

Democrats on the Agriculture Committee, like myself, it shuts out the voices of Republican Members who also oppose radical changes that would effectively destroy critically needed commodity programs.

Reforms are needed. We need to cut the costs of these programs. We need to make them more market oriented. Farmers understand this.

The area of Georgia I represent grows more peanuts than any place in the world. My colleague from the neighboring Eighth District and I have introduced a new peanut program that eliminates Government costs. It represents dramatic change. But, evidently, this is not enough. The majority leadership will evidently not be satisfied until commodity programs that give our farmers a more level playing field in the world marketplace are destroyed.

Members of the Agriculture committee represent agricultural areas. They have special expertise in the needs of farmers and agribusiness. Just like other committees dealing with other areas of the economy, they have always had a key role to play in shaping farm policy.

That role is now under attack.

Mr. Speaker, we will not be silenced.

Members who represent farm-belt areas will continue the fight for a fair deal for the country's farm producers.

THE FREEDOM TO FARM ACT

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, several issues have come up, but I would like to start out with agriculture, what the Federal farm policy should be in this country and the advantages and disadvantages to the farmer and the consumer.

Since the early 1930's, we decided that by controlling production we could guarantee a stable supply of food in this country. However, what has happened in the last 30 years is the consumer interests, the White House, the consumer interests in Congress have started dictating farm program policy, and what has happened is we have driven more and more of the small family farmers out of agriculture. Here is how farm programs have worked: We tell the farmers if they will grow a certain amount of crop and slightly have a policy that encourages overproduction, we will give those farmers subsidy payments. So what we have done, in effect, is encourage slight overproduction, keeping the prices down, which has been good for agriculture in this country because it has become lean and mean.

But in the process, we have disadvantaged the small family farmer in the United States. That is why, and I as a farmer from Michigan, I am now suggesting that we move to the market economy to give the rewards to the

producers of this Nation so that the farmers and ranchers can make their own farm management decisions based on their best interpretation and understanding of what the market is demanding for those special crops.

By doing these, many of the economists that have been advising us on freedom to farm have said that farmers will end up better off as we make this transition to the marketplace.

Make sure, it is a difficult transition, that we have enticed farmers to become more and more dependent on farm subsidies during the last 40 years. So their cash flow, in many cases, depends on it.

What we have got to do as we make this transition to a market economy, and that is what the Freedom to Market Act does, is make the kind of transition that is going to keep American agriculture the strongest in the world.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, now let me ask the gentleman about this freedom to farm bill because as I understand from a previous speaker tonight, that did not pass committee. Is it dead? Are you going to try to move it out of the Committee on Agriculture a second time? What is the status of that?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That now becomes, because of the failure for that committee to enact legislation consistent with the budget resolution, a new proposal will be offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget that achieves the same kind of budget reductions.

Let me tell you what has happened in the U.S. Congress, as I observe it, and that is Members traditionally members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities that wanted to spend more money on education, say, "I want to be on the Education Committee." Members that want more roads in their districts want to be on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. We have got Members on the Committee on Agriculture that would like more money for their farmers.

If we are going to phase out agriculture in a smart way and not make that farmer continuously dependent on the Federal Government and, hopefully, end up with a larger income for that farmer, then we have got to move to a market economy.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I think that the gentleman is walking on the very delicate balance, as you said, between farm programs that work and moving toward an economy that is more free-market oriented, and I know that is a tough road for you.

I have some provincial concerns; cotton, peanut, and so forth, but I do think what is important is that our farmers are involved in this process and stay involved in this process as things start changing, because I know

the peanut farmers have come a long way in their work and the cotton folks are trying to work for something that is a suitable solution.

There are some concerns I have on the sugar program. As you know, America is a net importer of sugar, and even though the taxpayers are not paying the difference, the world cost of sugar is about 11 cents a ton, but the domestic price is 24 cents a ton. We have an 18-cent-per-ton price support.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, I think we are on the same track. The question is how do we achieve the same result in making the transition for farm programs. We have got to do it smartly, simply, because other countries are subsidizing so heavily.

ISSUES CONCERNING A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 50 minutes as designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, tonight we wanted to talk about a number of issues that stand between this Congress, the American taxpayers, and a balanced budget. There is a smorgasbord of issues, of course, that fall in that category. We are going to be touching base on the Davis-Bacon Act and some of the student loan programs, this so-called Istook amendment, and Medicare reform.

I have with me, of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], and always on special orders sharing his wisdom with us, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who has just given us a description of where we are in the ag program.

Let me ask you gentlemen, and I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] I am going to start with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] because he and I were freshmen together. We came here in 1992, along with a new President of the United States, trying to balance the budget and do everything we can. We did not, in the 103d Congress, get very far in that effort.

How do you think we have done so far? Do not pat yourself on the back. People are tired of that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The House has done very well. Now we need to finalize our ambitions, get these bills enacted into law. You know, it should be frightening to everybody in this country, how big this Government has grown to be.

After World War II, in 1947, we were spending 12 percent of our gross domestic product to run the budget of the United States. That is what we spent as a percentage of gross domestic product, 12 percent. Today we are almost twice that.

Every day the United States writes out over 3,200,000 checks. Can you

imagine a government, in talking to Secretary Rubin, Treasury is not even sure of all of the points that they make these electronic transfers, these payments, these checks? But the estimate is someplace around 12,000 different locations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me give you a statistic. The reason why I wanted to mention this is because I want to contrast the 103d Congress to the 104th Congress that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is a Member of.

In the 103d Congress, before the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] started running this House, 95.7 percent of all witnesses at the congressional hearings advocated more spending. Only 0.7 percent were for less spending, and that is a statistic from the National Center for Public Policy Research.

So now, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], you were not in that environment 2 years ago. Do you think we are moving toward balancing the budget?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think we absolutely are, thanks to your efforts and that of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I think the fact is the 104th Congress, fired up by 86 new freshmen, 73 Republican, 13 Democrat, I think it is pretty evident that we have an accountability issue out here where the people are saying, OK, you say you are going to make Congress more accountable, you say you are going to hold the line on taxes and spending, let us see if you can do it, and if you can, you may come back, if you do not, then maybe you are just like past Congresses that said one thing and did another.

If I could just add to that point, I think we have certainly set the tone by passing the balanced budget amendment, line item veto, unfounded mandates, regulatory reform, deficit lockbox reduction where we are going to have the savings go into taxpayers having to pay less interest on the national debt, those kinds of programs which the people of the United States want, Mr. Speaker, which are, in fact, what they have gotten. So I think that we are on our road to putting our fiscal house in order just like State governments do, just like county governments and school boards, but the Federal Government when we have had a tax increase in the past and spend more and more, just put it in the deficit.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask, the folks in Michigan and Pennsylvania, are they saying we are going too far too fast, or all we are doing is passing bills out of the House, they are not doing it in the Senate, we are dead in the water, it is just rhetoric, there is no difference between Republicans and Democrats?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. At least in Michigan, they are saying you are not going far enough, you are not going fast enough. You know, we are not doing the traditional tax-and-spend

anymore. I mean, the voters of this country have said, "Look, we are paying over 42 percent of what we earn in taxes. Now, that is enough." So what Government has done is they have decided that they can go out and borrow the money and expand social programs and expand the size of this bureaucracy by borrowing more and more money. The interest just of servicing the Federal debt, the interest on the debt subject to limit this year was over \$330 billion, almost 22 percent of our budget just for servicing the debt, and so the borrowing has got to be stopped. We have got to bring down the size of this Government if we want individuals to have the freedom and independence that the founders of our Constitution designed.

Mr. KINGSTON. So what the people in Michigan are saying is keep going and do not chicken out. What are they saying in Pennsylvania?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. In Pennsylvania, they are very happy about the fact we are holding the line on wasteful spending. They want to make sure, however, the direct services that can be handled by the Federal Government should be handled by the Federal Government, are done so in a meaningful manner. By this I mean we are looking at the whole budget this year in the right way. If it should be the private sector that should be doing what the Federal Government is not doing, give it to the private sector. If it should be done by the Federal Government, what is the government closest to the people doing the best job? It may be local government, it may be county government. The government of last resort that should be working on a program is probably the Federal Government. You have already seen we have recommended in the House the WIC program, the food nutrition programs, while we made sure there is a 4.5 percent increase in those important programs for our children, we have also said we are going to block grant that back to the Governors. We used to spend 15 percent to administer the programs. We told the Governors you can only spend 5 percent. With the extra 10 percent, you have to feed more kids, more meals. That is meaningful reform. We are getting more direct services to the people, but less waste.

□ 1830

And that brings up one more point, if I can, Congressman KINGSTON and Congressman SMITH.

Mr. KINGSTON. You bet it gets the point, and now the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH]—

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. OK.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will not get a chance.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. OK, the other point is this:

On Medicare reform and things like that the people want to be involved in the dialog, and I think that is what is important, what I did this summer and what I think plenty of other Congress-

men have done, and that is to talk about the problem.

You know Medicare has run out of money. Seven years, there is no Medicare, so we have got to do something about it whether it is taking out the fraud, abuse, and waste, which I think is a large part of it, \$30 billion a year is wasted just in fraud and abuse in our Medicare Program.

So what we have done is, I think, responsible Republican Congressmen, working with our allies and friends on the other side of the aisle, is we now have legislation which is going to hasten the prosecution, investigation, and the eventual sentencing of people who are involved in this kind of fraud. People want the services. They do not want the fraud; they do not want the waste. They want to make sure the Government is efficient and doing its job.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. KINGSTON, are they saying more or less spending in your area?

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, in Georgia it appears the people are saying we need to be convinced here that you are serious. We want programs that eliminate, and consolidate, and end the duplication and inefficiency. We do want things back at local and State levels as much as possible.

We have with us the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], who played college football for the Wolfpack in North Carolina, then tried to go on to the pros, and those coaches recognized what the college level should have recognized, is that he could not play football after all, and so now he—

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. To being a sportcaster, to being a politician, and I hesitate to yield the floor to him. I am going to put on a stopwatch on him, whatever you guys say; so tell us what are the people saying in Arizona. Do they want a budget cut or not?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, first, for purposes of rhetorical self-defense, and also to make sure the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have some ring of truth, I am compelled to note for the RECORD that though I was recruited as right tackle at North Carolina State, I soon discovered myself left out. So, that is the first tale about football.

But it is interesting to hear what you folks have seen in Georgia, and Michigan, and in Pennsylvania, and indeed I beg your indulgence for arriving a bit late, but we had the inaugural meeting of the—

Mr. KINGSTON. Are you through with the introduction, or are you going to tell us—

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, this is something very important because you asked me what on the minds of the people of the State of Arizona, and I can tell you that although Arizona is the youngest of the 48 contiguous States, Arizonans are very concerned about what transpires here in Washington, indeed what is the proper role of the

Federal Government, and, when you get right down to it, this date in history, September 28, 1787, the Congress of the Confederation resolved to submit the Constitution to the respective States for the ratification which gives us this system of government which we use now, and there is a legitimate public debate as to what is the proper role of the Federal Government, and so what we are doing now in this new Congress, what some would call a revolution, is we are sitting down and examining what is transpiring, not as detractors would say, to turn the clock back, but to say what is the reasonable role of the Federal Government.

So what I am hearing from seniors, from young married folks, from those who are new to the process, is this notion: Let us rethink the proper role of the Federal Government, and, as my friend from Pennsylvania spoke a moment ago, let us look for the practical role of the Federal Government as we approach the next century.

With reference to Medicare, one of the basic notions in this Nation is one of choice, economically, to have a variety of different options, and, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] knows because another Congressman who oftentimes sits in the Speaker's chair here, this Medicare task force I think summed it up quite well. What we have with Medicare in its current state is basically 1964 Blue Cross codified into law. The question becomes, Do we maintain that? Or we should maintain that for those folks satisfied with the 1964 health insurance policy, but should we also offer the seniors innovative plans that maximize choice and give them the chance to have a greater role in health care?

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, now let me ask you this because I hear so much on Medicare: Is it not true that seniors will still be able to keep traditional Medicare if they want to, and I know the gentleman from Michigan has done some work on this?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, there is no question that the design of the program is to preserve Medicare for not only the estimated 36 million people that now use Medicare, but also for future generations, and so the No. 1 decision of the Republican conference is anybody that wants to stay in this current program as it is designed has the option to do that, and from there we expand to what is called Medicare Plus, giving seniors greater options. We have got to end up with seniors being better health care shoppers, and to do that we are suggesting that seniors should be allowed to keep some of the savings that they can derive for not only the Federal Government, but for themselves as they do a good job shopping for health care—

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, let me now ask Mr. Fox.

I used to sell commercial insurance, not health insurance, but commercial insurance, not health insurance, but commercial insurance; very confusing,

intangible product. Will my parents, and will I when I turn 65, be confused by all of this?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I do not think so. If we have done our job correctly—

Mr. KINGSTON. Is it going to be simplified?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think it is our job to make sure it is simplified along with the Federal agencies involved, would be Health and Human Services. The fact is that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] was talking about, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], is at least three options. If you want to still continue to getting the fee for services, that will be there. If you want to get managed care, which might include other options, might include other items such as getting pharmaceuticals, dentures, or hearing aids, or any other items that might be included in a managed-care proposal, that would work. And also the medical savings account, and there you would get \$4,800 a year, but you could use it for whatever purposes you want. The money you would not spend you could keep or roll it over until your next year's medical savings account. Then that next year will be more money because under the proposal we have before the Congress every subscriber now will get \$4,800. By the year 2002 it will be \$6,700. So it is going to go up 47 percent, and I do not think that much has gotten out well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, let me ask the gentleman from Arizona. This medisave account, I am going to get to keep the leftover money in the account. Is that what I am hearing?

Mr. HAYWORTH. That money is yours if you choose a medical savings account, and the notion is this. And I think we have to be very particular to restate, and restate and amplify, what is going on here. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] touched on something that cannot be repeated enough.

For those in this policy debate who talk about a cut for seniors, the most charitable thing I can say to those who speak of a cut is that they are not very good students of mathematics because the average spending per beneficiary will increase from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 in the year 2002. I defy anyone to show me how that is a cut. It is an increase, but yet we have seen very interesting formulations and numbers that have emanated from here in Washington, DC.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, now I have heard this. Are we going to decrease deductibles, increasing copay? We are not; is that correct?

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is very true. We are going to keep the program intact, but the idea is we are going to move toward a better Medicare that offers policy choices like the medical savings account, like managed care through HMO's, and again, as the gentleman from Michigan mentioned so eloquently, if a senior has this pro-

gram, Medicare as it exists today, and wants to keep that program, that that senior need do nothing. It will remain the same for that senior.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, now the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is on the Committee on the Budget. Why are we doing this at all? I hear some folks in the Congress and Government in Washington saying this is unnecessary to even do anything.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, you know, it is only partisan for those individuals that think they have a target to shoot down something, to criticize rather than being constructive to help develop the best solutions to save, preserve, and keep Medicare available to the current recipients and the future recipients, so, as far as a budget consideration, the trustees of Medicare came to the Committee on the Budget, and they said Medicare is going to be going broke. We are going to take in less money than is needed for payout starting next year. Something has to be done.

Mr. KINGSTON. One second. Were those Republican trustees?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No. Thank you, Mr. KINGSTON, no. These were the trustees actually, were three of the Cabinet Members that the President appointed.

You know, the President has even said as we look at the Medicare B provisions, he—this is—what he expects recipients to pay for their share of the premium ends up to be \$7 less than what the Republican proposal is, so we have \$7-a-month difference in the President's proposal and the Republican proposal. Everybody that is honest about this knows that we have got to do a better job, and I do not want to talk too long here with these good ideas, but look what the private sector has done, look what the private sector has done in terms of lowering their medical health care costs. We have actually had negative cost increases in the private sector while we have had 11 percent in the public sector.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Fox, I could tell what is your interest on—

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Well, Congressman KINGSTON and Congressman SMITH, also Congressman HAYWORTH, I think it is very important to understand. You pointed out the President had a proposal, and you have heard a Republican proposal, but there has been nothing from the Democratic House in the way of a proposal, and it is not responsible, I would submit, for us to debate the issue of how we are going to save Medicare unless we have a proposal from more than one side of the aisle, and frankly American people expect that, if we are going to come to a resolution, every good idea from Congressman HAYWORTH's district, Congressman SMITH's district, Congressman KINGSTON's district; we want to

hear those ideas. That is how this Congress can do a better job, and I have invited my senior citizens and others interested in health care to come forward with those good ideas, and—

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I do think it is also important to point out that there are—there is bipartisan support on it. Now there is some partisan criticism, but we do have a lot of bipartisan support saying, Don't let this thing go broke in 6 years. Let's roll up our sleeves and work together for what is fair, and what is simple, and what is best to protect and preserve the system.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Can I just say that I understand from the Committee on Rules that, if the Democrats do propose a plan that meets the budget guidelines, that will be made in order for debate.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And if the gentleman would yield, I think it is important to note again for purposes of full disclosure, and again to bring some element of bipartisanship to this debate. Now I understand that Members of the new minority are taking their own fledgling steps toward coming up with a plan, and I welcome what in essence, according to one newspaper account, amounts to a, quote unquote, deathbed conversion after months of railing and ranting when we were willing to abandon politics as usual and say no. It is always better for a professional politician to try and explain away problems. No, we rather not confront this, the fact that we have come from different walks of life to serve here as citizen legislators and say to the American public this is an issue too important to play politics as usual, and so I think even though we had months and months of reticence, to put it diplomatically, from our friends from the new minority, now even they are understanding that the American people are not going to be satisfied with people sitting on the sidelines moaning, complaining, about very serious policy questions.

So to their credit in fairness I am glad to see that many Members of the minority now say that they want to come up with a plan. However, it is important to remember this. Is it a fledgling step for political appearances that amounts to putting a Band-Aid across a very serious wound?

The fact is we have to take on this problem and solve it, and it is not time for a Band-Aid solution to get us through 2 years to an election. No, when we take the oath of office here, we are here to act first as legislators, not ignoring the political dimension, but to act.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if we had ideas coming from 435 different Members of Congress from States all over the country, the best product would evolve, and that is what we want to happen because what we want the end product to be is not a Republican plan, not a Democrat plan, but an American senior citizens plan so that

your mom, and dad, and grandparents, and you, and I, and our children one day can enjoy a system that is safe and secure.

□ 1845

That is what our goal is. One of the big tragedies, when we talk about cuts, is that what we are trying to do is slow down the inflation rate. Medicare inflation last year was 11 percent. Regular health care inflation, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], pointed out, was actually about 1 percent. What we are trying to do is get Medicare down in the 4 to 6 percent range, and if we can just slow down the growth to that degree, we will be increasing the benefits of the people \$4,800 to \$6,700, as the gentleman pointed out, and we will have more options for our seniors.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the point is that we have been leading. I am glad that the gentleman pointed out that it is now bipartisan, but it was also a bipartisan Republican leadership that led the fight to make sure the 1993 unfair Social Security tax was repealed by the House, and it also was a Republican-led House this year that made sure we allowed seniors who made up to \$11,280, without having a bite out of their Social Security, can now, if this law gets approved by the Senate, make up to \$30,000 without having a bite come out of Social Security.

So we are the same Republican-led House that is going to make sure that Medicare is strengthened, preserved, and protected, so not only will senior citizens who are living today, but those generations that will follow will also have a quality health care program as seniors that will be second to none in this country.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I believe there is one other important distinction we need to bring up that has been bandied about in the realm of political theater. Perhaps the gentleman touched on this previously, before my arrival, but again I do not believe we can repeat this too often.

Mr. KINGSTON. J.D., even if you were sitting here when we said it, you would repeat it if you wanted to.

We will not try to stop you.

Mr. HAYWORTH. In the interest of full disclosure, I certainly will allow my friend the gentleman from Georgia's evaluation to remain a part of the RECORD.

Let me make this point. You have heard a lot of talk about these plans paying for some tax cut. It is important to note this, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, who worked long and hard as part of the Committee on the Budget, will attest to this fact: The historic tax cuts that benefit every American, not just a select few, were paid for, if you will, through the hard work of the Committee on the Budget long before this Medicare debate was enjoined. We

did this long before, so there is no "if" then to this procedure. There is not a situation where the new majority is trying to fish out of thin air, or certainly not off the backs of America's seniors, to pay for a tax cut. That is just blatant fiction.

Mr. KINGSTON. When the April 3, 1995, trustees' report came out saying that Medicare was going to go bankrupt, it did not say, "It is going to go bankrupt in 6 years if you pass a tax cut." They just said, "It is going to go bankrupt." They are two independent things.

As the gentleman earlier pointed out, the gentleman from Michigan, the average American right now is paying 40.5 percent in taxes. These are middle-class people. Each family has two incomes, you never get to see your spouse any more, your children are all running around going crazy. It is their dollars. We are not giving them back something, we are just not going to confiscate it in the first place.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would hope we can use part of this hour to talk about some of the other crazy things that are happening in the Federal Government, but it seems to me the fact is that there is no dollar savings as we look at revitalizing Medicare in this country. We are going to spend more and more money, as the gentleman from Arizona pointed out. Individual recipients who are receiving \$4,800 now will be getting, by the year 2002, \$6,700, so actually, we are continuing to spend more and more money.

I would ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], as we talk about maybe some of the other issues in the minutes that we have left, if he would give us a briefing on the status of the Istook amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. What the Istook amendment is, there are 40,000 different organizations that receive taxpayer funding in the form of grants or direct loans or straight funding. Many of these organizations, and by the way this is to the tune of \$39 billion, many of these organizations, most of them, are not even open to public disclosure of their records, saying where the money is going, who is spending it, what kind of salaries the directors are making, and so forth. What the Istook-McIntosh amendment says is that if you receive Federal money, what you have to have is that kind of disclosure.

Also, you cannot use the money for political lobbying. There was one example of an outfit that got 97 percent of its money from the Federal Government, and spent \$405,000 in PAC contributions to congressional candidates; absolutely nothing but funding politics with taxpayer moneys. It is totally wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is one of the things we are doing that will help move us toward a balanced budget and put some common sense in this crazy government system.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield—

Mr. KINGSTON. I have never seen the gentleman speechless.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And you shan't during my time here. Although it is very good to listen to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, outline the parameters of very important legislation which passed this House overwhelmingly, and we look forward to seeing it enacted into law, and I realize quite often this is the function of State government. But when many highway projects were being completed when I was growing up, you would see that famous slogan, "Your tax dollars at work."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is just important for the American public, who has seen so much of its income, the American families have seen so much of their income, taken in taxation by this Government, to the point, as my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, pointed out a few moments ago, in 1948 the average family of four paid roughly 3 percent of its income to the Federal Government. By last year, almost one-quarter of the average family of four's income was surrendered to the Federal Government in terms of taxation. I believe the hardworking people of America need to know that oft times political advocacy here on the bank of the Potomac, rather than any charitable or philanthropic endeavor, is where their tax dollars were at work.

Are we here to suffocate or strangle or silence public debate? Of course not; certainly not here in the well of this Congress, where we preserve everyone's right to have a diversity of opinion and to express that opinion.

However, the point is, pure and simple, it is an inappropriate use of tax money for groups to come to this Congress and ask for the largesse which is the money of the American taxpayer, to take that money and go out and be involved in political campaigns, or to take that money and come back here to lobby in the halls of the Congress for yet more and more money.

Mr. KINGSTON. I served in the State legislature before I was elected to Congress and served here one term, and then got put on the Committee on Appropriations this year. I cannot tell you how many tax-funded lobbyist schemes come across our desks in our office every day. You know doggone good and well people are there at taxpayer expense. They are printing the forms and so forth. Billy Joel wrote a song: "You Can Speak Your Mind, But Not on My Time." This reminds me of what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] is saying: "You can speak your mind, but not on my dime."

We need to move on because I want to talk about this train wreck, but I do want to say one thing. I have offered an amendment to the Istook-McIntosh legislation. What it says is that if your organization spends less than \$25,000 on political activity, then you can continue doing that. This way your local art museum, your local history museum, historic society, symphony, and

so forth, they will not have any problem still calling you up, asking questions, and giving their valuable inputs and so forth. I think it is important for us to say we do not want to pick on the hometown folks because we need their input. But some of this Washington-based lobbying on taxpayer funds needs to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] on this continuing resolution and the train wreck. Tell us, in non-Washington terms, what all that means.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We have two trains. There is a train on each track. One is the appropriation bills. We have 13 appropriation bills. They must be enacted to allow the Federal Government to continue spending in those areas. Those 13 appropriation bills have not been agreed to. So what we did today, this morning, is we passed what is called a CR, a continuing resolution. That continuing resolution allows the administration to continue to spend money, but at a lesser rate than they were spending money before the 1st day of October. So 3 days from now, when the new fiscal year starts, they will be allowed to continue spending until November 13 the average of what the House passed in the appropriation bills, compared to what the Senate passed in their appropriation bills, minus 5 percent. And so we are saying OK, we will allow continued spending, but at a very modest rate until we come to final agreement on the appropriation bills.

The other potential train wreck is the debt ceiling of this country. There have been a lot of suggestions that withholding our vote on increasing the debt ceiling is going to cause catastrophe.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman to explain to folks what the debt ceiling is, because I do not think the American households and businesses have debt ceilings. I am not sure they do. Tell us what that means.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Arizona would agree that this person, probably after Congress, could go right into the radio business as a talk show host.

Mr. KINGSTON. I will not let you guys get away with that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In 1917, Congress was passing on every borrowing, so they would agree who we were going to borrow money from and on the interest rate. In 1917 what they said was, "OK, from now on we are going to set a debt ceiling. You can continue to borrow as long as you are under that debt ceiling." But it has sort of become a way of life. Since 1940, we have increased the debt ceiling 77 times. The last time we did it, at \$4.9 trillion, was in 1993. We are going to reach that \$4.9 trillion in about 3 weeks from now.

Mr. KINGSTON. As you have explained it to me, it is a line of credit, that is what it is.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think the point has been made, there is a lot of talk in the press about how we are

going to have a train wreck, and House Republicans are not going to come together with a resolution, and here we have seen a bipartisan effort, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] working with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and others, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Speaker.

We have a continuing resolution now, and we are going to be able to work out, hopefully, with the Senate and the other side of the aisle the responsible things that the American people want. They want the government services that the Federal Government has to do, but they do not want the waste, the fraud, the abuse, and they do not want the cost overruns that have happened year after year.

So I think there is a cautionary red flag from the public saying, "We understand you have some important programs. Prioritize them, phase out the ones you do not need, privatize the others, downsize still others, and if you have an agency that can be eliminated because the State government is already handling it, that is OK, too." I think we are going to have this resolution because of the work of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], who are on the Committee on Appropriations. I think the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is going to speak out about how this is going in the right direction.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, because the vernacular of Washington, and especially the liberal press corps, has really taken over. Two years ago it was the notion of gridlock. Now it is the notion of a train wreck.

It is important to note, just borrowing that phrase right now, that I believe, as our good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. DANNY HASTERT, has state so well, I believe the American people firmly have their train on the tracks toward lower spending, lower taxes, reshaping this to be a limited and effective government for the next century.

With that train on the tracks, the challenge now exists in the executive branch for the President, who came on television in a brief 5-minute speech a few months ago, who again asserted the importance of a balanced budget, for the President to come along with us in a bipartisan fashion to move to balance this budget in 7 years. And if the President is willing to do that, and if the President is willing to come along with us in a bipartisan fashion, along with members of this minority, then the American people's train will stay on track.

However, if others who cannot seem to part from an almost pathological need to spend more and more money, to make government larger and larger, if they cannot abandon those outmoded notions, then the responsibility for any wreck will be on them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to ask a test question. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the question to the American people to give me your best guess, of all of the money lent out in the United States last year, how much of that money do you think was borrowed by the Federal Government? I will give you the answer. Think about it a second.

The answer is 42 percent of all of the money lent out in the United States was borrowed by the Federal Government. That is why Greenspan says if we can just do what we should do and not spend more than we are taking in, interest rates will go down 2 percent. How do we cut down on some of this wasteful spending of the Federal Government? I think that is a question for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON]. Let us all pitch in some ideas on wasteful spending.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am going to throw some things out at you. I have a constituent who wrote, Kenneth Richardson, actually from Atlanta, and he came up with this figure. He said that every minute in the U.S. Government, under their calculations, we waste \$2,152,207, and they show what our interest is and what our fraud and waste is in various government programs year in and year out. That is a scary thought.

He said, "What are you going to do about it, because every minute you are costing the taxpayers \$2.1 million." There are so many things that we have done in the appropriations process that, even though the Senate did not pass the balanced budget amendment, it is clear the American people want a balanced budget.

□ 1900

So I think the number one thing that we are doing is every bill that we pass, 13 different appropriations bills, we are moving to a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things that I want to point out. There are 163 different Federal job training programs. Sitting in on the hearings, many of them do the exact same thing. You cannot get the agencies to agree to consolidate, but if you sit there and you are not involved in the program, they sound like they are doing just exactly the same.

I would submit to my colleagues that out of 163 different Federal jobs programs, certainly we can combine many, many of them. I am not going to give a number, but I would say substantially most of them.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, talking about what we have tried to do so far, two items come to mind. First, the line-item veto which is the President's way that we have given him, once the House and Senate versions are agreed upon, to line-item out pork barrel legislation, which will take out those programs which have been in prior Congresses to get people re-

lected. They are not items that are of regional value or permanent value. That line-item veto is one item.

No. two, the Lockbox Act which we passed is going to guarantee that the money that is saved from the elimination of a program through appropriations is actually going to deficit reduction.

We have the problem that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] identified. They took out \$25 million for a turbine program which was requested to be pork. He took it out in committee. The next day it was in someone else's district already reassigned as pork somewhere else. It is moving around, and we cannot catch all of this pork.

Well the Lockbox Reduction Act which we passed last week is going to be one more way to make sure that the savings that the American people want of the waste and the inefficiencies and the items that do not belong in the Federal Government will in fact be eliminated permanently.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think it is very important, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, as Americans join us via C-SPAN to be part of this process, many folks have spoke about the intent of the new majority to consolidate some roles and to eliminate various cabinet level agencies.

I was involved in an interview with a national magazine yesterday where the question was put to me saying, Well, you have yet to eliminate a cabinet level agency. We realize you are working very hard in the Commerce Department, and certainly there is great merit to the elimination and consolidation of some worthwhile programs, and ultimately the elimination of that cabinet level agency, but the question came from the journalist, why have you not done more?

I think again, this cannot be stated enough, Mr. Speaker, to the American public. It is very difficult in the span of 9 or 10 months to reverse the inexorable trend of the previous 40 years. We are working very hard to reduce the size of government, to rein in waste in spending, to eliminate not only waste, fraud and abuse in a program like Medicare as we move to enact Medicare Plus and enact a better Medicare, and do that across the board in every area of this Federal Government, but it is a challenge that takes more than a few weeks.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is right. Mr. Speaker, we have enticed so many people to come up to the public trough, that they have become accustomed to it. It is difficult to make the transition away from that trough. It has to be done.

Mr. Speaker, politicians are not going to do it unless the American people say, hey, it is time. Cut spending. We are willing to tighten our belts to make some of the sacrifices so that our kids and our grandkids have the same chance of improving their lifestyle as we did.

Davis-Bacon comes to mind. Davis-Bacon is coming up in the next several days. Davis-Bacon was enacted by Republicans in 1931 so that some lower-cost, black labor coming into New York could not get those construction jobs where there was any Federal money. So the law was passed, it kept the beginning wage-earners out of the marketplace for anything that government was contributing money towards constructing or building. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1931 reveals that one of its primary goals was to block southern minority contractors from obtaining New York construction jobs.

Let me just give an example of the requirement of prevailing wage. The prevailing wage in Philadelphia for electricians averages \$37.97 an hour, but the average wage actually paid by private contractors is \$15 an hour. That has resulted in an overcost to the American taxpayer, and with the expenditures that we borrow from the United States, of \$3.2 billion. That is only the tip of the iceberg, because every place that government has any money in a State contract where the State may be paying the majority share of that contract, the State is now required to pay those prevailing wages instead of the market wages that could tremendously reduce the cost of schools and any other construction.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to mention another way that we can save money on the budget, which is to crack down on illegal aliens entering this country simply because of the generous and almost irresponsible, I think in fact very irresponsible, public benefit and assistance program.

I am going to read something that maybe the gentleman from Arizona is very familiar with from a group called FAIR, the Federation for American Immigration Reform. I am not familiar with this group, but I have heard this story many times and I know the gentleman from Arizona has heard it also. That in the town of San Luis, Arizona, there are 8,100 postal boxes, but there are only 4,000 people who live there.

Every month the post mistress of the town, Ms. Rodriguez, has to sift through thousands of letters containing welfare checks, unemployment checks, and food stamps, and in the last month there were 13,500 income tax refunds that were all fraudulent.

What is happening is that 10 to 15 people are using a mailbox and they are getting Federal Government, American support and they are not American citizens, but they are defrauding the American Government.

This problem for the Western States and all the border States is tremendous, and it is costing Americans billions of dollars each year. I think the cost to the California school system alone is \$2 billion to \$3 billion. Twenty-two percent of the prisoners in our Federal penal system are illegal aliens, and my colleagues and me and our constituents are picking up the costs.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia would yield, yes, I am very familiar with the story of what transpired in San Luis and indeed would like to thank the Arizona Republic newspaper for bringing that story to such prominence to citizens of Arizona, and indeed, to the Nation.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] points up something that is very, very important here. Again, it is time to pause for a distinction, because implicit in what the gentleman says is the notion that a lot of people, whether they are citizens or not, would move to take advantage of what I believe to be misguided largesse of this Federal Government, and we need to make this distinction.

Mr. Speaker, when we are here tonight speaking, we are not here to demonize those who come to these shores looking for a better life who follow the path of legal immigration, but it is summed up in the very description that I believe some people have almost become immune to hearing. It has become a catch phrase. Why do you think we call it illegal immigration? It is against the law.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon this Congress to carry out the wishes of the American people, especially the people of the border States, and indeed nationwide, who see the fruits of their labor, their hard-earned money taken through what many would call confiscatory taxation policies and bestowed on folks who are not even citizens of the United States.

Now, there can be a legitimate debate, and indeed, there is great diversity in this House, and there are many different philosophies, and there are those in this body who genuinely believe that it is the role of this government to be the charity of first resort. I think that is blatantly wrong. Some people have that idea. But even if we accept that idea, should not charity begin at home?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that bothers my constituents as much as anything maybe is their experience standing in food lines and the individuals ahead of them at one time or the other have food stamps, and the food that they are buying with those food stamps is more than the individuals that are working very hard for a living, that go to work every day even when they do not feel like it, can afford. So they are bothered by what turns out to be a \$25 billion a year food stamp program and welfare, AFDC.

Can my colleagues imagine going to our own daughters and saying, I want to talk about your allowance. If you get pregnant, we are going to increase your allowance by \$500 a month, provide you housing, and a food allowance on top of that. We never say hat to our own daughters, but as a society we are doing that. In some cases, it is a deciding factor in what has happened in this country with these young women,

where now 30 percent of the births in the United States are out of wedlock.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a point made quite well by Marvin Olasky in his book, "The Tragedy of American Compassion." Somewhere along the line in this country we decided that caretaking should be substituted for caring, and so engrained has it become in the subconscious of the body politic that it is pervasive almost to the point that we gauge caring by examples of caretaking through Federal largesse.

Now, are we saying that people should just be cut off, tough luck? No, not at all. What we are saying is this: as we transform this welfare State into an opportunity society, we should take care to make sure that what we truly have is a safety net instead of a hammock. That is the challenge we face as we move to confront a new century, and as we engage in open and honest debate with those who may have a different point of view.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think what we want with welfare reform is a program that has a work requirement, if you are able to work, a program that lets States have flexibility, because in Georgia we are going to do it differently than you do in Arizona, different than in New York City and San Francisco, and that is the way it should be.

Let us decide how we are going to deal with our poverty. Give us some guidelines, but give us the flexibility that we need, and then there is that illegal immigration component. We do not want money being used to attract people to come to America just so that they can enjoy the public benefit.

Then finally, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] said, you want to have a component in there that does not reward irresponsibility, particularly when it is not age appropriate for 16 and 15-year olds to be parents.

Mr. Speaker, we are coming to a close. I do want to say on the subject of welfare reform and all of the things that are going on in my hometown, Savannah, GA, where there is a group called the Chatham Citizen Advocacy led by a good friend of mine, Tom Kohler. I believe Tom Kohler leans Democrat, but I was kidding him because he works for an agency who I think the philosophy is Republican, because No. 1, it does not take any Federal dollars or local dollars.

What Tom does is he matches up somebody who is established, prominent, better off, upper middle class with somebody who is unfortunate, who has had some hard knocks, who is down on the ground. He matches the two together. Not so that the wealthy one can write a check and feel good about himself; he turns them into friends. The wealthy person says to the poor person, let me help you. What are your problems? How can I help you get a job? How can I help you to the hos-

pital today? How can I help you kick the habit, or whatever it is.

Tom says that the benefit to society of course is economic. The benefit to the two individuals when they come together with human compassion is immeasurable.

□ 1915

I am not saying that is going to solve our problems, but, doggone it, the thing about it is it is a local problem and it is not taxpayer-funded money but it complements what we are trying to do. We all have to have a role in it, the Federal Government, the State government, the local government. But certainly the volunteer sector can come in, also. If we get out of the way, there will be a lot more room for them.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentleman brings to mind a program in Arizona, known by its acronym, WOW, Women Off Welfare, which employs many of the same notions that you describe in the program in your home district in Georgia.

Let us hope for our society that we never go down the road where Government has grown so large, where it has taken over acts of kindness and charity to such a great degree that we denigrate those who would step forward through traditional notions or innovative notions of charity that offer perhaps the most elemental and the most significant contribution that can take place, one-on-one caring, not care-taking.

For indeed as we see, who cares more about children? Their parents. Not someone employed by the Federal Government in Washington.

I do not call into question a government employee's dedication. But it will never take the place of a parent's love, it will never take the place of mentoring that most parents can provide, and indeed as we confront a new century, it is important to note that Uncle Sam is our uncle, he is not to be big brother, nor is he to be Mother and Dad and surrogate family to the American people.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think you have wrapped it up real well. I am going to add one last line. A lady named Charlie from Denton, TX wrote me and said on the subject of the public debt, which is of course what has been our central theme today, saving money, cutting back on the size of Government and so forth, she says:

I'm very upset that some people think it's okay to tax my grandchildren, 17 years to 3 months old, for things other people have already used up.

We have got to balance that budget, we have got to give a promise so that Charlie's grandchildren and your grandchildren and my grandchildren will have a bright, great America as we know it can and should be.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE
SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4. An act to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4) "An Act to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence" and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

RADICAL LEGISLATIVE CHANGES
ON HORIZON

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of some colleagues of mine who were here earlier speaking about the Medicare cuts and the Medicaid cuts. Nothing is more important now on the legislative agenda than the rape of Medicare and Medicaid.

Many people have focused on Medicare and do not even know that Medicaid is being cut even more drastically than Medicare. Medicaid is being cut by \$180 billion over a 7-year period. But it is a smaller program and the percentage of the cut is much greater.

Of even greater significance than that is the fact that there are proposals on the table to eliminate the entitlement for Medicaid. Medicaid at present offers a means-tested entitlement. That is, if you can prove that you are poor and needy, then you qualify for Medicaid if you are in the category which on the basis of this means-testing process makes you eligible.

This means-tested entitlement, as we call it, is now on the chopping block. It is being proposed that it be eliminated.

We have a precedent that has been set in the last few days. We have witnessed the Senate follow the pattern of the House and eliminate the entitlement for AFDC, Aid to Families with Dependent Children. That is welfare mothers in popular terms.

Welfare mothers, welfare families, welfare children, under the law that has existed since the Social Security laws were enacted, under the New Deal, under Franklin Roosevelt, have had an entitlement. That is, if you can prove that you are really in need and you are poor and you qualify under the means-testing, then you are eligible for the benefits of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

That is gone now. It is only a matter of the President signing it into law.

The Senate has passed a bill which removes the entitlement. The House had already removed it before. It is a barbaric act.

I have used the word "barbaric" before. I have defined barbarians as those who have no compassion. Many barbarians have a great deal of education but they have no compassion.

When I use the word "barbarian," I do not refer to religion. I do not care which religion or which denomination they belong to. If they have no compassion for anyone except their own kind and kin, then they are barbarians. They are incapable of having compassion.

Barbarians are a threat to society, especially when barbarians have power. When barbarians are able to make decisions and they do not have any compassion, they are a threat to any society. They are a threat to America, because they are making these horrendous cuts and taking away entitlements like the entitlement of a needy child to help from their Government.

They are threatening to take away the entitlement from Medicaid, the entitlement of a person who is sick or families who are in need of medical attention and are unable to pay for that medical attention themselves. They are going to take it away.

They are going to leave the elderly out on the hillside to die, in symbolic terms, because when you cut Medicaid and you take away the Medicaid entitlement, what you are doing is cutting nursing home care, because two-thirds of Medicaid goes to nursing home care and care for people with disabilities. Two-thirds. One-third is for families who are poor, but two-thirds goes for nursing home care for the elderly and for people with disabilities. So you are going to take away the nursing home care from the elderly people when you remove that entitlement.

The Federal Government is going to get out of the responsibility of promoting the general welfare in that respect and leave it all up to the States who would not do it before. Before we had Medicaid, they would not do it. Before we had Medicare, the States would not do it. So there is no reason to believe the States are going to take up that burden once the Federal Government gives them that responsibility and slowly the amount of money made available by the Federal Government is decreased.

I want to loan any support and certainly associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who spoke earlier about this problem of Medicare and Medicaid being number one on our agenda. Everybody has to be concerned about it. It is a snapshot of our civilization.

Where are we in America right now? If the American people sit still and allow this to happen, where are we? If we allow coverage for health care to instead of going forward to become universal coverage as we were discussing just a year ago, just a year ago we had

plans on the table to move forward universal health care coverage, where eventually 95 percent, at least, of all the people in America would be covered with some kind of health care plan. Now instead of moving forward, we are going to take away the coverage which is already guaranteed to people who are eligible for Medicaid and move backwards.

There will be many fewer Americans who are covered with any kind of health care plan after this Medicaid entitlement is removed. That is a great step backwards, and the American people must focus in and take a close look at who are we, what are we, where are we?

Are we so desperate that we have to act as barbarians? Are we so desperate that we have to sit by as the voters and the citizens and approve of such barbaric acts? Are we going to swallow the arguments that we are on the verge of bankruptcy and there is no other way to get out of this threat of bankruptcy except to do mean and extreme things to each other, to the least among us, those who are unable to help themselves?

Please try to stay with it, because the pace of change over the next 3 or 4 weeks will be quite rapid. Next week we will have a week off, but the pace goes forward even though the Congress will not be in session, because the negotiations now on the appropriations bills, the negotiations and the details of the health care plans and Medicaid, the welfare reform, a number of things are happening, and they will go forward even while Congress is not in session next week.

But once we return, then all other things will have to be wrapped up in a matter of a few weeks and the pace will be mind-boggling. There will be radical legislation changes. We are not just finishing up the first half of the 104th Congress.

The agenda for the 104th Congress requires, because of the way the leaders have structured it, that we pass radical legislative changes before this half of the session ends. That means that in the next 3 or 4 weeks, you are going to have to follow very closely while some very mean and extreme changes are made rapidly. Under the cover of the rapidity, the swiftness with which things are done, much will be lost unless we follow very closely.

We did pass a continuing resolution today. A continuing resolution, I have explained before, is a resolution necessary to keep the Government going when the appropriations bills have not been passed to cover programs and activities of the Government. Most of the appropriations bills have not been passed by both the House and the Senate.

I would like to applaud our leaders in the House, our leaders in the Senate and our leaders at the White House for not indulging in melodrama. We did not have any melodramatic showdown