tremendous amount of money.

To give people a perspective as to how much money that is. If an individual had gone into business the day Christ rose from the dead, and they lost a million dollars that day, and the following day, and every day of the week, and every week of the month, and every year for almost 2,000 years, they would only be one-fifth of the way to losing $4.9 trillion.

Most of us think a million dollars would be a sufficient amount of money to perhaps retire on. To think of losing that amount of money each day for almost 2,000 years and not even getting one-fifth of the way to losing what we have currently as our Federal debt gives us an idea of how much money that is.

For a child born this year, it would amount to about $187,000 in the form of taxes just to pay the interest on this debt, if we are unable to balance in 7 years.

□ 1845

Next year, in fiscal year 1997, the interest on the loan, on this debt, the national debt, the interest will exceed every other expenditure except for Social Security. It will be more than we spend on the Army and the Navy and the Marines and the Air Force and the Department of Defense structure, the intelligence-gathering community. The entire Department of Defense budget will be secondary to the amount we pay on interest on the debt, with Social Security being the only one we expend more on.

With all of that going toward interest, we do nothing to meet the needs of the poor; we do nothing to meet the nutrition programs. We do nothing to provide part B Medicare support. Nothing on Medicaid. Only interest on the debt.

It is a tremendous problem that we must deal with and solve, and we do that by balancing the budget. When we establish priorities toward getting to that balanced budget, we are going to have to deal with a lot of disinformation that is flowing. One, we have heard that we are trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, and the earned income tax credit has been drastically cut. But, Mr. Speaker, between 1995, this year, this fiscal year, in which we are spending $19.85 billion, by 2002, in the budget that we just passed tonight, we plan on spending $25.4 billion by that year. That is an increase. From 19.85 to 25.4, an increase, and yet we have heard that it is a cut and that we are trying to cut individuals to balance the budget. Mr. Speaker, only in Washington, DC, is that called a cut.

The school lunch programs, we saw last spring, the President go to an elementary school and state that the budget that was before the Congress was going to take food away from these children, that they would be starving.

Well, I have visited some of the elementary schools in Wichita, KS, in my district, the Dodge-Edison School, and there were no reports of children starving at that institution, nor at any school in Kansas or any school across the Nation. In fact, the budget that we passed tonight allows for $6.3 billion to go to school lunches this year. It will grow. It will increase to $7.8 billion by 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close tonight by saying that we must establish priorities, we must balance the budget in 7 years, and I am pleased to be able to work toward that effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IS BOSNIA WORTH DYING FOR?

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, we theoretically were supposed to adjourn the first week in October. Theoretically, all 13 major appropriation spending bills finished before that in sequence. Everything would have been authorized in the U.S. House. The Money House, the most important among equals around here in the separation of powers between the Supreme Court, the executive branch, the White House, and the Congress.

We are the first among equals. That is the way it was designed by our Founders, by the Framers of the Constitution. Between this House and the Chamber at the north end of the building, the U.S. Senate, we are the ones who control the power of the purse. The right to tax and the right to spend starts here.

The whole authorization, to appropriations to conference with the Senate process, is completely convoluted and all mixed up. Now, we are going out for 7¾ days, and the talks involving a war criminal from Belgrade at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base are breaking down.

Meanwhile, in Germany the 1st Armored Division over there is being trained to be ready to go in 48 to 72 hours and start sending thousands of men into Bosnia and Herzegovina without the consultation with the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and without Clinton having made his case.

Mr. Speaker, here it is in one sentence on the cover of today's brand-new Time magazine. The face of a typical handsome young soldier and it says, ''Is Bosnia Worth Dying For?''

Mr. Speaker, I did not get a chance during the brief debate on Friday to read a letter, which I meant to put in the RECORD and inadvertently forgot, a letter to the editor that I think says it all. It is from the Wall Street Journal of 6 days ago, November 14. It is about somebody who is experienced, Philip Merrill, a former Assistant Secretary General of NATO, and this article about says it all.

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker: ''The Clinton administration is still apparently planning to insert 25,000,'' now they say 20,000, ''American troops into Bosnia with no clear military objective, no definition of victory and no exit strategy,'' a huge mistake.

Jumping forward to the middle of the article, which I ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD in its totality, listen to this: ''This is not to say there is no moral issue in Bosnia.'' I also believe there is a moral issue. There is especially the atrocities, mostly Serb atrocities. ''We can best help the Bosnians by making sure their 120,000-man army fight for itself.''

''It's very doubtful that the Balkans can sustain a multiethnic society of the kind envisioned by Clinton. The U.S. has no strategic stake in this fight and cannot and should not be the military arbiter.''

''Our future policy seems to be,'' listen, Mr. Speaker, and any American following this Chamber, about 1,300,000 of our fellow Americans, listen to this: We seem to be simultaneously threatening Serbs from the air and killing them. We are in hiatus on that. We are going to act as a peacekeepers on the ground; at the same time train the Croatian Army, which I just came back from witnessing in August; arm the Bosnian military, which is what the leader in the Senate wants to do, and I do not have much argument with that, we voted overwhelmingly in the House to do that; and at the same time indict Bosnian Serb war criminals and a couple of Croatian war criminals. The Croatians have been turned over. The Bosnians, including three senior army officers, have all been promoted and are not being turned over. There are now over 54 or 54 war criminals involved in this; almost all of them Bosnian Serbs. No Moslems have been indicted yet.

Any one of those policies is in itself coherent and defensible. Taken together they are incoherent. As flare-ups occur, these inherently conflicting policies will leave us powerless to act effectively.