

in car pool lines deserve a \$500 per child tax credit? Do you think that they could use that to buy a few more pairs of tennis shoes, T-shirts and backpacks for their children? Do you think the workers of America deserve that? Do you think that they have paid enough and maybe something like that would help them?

Let us talk about some of these other taxes that we are accused of giving a tax cut for the wealthy. Do you think that our senior citizens should get the tax relief on their Social Security when the President increased taxes on Social Security in 1993? Do you think it would be fair to take that tax off of our seniors? Do you think that it would be fair to let seniors work longer without being penalized on their Social Security? I do not think that is extremist.

What about the capital gains tax? If we pass a capital gains tax, will Ted Turner benefit from it? He will. I do not have a problem with that, Mr. Speaker, because who else will is all the widows in my area, which is a growth area, who have bought their house 30 years ago, it is now paid for, but the house that they bought for \$50,000 in the 1960s is now worth \$300,000 and they could benefit from a capital gains tax cut.

Welfare. Let us talk about welfare. We have been accused of extremism in welfare and all kinds of quotes that almost are hard to recognize. The President, as you know, promised to end welfare. He did not offer a welfare reform bill. When we tried to offer one, we were accused, here is one, of Representative LEVIN, "You use a meat ax against the handicapped children and their parents."

President Clinton said in February 1995, "What they want to do is declare war on the children in America."

Here is another quote from a Member of the House of Representatives on the House floor said, "These people," they are talking about these Republican freshmen, "are practicing genocide with a smile. They are worse than Hitler."

Here is another one. These are all from House Members. "There is a similarity between NEWT and Hitler. Hitler started out getting rid of the poor and those he said were a drag on society and NEWT is starting out the same way."

These words have been said on the floor of the House by Democrats.

□ 2215

Now I ask, does that sound a little extreme in terms of rhetoric? Is that based on reality? What is the Republican welfare bill?

#### SUPPORT THE CHILD TAX CREDIT FOR FAMILIES

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. You are truly a gentleman for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on an issue that I think is of critical importance to the people in my district, and that is the people who I believe truly are the forgotten people, and those are the people that work day in, day out to try to struggle to make ends meet.

It is really a privilege to be in this body, it is really a privilege to try my best to represent the people of my district. But one of the things that bothers me and that honestly I am sick and tired of is that there are thousands of people in my district who I honestly feel are ignored, their concerns, their interests are overlooked by the politicians in this city. They are the people who dad works, dad works two jobs to try to make ends meet, mom is working as a cashier at the supermarket to try to make ends meet, and honestly at the end of the month, at the end of the day, they frequently do not have enough money to try to pay for the things that they need.

They are trying to set aside money for college, and they cannot do it. They do not know how they can pay for braces for the kids. The car needs new tires, and they do not have enough money after they pay the rent. They do not have enough money after they buy the food to be able to put new tires on the car. So what do they do? They drive around with a car that needs new tires.

And one of the biggest problems for these working families is the burden of the taxes that forces them to have to put mom out to work when she does not want to or forces dad to have to work that second job and, as a consequence, he cannot spend the time with the kids that he really needs to.

We Republicans, we were trying to do something about that this year. We put forward a \$500 per child family tax credit. Those families today in America, typically the working family today in America, they are sending 25 percent of their income to Washington, DC, and 40 years ago when I know when my mom and dad were raising us, when I was a kid growing up, they were sending 4 percent or 2 percent of their income to Washington, DC.

It is the burden of government, of the bureaucracy, of the programs after program after program, the wasted money that is shackling and hurting our working families in this country. So we put forward a \$500 per child tax credit, a tax credit that I thought was really going to help some of those working families, working families like the Tanner family in my district, who Bill Tanner works as an electrician. His wife, Anne, just recently had their fifth child, and our \$500 per child tax credit would have meant \$2,500 more for Bill and Anne Tanner to put toward the

new tires on the car, to put towards money for college for the kids, to help them make ends meet.

The President of the United States, he opposed us on that \$500 per child tax credit after he ran in 1992 promising a middle-class tax cut, and we put forward a reasonable proposal, and the Democrats in this body opposed us on that \$500 per child tax credit.

I think it is wrong for politicians to come up here to Washington and say that they are working hard and they are fighting for those working families, those families that are having trouble making ends meet, and what happens, what is the end result: that they oppose the proposals that we are trying to put forward to honestly try to help them.

They even opposed us on the balanced budget. The economists tell us if we could balance the budget, interest rates in this country could drop 2 percentage points. What that means for those working families is a car loan that is 2 percentage points less, a mortgage that could be 2 percentage points less. That can translate for those working families into more money in their pocket, and that is money again that they could turn around and use for their families.

This government has gotten too expensive. It has gotten to be too costly. Oliver Wendell Holmes said that taxes are the price we pay for civilized society. I believe that the price is too high and that working families in this country need a break. The President and the Democrats in this body need to change their position on this issue. They need to support the family child tax credit. They need to support our balanced budget effort.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY AMONG AMERICANS

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted tonight to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] to join me in probably about 30 or 35 minutes of a dialog regarding issues facing the American people today. With that, I have asked my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, if he would be the floor manager of this discussion. With that, I will ask him to initiate the discussion.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, we have just returned from some time back in our districts, and I do not know about the rest of my colleagues, but we have had a chance to hear what some people have had to say on the issues of the day. I had, I think, eight different town meetings, I was involved in about nine parades, did one special meeting with seniors in my district, and so I think I got pretty good feedback, and

I thought maybe we could talk a little bit about some of the things we heard during the district break.

But I know that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] has some points that he wants to make and so I would like to yield to him for as much time as he may consume, if that would be all right, then we can get more into a discussion.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wanted to address something that I think is dear to your heart, and that is the label that Republican freshmen have been getting hit with about being called extremists. Your class came to Washington with a spirit of reform and yet the press and the Washington establishment, who likes the status quo, has called you extremist, mean-spirited, callous, and so forth. The reason why is because you have tried to do this thing called the Contract With America. The Contract With America is a legislative package designed to reduce the size of government, cut waste, lower taxes, balance the budget, reform welfare and increase personal freedom.

Now, my friends and neighbors that I see at the grocery store at checkout lines do not consider those extreme ideas. But let us examine this in detail. First of all, do you think it is a good idea to balance the budget? Do you think we should do something about the \$20 billion in interest we pay each month on the national debt? Do you think we should pass this legacy on to our children? Do you think it is extreme to try to balance the budget in a 7-year period of time? I think not. I think that is a responsible legislative agenda, and I am glad that you are taking it. I applaud the gentleman for it.

What did the Democrats do before when they were in the majority? Well, they increased domestic spending another \$300 billion. They created over a period of time 163 different Federal jobs training programs, 26 different food and nutrition programs, 180 education programs. We may need more than one, but do we need all that duplication in Washington? Do we need all that bureaucracy?

What did the Democrats do about taxes? Well, in 1993, President Clinton passed a \$245 billion tax increase, which included a four cents per gallon gas tax, a tax on Social Security, a tax on small businesses and partnerships.

What do the Republicans want to do? Well, we extremists have been accused of wanting to give tax breaks for the rich and the elderly. One of these taxes is a \$500 per child tax credit. I ask the Members, is it extreme to give the working families of America a \$500 per child tax credit so that they can buy a few more tennis shoes, a few more lunch boxes, a few more books, a few more clothes and so forth? I do not think that is so extreme.

What about our seniors, shouldn't they be able to work longer without being penalized on their Social Secu-

rity? That is one of the tax relief ideas that we had, allowing seniors to work longer.

What about the capital gains tax cut? Now, will Ted Turner benefit from a capital gains tax cut, and all the wealthy people? Yes, this he will. Do you know who else will? All the widows in my district who bought property in a growth area during the 1960's. They bought a house that was worth maybe \$35,000 at the time, and today it is worth \$200,000, and they can sell that money for long-term personal care home or a medical emergency and not be taxed at the highest tax bracket because of this thing called the capital gains tax.

What about the marriage tax penalties? Should we give the same tax rate to people who are married as we do to the people who live together? Right now, a couple can live together and they pay less taxes than a couple that gets married. Is that right? Is it extreme that Republican freshmen want to change that? And what about welfare? Members know, we tried to change that.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Georgia, I just wanted to further refine and clarify something he said about working people. Is it not true in America today that the average working family will spend more on paying taxes than that same average working family will spend on clothing, housing or food? Have you heard that?

Mr. KINGSTON. That is absolutely right. Another statistic I have heard is that the real Independence Day is July 3 instead of July 4th, because from January 1 to July 3, that is when you are working to pay for all the cost of the government at every level plus the cost of regulation at every level, and that is right out of working people's pocket.

Mr. JONES. Is it not true also, according to the General Accounting Office, known as the GAO, that in 17 years without a balanced budget, which the Republican Party is committed to achieving, without a balanced budget in 17 years, according to the GAO that average working person will pay 80 cents out of a dollar to taxes? Have you heard that?

Mr. KINGSTON. I have heard that, and all I can say is that family will quit working.

Mr. JONES. Absolutely.

Mr. KINGSTON. There comes a point when the mule cannot pull the load anymore.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about welfare. The President promised to end welfare as we know it, never introduced a bill when the Democrats held the Senate and the House, and yet when the Republicans did, what were we accused of? And these were quotes, actual quotes that I got out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we were accused of by our Democrat colleagues: These people, the Republicans, are practicing genocide with a smile. They are worse than Hitler.

And here is another quote: There is a similarity between Newt and Hitler; Hitler started getting rid of the poor and those he said were a drag on society, and Newt is starting out the same way.

Here is another quote: But not since the biblical day of King Herod have our children been in such grave danger. But unlike King Herod, who went only at the male child, the Republicans are going after all children.

Now, what is it that we were doing that was so extreme, so hard for the Democrats to take, so that they were accusing us of declaring war on the children? Well, the main thing we are trying to do is say able-bodied people who are on welfare who can work are required to work. Is that extreme? Is it fair for a guy who is out there working 40, 50, 60 hours a week paying for somebody to stay at home, is it extreme to say to the guy who is able to get to work and join him to be required to work? I do not think it is.

What about illegal immigrations? We said no more permanent benefits for illegal aliens, people who are not American citizens. Is that extreme? I would say it isn't. That was part and that was one of the things the President vetoed.

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] or the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT], we recently, as you were talking about welfare reform, if my colleagues remember, the House of Representatives passed a bill, and I am going a little bit off your subject but it does tie in, about we are talking about late-term abortions, and the President of the United States, the highest office in this land, when the majority of people in America said, even women and men that were pro-choice said, that late-term abortions are wrong when a child in the 7th and 8th month of life in the womb of a mother, is murdered, and yet the President vetoed a bill that Democrats on that side and Republicans on this side said that we need to ban late-term abortions in America.

□ 2230

And yet the President vetoed it. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota how his people in Minnesota feel about that issue.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, I think it ties together with what we are talking about, because when we are advancing what I think is a commonsense agenda, and I think it is commonsense whether you are from North Carolina or Georgia or Minnesota, of putting the Federal Government on a diet, making the Federal Government live within its means in advancing policies, whether it is the Defense of Marriage Act or eliminating or making illegal these diabolical late-term abortions where the baby is literally pulled from the mother's womb, all except the head, the head is left in, scissors are inserted in the back of the baby's brain and literally the baby's brains are sucked out

with a suction device, I think everywhere outside this Beltway that is considered extreme.

The agenda we have advanced is commonsense. The extremism, if there is any here in Washington, DC, is I think confined to our liberal friends.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is it not true that two of the most liberal Democrat leaders, the gentleman from Missouri, DICK GEPHARDT, and the gentleman from Michigan, DAVID BONIOR, voted to ban these partial birth abortions?

Mr. JONES. Absolutely.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yet the President still vetoed it.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is a good point. Many of our friends on the other side, who you would consider liberal, joined us in that particular vote, and hopefully this Congress is going to have another opportunity to revisit that issue and we are going to have a chance to override that veto.

Because I do not know about you, and we have talked about going home over the Fourth of July, I was at one county fair, and I must tell you that was the number one issue that people wanted to talk to me about, because they had learned the facts about this procedure and they said you have to do everything in your power to override that veto, to make certain that that stops.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is it not true this procedure is so gruesome that the extremists who are against the legislation did not want to allow the sponsor to have a poster, a chart that actually showed the procedure, and they tried to vote not to allow it on the floor? Is that not the case?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is exactly right. And it was a very simple medical type diagram to demonstrate exactly what happens in this procedure. But again it comes back to what the gentleman has been talking about what we have been advancing, whether we are talking about regulatory reform, balancing the budget, or allowing families to keep more of what they earn. And your point was made as well that back in the 1950's when we were growing up, I am not sure about you, Mr. KINGSTON, you are quite a bit younger than us, but when we were growing up, my parents, and we talked a little too about working families, my dad worked in a factory all his life, union man, member of the AFL-CIO, and my folks raised three boys and my mother did not work. She stayed home.

Now, we did not have a lot of the things that people think that they have to have today, I am sure, but we never considered ourselves poor. But there was a big difference back in the fifties. Most of the families raised their kids on one income. And why couldn't they? They got to keep 95 percent of what they earned. The average family today has to raise their kids on less than 60 percent of what they earn. Huge difference.

Mr. JONES. In my district, as a candidate for Congress and now as an

elected Member of Congress, and going back in my district every weekend since I have been here 17, 18 months, except for about four, the people keep telling me, Congressman, we are tired, we are working harder, we are working longer, but we are taking home less money, what can you do to help us?

I think the Congresses of the past that have been the Democratic controlled Congresses kept increasing programs, increasing the size of government, and when we increase the size of government programs we are taking more money out of working people's pockets.

What has happened in America is that frustration. That is why I think we are the majority now. People are looking for us to reduce programs, particularly those that do not work, which there are plenty, and they are looking to us to say please give us a chance, let us work harder but let us keep more of our money.

I see this frustration every time, every weekend I go home, because I see people at the grocery stores, I see people at church, I see people down the street and they say to me, Congressman, we like what you all are doing, please give us a chance to earn and to have a chance to do for our families what we think we should have a chance to do.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the examples I like to point out in terms of the Federal registration, which is the book of all the Federal regulations, and so forth, it has grown from 41,000 pages 10 years ago to 68,000 pages today, and we have over 130,000 Federal bureaucrats that basically just look over your shoulder to make sure that you are behaving right and telling you how to do things from educating kids, running a poverty program, to health care, to running your business, to your home. Everything.

Some of it is good. I certainly want to have a safe and sound government, but I want to have a commonsense government, one that is balanced. And is that not what we are saying? Is it not that we want to give the people back home more decisionmaking power and more personal freedom, and is that an extreme position?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think the two fundamental questions, and this comes up in my town meetings as well, and I am sure you hear it, and it comes down to two very important questions. The first question is who decides? Is it going to be the Federal Government or is it going to be decided by local units of government and, more importantly, by families?

And second, and I think it is almost the same question, but who knows best? And I think an attitude has developed here in Washington, and I agree that is one of the reasons they sent so many of us here in the last election cycle, was that the attitude that had developed here in Washington that Washington knows best, whether you are talking about raising broccoli

or raising kids, there is this attitude that somehow Washington knows best.

I think it was exemplified a few months ago in a hearing in the Senate when one of the education experts ultimately said to one of the Senators that he really felt that he cared more about children than the average parent. And the Senator finally stopped him and he said, well, if you care more about my kids than I do, then please tell me their names.

And when you get right down to it, the truth of the matter is parents care more about kids than bureaucrats and it really is a question of who decides and who knows best. And we have tried to say that we think families know best. We think we ought to allow them to keep more of their own money, to make more of their own decisions so that they can do more for their kids, so that they can save more, so that they can take mom out for supper on Saturday night and leave a little more in the collection plate on Sunday morning.

That is what this is all about. This is not some mean-spirited accounting exercise; it is about renewing the American dream. And for too many Americans that dream is dying today.

Mr. KINGSTON. I had a town meet in the little town of Darien, GA. A teacher came there and she said, you know, each week, or each day I spend 2 to 3 hours on paperwork, most of it for the Federal Government. Now, that is 2 to 3 hours a day, equaling 10 to 15 hours each week, 10 to 15 hours a week she is not teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic to the kids.

Now, the question is, who do you think best knows how to educate the kids in Darien, GA, that teacher or Washington bureaucrats down the street from where we stand right now? And as you have pointed out, as much as these bureaucrats love children all over America, I still think because they are in Washington they might not be able to teach them as well as the teacher who is right there in Darien, GA.

And I do not know why everybody outside of Washington, DC, understands that, but the bureaucrats here just do not get it.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. But the story gets twisted. The unfortunate thing is the story gets twisted somehow between what we are trying to do and as it goes through this cycle here and as it gets filtered through sometimes the dominant media culture out there that somehow if we decide to reduce the size of the bureaucracy, the educational bureaucracy, for example, to follow up your point, that if we vote to reduce the size of the educational bureaucracy then we are hurting kids, when in fact there is no real proof that what we are doing right now is helping kids. Test scores have gone down as we have increased the size of the educational bureaucracy here in Washington.

Mr. JONES. During the week at home during July Fourth, just like I am sure you as well as the gentleman

from Georgia, I attend four or five church services that were called God and Country Day.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I am glad to hear that now. You deserve it. You need that.

Mr. JONES. I am going to give this back to you in a moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. I did 15 services myself.

Mr. JONES. Well, I want you to speak about yours in just a moment. I attended four or five church services about God and Country Day and Return to Glory Day, and I must say that it helped, it inspired me for this reason. As you know, both you gentlemen know, and I am on the bill and maybe you both are, I am on the bill introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma, ERNEST ISTOOK, called the Religious Liberties Amendments, and I had this discussed many times. Why do you in Congress, when you have behind the Speaker's chair "In God we trust," why do you not allow our students to have voluntary prayer in school?

And I was pleased to tell them that ERNEST ISTOOK, a second or third term from the State of Oklahoma, has introduced a constitutional amendment, and that is the way it should be, to give voluntary prayer back to the States and the schools. And these people applauded in church when I told them that I was on a bill that would help, if it passes the House and the Senate and goes back to the legislatures.

As you and I, all three of us know, and those listening, 38 out of 50 State legislatures have to pass the legislation before it becomes an amendment to the Constitution. But people in America are ready for the clarification of our religious freedoms that the writers of the Constitution promised us, whether you are a Jew, Catholic, Protestant or Moslem.

I will share this and then I will yield to you, the gentleman from Minnesota or the gentleman from Georgia. It so happens that last year, in 1995, a Federal judge in Santa Fe, TX, I think his name was Kent, I apologize if I am mistaken, sent a notice to a high school graduating class that if you were going to use the word "Jesus" in a prayer, and it was a Protestant-Catholic group, 90 percent of it, then he would have to have you removed by the Federal marshals.

So what ERNEST ISTOOK and those of us who have joined in this legislation have done is to say all we are asking is that we clarify our constitutional rights to practice religious freedom in America, whether you are a Jew, Catholic or Protestant or Moslem.

So I am pleased to tell you that back home in my district, in eastern North Carolina, and I am proud of this district, we care about religious freedoms in this country, and that is what I think the Constitution is all about.

Mr. KINGSTON. All I will say about that Federal judge is he obviously wanted to go to hell and he did not want to wait in line.

I think it is real important that we understand that what we are trying to do is just get decisionmaking out of Washington. Think about this. In Minnesota, North Carolina, if your county welfare agency knew that it was in their hands and in their power to end poverty in your home county, what a difference it would make, because really we do not look at poverty as our problem.

The thing about Americans is we see a problem, we want to fix it. And so what we have found ourselves subconsciously doing in many cases is ignoring problems because we see something like poverty and we think, well, we cannot fix that. You know why we cannot fix it? Because there are too many rules and regulations.

If somebody is on welfare, a 16-year-old with a baby, she needs health care, she has education needs, she has transportation needs, she has child care needs, and under our current welfare bureaucracy different agencies do different things, and so if you wanted to you cannot solve her problem because there are too many bureaucrats who are telling you this is my territory; this is my territory, and I get her here and I get her here and we do not want you just to have one A to Z program to get this young woman independent.

So, as a result, we all kind of tend to back away from it. But if you knew in your hometown you could make a difference, then you would make a difference.

Mr. JONES. Is it not true that since the mid-1960's, when the Great Society program was established under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson, that it has cost the American people \$5 trillion? This Nation today is about \$5.3 trillion in debt. So welfare has cost the American people \$5 trillion.

In addition to that, what the Republican majority has proposed that even Democrats supported and the President vetoed is a program that would save the taxpayers in 7 years in outlays about \$58 billion and lend the programs, or I should say direct the programs back to the States, which most of them want, and the President vetoed it.

□ 2245

Is that not correct, please?

Mr. KINGSTON. It is correct. I think, there again, the President was acting from an extreme point. There is nothing extreme about requiring able-bodied people to work. There is nothing extreme about discontinuing permanent benefits for illegal aliens or telling local folks they can get involved in their own poverty program through State grants.

But the President decided to go for the status quo, and if the American taxpayers have paid \$5 trillion, is it not time that we tried something different because of no results?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the important point. We have spent \$5.2 trillion on the war on

poverty. It is terrible in terms of the cost in dollars, but the real tragedy of the welfare system we have created in the United States is not the cost in terms of dollars; it is the cost in terms of human potential.

As I say so many times, we do not have to walk very far from this Capitol building to see the effects of what we have done on people. Go to any of the housing projects. In fact, 85 percent of the violent crime in this city is committed within 3 blocks of a Federal housing project.

We see the despair and despondency and dependency that we have created. The cost is astronomical in terms of dollars, but the cost is so much higher in the cost of human potential. The real reason is when we try to substitute Washington-run welfare systems for those old-fashioned traditional values that really made this country work, things like work, and family, and faith, personal responsibility, those are the cornerstone values that really have made this society work. The problem with the welfare system is not the cost in terms of taxes; it is that it erodes and destroys and eats away at those cornerstone values.

That is why we need to reform the welfare system, not just to save money for taxpayers this generation or the next. We need to reform the welfare system and move away from a Washington-run welfare system because we have destroyed all of those basic values. Look at the families that have broken up, and people do not see themselves as personally responsible anymore. We do not encourage faith. All of those things made this country work.

In the 1840s there was a French gentleman who traveled the United States and he wrote several important books. One was called "Democracy in America." I am talking about Alexis de Tocqueville, and he said it in so many ways so beautifully. It was this volunteerism that really made America work. He talked about religion.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] talked about ERNEST ISTOOK's bill that I am cosponsoring as well. De Tocqueville said religion is the first instrument of democracy. Yet somehow we have driven religion and faith from the public square. The only welfare system was through the churches and faith institutions, and now we have said they cannot participate.

I do believe that we have to reform the welfare system and help the President keep his campaign promise. It is much more about human potential and the waste that the Washington-based welfare system has created.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the things about welfare, in preparation for Father's Day I was doing some research and found out that police departments unfortunately use as an indicator of crime in the neighborhood, not the drug use and not the location or the geography but how many fathers live at

home. Ninety-two percent of the children on welfare do not have a father at home. Those are the kids that do drop out of school, do have teenage pregnancy situations, do have violent crime and so forth.

The fact was unbelievable, but it is that breakup of the family unit. Why is the dad not at home? Because we have a stupid, insane government policy that says if he stays at home, they get kicked out of the housing project because their income will make them ineligible. Does that make any sense?

Would it not make sense to have a housing project where we have stable mom-and-dad relationships, where we can have some model citizens that other folks who live in the housing project can look up to? Does common sense not dictate that we do that?

Instead, we have a Federal Government that says, "No, dad, you are out of here. If you stay here, she is going to lose her benefits," and she cannot go out and find a job and get the benefits and the child care and the health insurance, and she needs that. I do not blame her.

Mr. JONES. The points have been well made. What we are trying to do is to give a program to the States with a financial support because we believe the States throughout America, the 50 States, as has been proven in Michigan and Wisconsin, that the people of the State know what will help those that are dependent on welfare.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is right. Most of the people on welfare would like to have an opportunity to get off of welfare, but we have a system that punishes them, whether it be that they live in public housing and they go out and get a job and start making a little more money, and they raise the rent and they cannot get caught up. It is the same way with those that want to work.

The point is that we have got to develop a system. I think the States can do a better job—that has been proven—than the Federal Government of saying what works in my country, Pitt County, North Carolina. The State of North Carolina knows better than some bureaucrat that we made reference to 10 minutes ago telling North Carolina or Georgia or Minnesota what works better in their State. Let the people decide. Let the people help people. That is what it is all about.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield, I have had 75 town meetings since I was elected. I did not realize that until we counted.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is extreme.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is extreme, but every one of them, I feel better. Certainly we have a few people that disagree with us, and that is part of a democracy as well.

But there is so much common sense among the American people, and they understand exactly what was just said. They understand that the Washington-based, one-size-fits-all, whether we are talking about education, the environ-

ment, whether we are talking about welfare, we can take any issue and they know instinctively that it can probably be run much more efficiently and frankly more compassionately if it is run locally and if we allow people to volunteer and to work together. They know that.

It comes up at my town meetings and I suspect it comes up at every town meeting, that the common sense, the decency and the compassion of the American people is overwhelming. But somehow all of that that we talk about here in Washington is called extreme by some of our friends here in the Congress and by some of the folks in the media, and certainly by the people down in the White House.

But outside of this beltway there is tremendous good common sense among the American people. They understand this. Frankly, I have said this before, I think they are way out in front of us. The things that we are talking about I think the American people understand instinctively.

I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] wants to share some thoughts with us tonight. I wonder if we can kind of wrap up. I do want to talk about some of the other things that we may have heard or learned while we were back in our districts over the Fourth of July break. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] have any? I have a couple of other points I might share.

While my colleagues think about it, I will share a couple. I was surprised in my district how often the issue of the FBI files came up. Frankly, again, I think the American people are out in front of us and I think they put their fingers on the correct questions.

The first question that they cannot seem to understand and I do not understand is how people could be heard in the White House and not know who hired them.

Mr. JONES. Would the gentleman yield? I am not going to take his time, but I must tell him that is the question that was asked of me numerous times. How could Mr. Livingston have such an important job and nobody knows who hired him? That is the point he is making.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I want to make sure we are all on the same page. The question is who hired Mr. Livingston, and he is the political operative who illegally obtained over 900 FBI files on private citizens and invaded their privacy by looking into those files illegally, and has yet to give us an explanation of what he was doing with them, why and who ordered them, and how he is saying he did not even know who hired him.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. One of my constituents raised a point that I had forgotten, and that is that a number of years ago a guy by the name of Chuck Colson went to jail for mishandling one FBI file, and he went to jail for 3 years.

I think there is an instinctive understanding among the American people

that if they can misuse the FBI against Republicans here in Washington, that they can misuse the FBI against anybody. It can happen to them. It is a grave concern to the American people.

They are happy that Congress is looking into it, but they also suggested that we have to be very careful that this does not become just a partisan political witch-hunt. I think we have to do our jobs and exercise oversight without becoming overly partisan.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman would yield, because we may in 1 minute yield the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] so he can have a full hour, but I would like to add to the point very quickly that you, with a badge on your lapel that says that you are a Member of Congress, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], you will have a very difficult time, as I would or anyone else in this membership, to get into the White House. Yet we have a man running a security that nobody knows how he got there. It is absolutely ridiculous and crazy.

I think I have about 2 or 3 minutes left. I would like to yield, if the gentlemen would agree, the remainder of my time.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If I could, just for 1 minute, one other very important question was raised. I think this is one of the best questions that I heard. I am embarrassed that I did not think of it. If this is an innocent bureaucratic snafu, why is it that the bureaucrat who was most responsible when he was called before the Senate, why did he take the fifth amendment? There are a lot of unanswered questions and I think the American people are expecting us to get to the bottom of it.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Georgia for participating with me tonight.

#### FBI FILES SCANDAL

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to continue joining me in this discussion, and then I will use the last half-hour or whatever I have left to go on about the patent issue, which is an issue that I have been championing here, and will go into great detail for the record after we are done with this discussion.

Let me just note that I worked in the White House for 7 years. I was a speech writer for Ronald Reagan during that time period. I am fully aware of the apparatus in the White House, and I was absolutely horrified to see what was going on there in terms of these FBI files.

Let me also note that I was horrified when Billy Dale, who was a hard-working, just regular human being, a civil