

Mr. HUNTER. Well, I thank the gentleman. BOB DORNAN is my candidate. I am endorsing my great seatmate and buddy just north of the San Diego County line, BOB DORNAN. His motto is faith, family, and freedom. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has run under that banner for a long time.

We just saw his effect as a conscience, one of the House consciences along with HENRY HYDE and CHRIS SMITH of the pro-life value and ethic in this Congress, how he has been such a leader there. He has a great family, and that faith, family, and freedom is something that always resonates, at least when I see BOB, because I think of his great family.

Sally, I call her Sally Kay Dornan, it is really Sally Hansen Dornan, is a wonderful person. I know her very well, and she helps to preside over their five children, Robin Marie Griffin, Robert Kenneth, II, Teresa Anne Cobin, Mark Douglas and Kathleen Regina Penn, and they have eight grandchildren and I am going to name them, since we have them right here. Richard K. Cobin, Terry Cobin, Kevin Gary Griffin, Collin Robert Griffin, Anna Victoria Cobin, Erin Marie Griffin, Haley Olivia Dornan. Of course, BOB DORNAN's uncle was the "Tin Man", Jack Haley, in the "Wizard of Oz," so that is where Haley comes from, and of course rounding off with Robert K. Dornan, III.

Let me tell you, if you go to BOB DORNAN's house, you do not see any of what the national news media complains about as being a mean demeanor or tough or ill-willed, all of the tough stands that he takes when he sees real liberalism on the horizon. You see a grandfather who lives for those kids. You drive up to that big ex-hockey player's house out there in McLean and you will see BOB DORNAN coming down, if it is in the wintertime, a bobsled run that would challenge what we have in the winter Olympics, and he may have a camera mounted on the front of his helmet and have four or five grandkids cuddled in his arms, or he may be throwing water balloons at them out of the top story of that house. BOB DORNAN lives for his family.

He has a great family. I can remember once watching the Larry King Show, a detractor sitting there and talking about taking on BOB DORNAN in a race, and the phone rang and Larry King took it and it was Mark from California. That was Mark Dornan, his son. When Mark Dornan finished with that particular guest, it was clear who had won. That is how close that Dornan family is.

So faith, family, freedom. BOB DORNAN has a lot to offer this country, and I think he has injected a lot of value, a lot of ethics and a lot of real conservative spirit into this presidential race. I would be happy to yield, having talked so long, to the great fighter pilot, the gentleman from Texas Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I just want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, we had a great time in Texas, incidentally, talking to all of the defense industry in this last year with myself and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and we had BOB DORNAN there that time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, he was there, yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, DUKE CUNNINGHAM also, and a lot of the ideas that we had for preserving the defense industrial base of this country, we have started to carry out in this Republican-led Congress, and you have been a big part of that.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been a revolution for the military.

Mr. HUNTER. So I thank the gentleman from Texas so much, and God bless ROBERT DORNAN. I hope you are out there campaigning hard today, BOB.

OUT-OF-CONTROL BUDGET

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, this House has performed some groundbreaking work by ranging in on the Nation's out-of-control budget. Before we passed a reconciliation bill last week, Americans had been weighed down by the annual deficits that exceeded \$200 billion a year. Their children were saddled with a national debt of almost \$5 trillion. On its way to that historical reconciliation bill which balances the Federal budget in less than 7 years, Members of this House made some difficult decisions to lift that weight from Americans' shoulders and to free future generations of a lifetime of government servitude.

However, Mr. Speaker, the House's work is not finished. There is one more tough decision left on the table, the decision to lift and end subsidies for special interests. This welfare program is actually a Federal grant system. Under this system, Federal agencies award money to private organizations to perform various services. Unfortunately, these services and the agencies that are paid to perform them, are not always the wisest use of taxpayers' dollars. Expense amounts, and this expense, and this is important, this expense amounts to \$40 billion a year.

Fortunately, just as Americans called on Congress to balance the Federal budget, so they have called on Congress to end this unofficial entitlement for special interests. The interests I speak of are those who represent advocacy groups that, because they are classified by the Internal Revenue Service as tax exempt, see themselves as charities. But some of these organi-

zations do not practice charity. Charity is generosity, helpfulness, relief given to needy or suffering people.

What some of these advocacy groups practice, however, is really greed and influence. These organizations do not extend a helping hand to the poor and the needy, they extend their open hand, palm up, to the taxpayers for a handout. Many times, this money goes directly into the organization's coffers to hire more lobbyists who, in turn, ask Congress and Federal agencies for even more money and more legislation and regulations sympathetic to their organization's political agenda.

Americans cannot afford to have special interest charities double-dipping from the public trough, using the net gain from this tax-exempt status to pay lobbyists to hit Congress up for additional money and power. Americans are no longer interested in funding this profane grant system.

A national study performed just last month showed that a strong majority of Americans do not believe that special interest groups who receive funding from the Federal Government should be using these funds, either directly or indirectly, to lobby the Federal Government. By a margin of 70 to 26 percent, Americans agree that tax dollars should not be used to fund political activities. Of course, many of these nonprofit advocates claim that they are not using Federal money to lobby Congress. They maintain that there is a law against such a practice, and that they follow this law. But there is no way to verify this, because no group is required to open their books to Federal inspection.

What is wrong here, and what is wrong with this picture? If an organization is going to use a taxpayer dollar, especially at a time when the dollar is spread so thin, then the organization should account for every penny and prove that the money is being spent appropriately and as it was supposed to be spent.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending in this House that would bring integrity to the Federal grant system and end this unofficial entitlement for lobbyists. Members will soon have an opportunity to vote on the Istook amendment to the Treasury-Postal conference report. If passed, any portion that receives more than one-third of its revenue in Federal funds, could spend no more than \$100,000 on advocacy activities. Any nonprofit group with able activities of 300 million or more that engages in political activities will be prohibited from receiving Federal grants.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes, I do.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention to the gentleman from Minnesota that in the Treasury-Post Office conference committee I offered an amendment to the Istook-McIntosh bill that said groups and organizations that spend less than \$25,000 a year on

lobbying efforts and government outreach and contact would be exempted. That actually exempts 96 percent of these groups that we do need to have input from homeless shelters, museums, art galleries, symphonies and so forth, and that amendment takes away so much of the argument against the Istook bill that people have been giving us, where we need input, and we said okay, we have an amendment that took care of that.

You know, I agree with the gentleman that the big, big money involved in this has been abused by people who say well, we are not lobbying. If they are not, why not support the bill?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I was just going to get to that, that the amendment that you offered would exempt 96 percent of those groups. What we are really talking about is a handful of people that have abused this system. But frankly, the abuse could amount to \$200 million a year. It is time for it to stop. We cannot afford a subsidy for special interests. I think most people agree that it is wrong, and we will have an opportunity in the next several weeks to end subsidies for special interests.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time has expired. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

[Mr. GRAHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BUDGET RECONCILIATION IMPORTANT FOR OUR NATION

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, happy Halloween. What I wanted to talk about tonight, and I am joined by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] and some others perhaps later, this reconciliation process, this huge budget, this huge bill that we have been hearing so much about in the House and why it is so important. It is a massive bill, it is an important bill. It is right that all eyes of the Nation should be watching this particular piece of legislation. It is the bill that calls for a billion dollar budget, calls for Medicare reform, reforms that say protect and preserve Medicare. It changes the way we do our Medicaid allocation.

It has welfare reform in it, it has medical savings accounts and a tax cut for the hardworking middle class America. It is a very important bill, and it is one that we all have a horse in the race on, and so I wanted to talk about that a little bit tonight.

Let me yield the floor to Mr. GUTKNECHT. He has been a valuable

part of this as a freshman Member of this House. He knows that it was the freshman class who put the majority agenda forward, starting with the Contract With America, 10 items, 9 of which have passed the House, and then went to work on the 13 appropriations bills, even after the other body voted to end the balanced budget amendment, working on the 13 appropriations bills, saying that it is clear that the American people want a balanced budget.

That is what your freshman class ran on and that is what you followed through on, was a balanced budget. So let me yield the floor to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I said to the people of my district that it was a very historic day when we passed that reconciliation bill. It really is what an awful lot of us came here to do. This is what we promised we were going to do when we ran for election, and I am so delighted that we finally got the opportunity to keep that promise. My sense is that if the President hears from the American people, once they understand what really is in this bill and how the bill was put together and they begin to tell the President and the administration how they feel about it, my sense is that the President will reconsider, and he will actually sign this bill or one that looks almost like it.

If I could say to the gentleman from Georgia, I want to just talk a little bit about what we are really doing, because we have heard so much demagoguery and so much rhetoric about these draconian cuts and how this is going to hurt this group or that group. But the truth of the matter is, what we have taken is a fairly simple approach to how we are going to balance this budget. It breaks down into, in my opinion, three categories. First of all, with defense spending, we have adopted essentially a flexible freeze on defense spending.

□ 2015

On domestic discretionary spending we have made targeted cuts. We have eliminated 300 programs, which I think most people would agree were not very effective anyway.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me interject quickly. Many of these cuts are real cuts. Others are just slowing down of the increase and still others are consolidating programs.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, he is absolutely correct.

Then on the entitlement side, and this is where there is so much fear mongering going on out there with the senior citizens and other groups, for the most part whether we are talking about school lunches or talking about Medicare or the other entitlements, what we are really talking about is slowing the growth rate to approximately the inflation rate.

The good news is if we do that, if we make targeted cuts in domestic discre-

tionary spending, put a flexible freeze on defense and allow the entitlements to grow, but at a slower rate than they have in the past, the good news is we get to a balanced budget, under the plan that we have, scored by the CBO, in 7 years. My own sense is it is going to be about 5½ years, because we will see economic growth at a higher rate than is currently expected and we will see interest rates at a much lower rate than is currently expected.

The net of that is we will get to a balanced budget in about 5½ years, not 7 years. But the even better news, for those of us with children, is that we will have an opportunity, if we can stick to that discipline, which I do not think is a bitter pill to swallow. It is not tough medicine we are talking about. But if we can stick to the basic budget plan, not only will we balance the budget in 5½ years, the great news is if we stay on that path we will pay off the national debt in about 25 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to a conversation that the gentleman from Minnesota and I had earlier today, and that is the basic premise of this whole bill, which is balancing the budget, and why should we balance the budget?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield once more, the interesting thing is some people have turned this into an arithmetic exercise. It is not about arithmetic. It is not about a lot of the things that we are reading about. It really is about preserving the American dream for our children.

President Kennedy said we all cherish our children's future. We all want our kids to have a little better life than we had. But if we stay on the path we are on now at the Federal level, if the Federal Government continues to mortgage our children's future, what we do is we guarantee that our kids will have a standard of living that will be less than ours.

As a matter of fact, we promised them, or we are promising them under the current circumstances, if we do not make changes, that they will face sure bankruptcy for the Federal Government and our economy.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is it not true that if a baby is born this year, in fact, I have one, little Walker Watson, who is my nephew, he was born in April. Now, I understand his share of the national debt, should he live 75 years, which I am hopeful that he will and beyond that, he will owe \$187,000 on the national debt in his lifetime, just interest. Just interest. Not paying down the principal but just interest.

And we also know that the interest on the national debt is almost \$20 billion a month. Does the gentleman happen to know offhand what the budget of Minnesota is? The annual budget.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the annual budget for the State of Minnesota is about \$10 billion.