the world, and our energy information policy; less than three one-hundredths of a cent.

So for the average American family making $33,000 a year, they are spending $20 a year in the form of Federal taxes to support an energy supply, which, again, is the cheapest energy in the world. Today, a gallon of gasoline in America averages $1.26 cents a gallon. In Canada, it is well over $3. In Europe, it is over $4.

There are the offset which accrue of about 4 cents on the dollar to the American taxpayers. The Federal Government gets a mortgage credit of about $1 billion back; in the Postal Service, about $1 billion 800 million in FDIC deposit insurance, about $17 billion. It costs us a little over $6 billion for the Commerce Department to advertise and try to advance our commerce around the world.

The employer share of employee retirement is about $34 billion. The rents and royalties on the Outer Continental Shelf for drilling and exploring and so on, about $2.4 billion. Other offsetting receipts, about $7 billion. So we get back, for the taxpayer, nearly 4 cents on the tax dollar in terms of these offsetting receipts and credits.

I want to go back to this one chart again, because this capsulizes everything. Again, by function of government, what is it the tax dollar buys, from top to bottom? Twenty-two cents of each dollar buys Social Security for our people; 17.9 cents, or 18 cents, buys national defense; 15 cents, a little more, is interest on the debt; 14½ cents is income security for all those things we talked about previously; 10½ cents goes to Medicare. Nearly 8 cents goes to health; education, training, employment, and social services, 3½ cents of the dollar; transportation, 2½ cent; veterans' benefits, 2½ cents; natural resources and environment, 1½ cents; general science, space and technology, a little over 1 cent; international affairs, 1 cent; administration of justice, 1 cent; general government, 1 cent; community and regional development, three-quarters of 1 cent; agriculture, two-thirds of 1 cent; energy, one-third of 1 cent; and about 4 cents of the dollar in offsets and credits. That is what the Federal tax dollar buys for the American public.

For a family making $33,500 a year, that is $6,478 in all forms of Federal taxes. For a family making $49,000 a year, that is $10,800, in all forms of Federal taxes. For a family making $111,500, that is $30,786, in all forms of Federal taxes.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, we can do better. We can do better in some of these categories. There are debates raging out here right now about what we do to stabilize the Social Security fund before it goes broke in the year 2030. How do we continue to provide for my generation, which is in its fifties, and for my son's generation, in their twenties, to have Social Security that they have paid in all their life, as the present generation has provided? Maybe there are things we can do to invest more wisely, or allow people to invest more wisely to stabilize that fund.

We have cut national defense considerably over the past several years. We are downsizing that area of the Federal Government, but we cannot downsize it much more.

Our net interest is the area we have to work on, because we need a balanced budget. We need to balance this budget. We need to reduce interest as a portion of our Federal debt. We are making headway on that deficit, but we have to go all the way to zero deficit spending.

That is why the debate is raging out here about how we get there, and the two great political parties are sharing their philosophical notions about how we get there. It is my hope and prayer we will get there, for the benefit of our children.

Medicare and part of the income security and health dealing with Medicaid and other health care services, we are right now debating here ways to lower the cost of the government with respect to those health care programs which are the fastest rising parts of the Federal budget. We are going more toward managed care. Other types of things we are doing to try to lower the cost in these major areas. This is the discretionary area of the budget. These things are the entitlement areas of the budget. Everything has to be on the table.

But let me say this, Mr. Speaker. For those people who come down here and say, ''Well, we have worked until May 7 this year for the Federal Government,'' please tell the rest of the story. Please say that for those 4 months, we provided Social Security for our elderly and defense for our Nation, and we took care of health care problems and Medicare and health research and education and training for our unemployed; that we provided the best transportation system in the world; we helped our veterans; we took care of our environment and preserved our natural resources; we engaged in general science and space exploration; we conducted our international affairs as the leading power in the world; we had a justice system in which we maintained the FBI, the CIA, the BATF, the Federal prison system.

Please say that we spent only 1 cent on the dollar to operate this Congress and the executive department and the various agencies that serve this Congress and the executive department, and the General Services Administration and the Department of the Treasury, the Office of Personnel Management, and all these things; less than a cent on the tax dollar.

We have to tell the rest of the story, that we have engaged in community and regional development to the benefit of our communities in providing for sewer systems, water systems, other infrastructure developments that we have helped with, which greatly promote the economy and the commerce of this Nation, on very little as a percentage of our tax dollar; that we have supported the income security of our farm community, which has provided the cheapest, most plentiful, safest food supply in the history of any country in the world, and we have fed most of the world for many, many years. Say that.

The only thing I want to say is this: that the whole story is that it may be true that we worked until May 7 to pay our taxes to the Federal Government, but the rest of the story is that we get a lot of very good benefits. We can do better. We can save more, we can spend less, and we shall. But the American people ought to know, too, that we are struggling to give them what I think is the best we can do for the tax dollars that they send. It is not just coming here and going into a black hole. It is not just coming here and being wasted away.

Is there fraud and abuse? Yes. Should we get it out? Yes. It is incumbent upon every agency of the Federal Government and the oversight function of this Congress to give assurance to the American people that we are tightening restrictions, we are doing everything possible to make sure that we are spending this money in the most cost-effective, efficient way possible on behalf of the American people.

☐ 2145

We are trying to do that.

My only purpose here tonight was to try to give the American people some sense of what their tax dollar is being spent for. That is all. I hope that we can agree that it is being spent not in some of the ways that the Americans people are thinking, like 30 percent of it going to foreign aid, but that we are trying to do our best to serve our people with the income that they do send us.

COMPETING PHILOSOPHIES FUEL DEBATE OVER ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois who preceded me here in the well. Indeed amidst all the talk of a lack of civility, amidst all the talk of hostility in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I can personally say without equivocation that one of the honors of serving in this House in addition to being here representing the people of the Sixth District of Arizona is to serve alongside my good friend from Illinois. Because without venom or vitriol, he states a case, and he makes mention of the fact that, yes, there are two predominant philosophies at work in the Congress of the United States, by and large two philosophies represented within the two-

party system, and I applaud him for his efforts to go beyond mere accountancy and figures to try and explain what many of us have come into contact with with various road projects, both at the Federal and State level, where we have all seen the sign that says, Your Tax Dollars At Work.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of my good friend from Illinois. But, as he says, there are basically two philosophies, and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to put words in the mouth of the gentleman who preceded me here in the well but simply to challenge his fundamental thesis, the underlying argument, Mr. Speaker, that he presents tonight to the American people.

My friend seems to say that American citizens laboring from January through May to account for the huge Federal tax bite, well, that is money well spent, so my friend says. And, yes, there are problems, but incremental reform and fine-tuning and some adjustment can give us the necessary change to confront the next century.

Again I applaud my friend's effort and it is not a spirit of one-upmanship that brings me to the well of this House tonight, Mr. Speaker. But again I feel compelled to challenge the assertion nor the assumption of my dear friend from Illinois. For, you see, Mr. Speaker, I believe true reform and true effective use of tax dollars stems first and foremost from this document, the Constitution of the United States. And while I appreciate my friend's effort to account for your tax dollars at work, I do not believe that any of us can improve on the assertions of our Founders who in a beautiful and indeed inspiring Preamble to the Constitution offered, Mr. Speaker, I suppose in the buzz phrase of the mid-1990's, their vision statement, if you will, for this constitutional republic, and I quote:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

And indeed, although I am joined on the floor by a dear friend who is a practicing physician, most of what transpires in this Chamber and upon this hill does not equate with brain surgery nor complex accounting. Instead, its most fundamental premise is founded upon the notions set forth in this document, what one historian, I believe, rightly called the Miracle at Philadelphia. This document, timeless, timeless in its ability if not to predict the future but to provide us with a framework for a free people to determine what should transpire within this free society. And I cannot help but note the irony of those who purport to represent the party of Jefferson who all too often forget his words, and this is something that becomes misunderstanding given the theatrics and the rhetorical excesses bound to occur in an election year, but it is worth noting again the Jeffersonian ideal. It was not for elimination of government but, as Mr. Jefferson pointed out, the ideal of a limited and effective government with the proper role for the Federal Government and a far more active role for State governments, for counties and for urban jurisdictions.

And so that frames the debate as we approach the next century.

Are we to assume that history occurs in a vacuum? Are we to assume that because at previous junctures in our Nation's history we should only subscribe to a philosophy that would dictate that power should reside primarily here in Washington, D.C.? And, further, that that power be exercised not by those elected but by those appointed or those who have sought career service within a vast bureaucracy?

That is the crux of the debate. Let me pause here, lest someone misunderstand.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a diatribe directed toward those who find themselves in the employ of the Federal Government. Indeed, I would be the first to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are many hardworking, dedicated people employed in the service of the Federal Government. But, Mr. Speaker, it is to say this: At this juncture in our history, is it preferable for power to be concentrated here on the banks of the Potomac in the hands of unelected officials accountable really only to themselves? And is it proper to issue the assertion that, Mr. and Mrs. America, if you work from January until May to satisfy your Federal level of taxation, well, well and good, because you are receiving incredible benefits? Is that really the course we should follow? Or is instead it more proper to understand that the average family in 1948, the average family of 4, surrendered 3 percent of its income in taxes to the Federal Government as opposed to the average family of 4 one year ago which surrendered almost one-quarter of its income to the Federal Government? And, mindful of that, is it a good and fair deal that the families of this Nation now spend more, Mr. Speaker, on taxes than on food, clothing and shelter combined?

For, you see, Mr. Speaker, this argument is made not out of avarice or greed or selfishness or any of those labels so many in this election year are willing to bandy about akin to playground taunts. No, the question is asked legitimately because it helps define what type of future we should have. And indeed as I look beyond the Preamble to this Constitution, I cannot help but note the first clause in article I, section 1, which reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

''All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.''

All legislative powers, Mr. Speaker, vested in this institution and the other body across this magnificent structure, the Congress of the United States.

Yet what has transpired in this century? Often for the most noble of motives, this Congress has established agencies within the executive branch and those agencies in turn issue regulations.

Let me again pause at this juncture to make sure I am not misunderstood, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying that regulation in and of itself is a bad thing. No, quite the contrary. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, in my profession as a broadcaster, I know firsthand that a modicum of regulation was necessary to create order out of chaos on the airwaves, first at the behest of a Secretary of Commerce by the name of Herbert Hoover, then through a Federal Radio Commission established in the late 1920's, and ultimately within a Federal Communications Commission, and I think we can all agree with the developments in technology, with the changes we have seen throughout this Nation with the wonderful expansion of the economy and opportunity, some modicum of regulation must continue. But what I am saying and indeed what I propose in H.R. 2727, the Congressional Responsibility Act, is to indeed make sure that the first section of Article I of the Constitution is followed, that all legislative powers be vested here. Accordingly, H.R. 2727 would provide that every proposed regulation return here to the Congress of the United States for an up-or-down vote before it is printed in the Federal Register.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia who joins my good friend the physician from Florida.

Mr. KINGSTON. I do not want to jump in front of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] but on the point of regulation one of the bills that we have pending now is reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act. One of the current regulations that water systems have to operate under requires small systems that use ground water to test for contaminants that are only found in surface water systems.

☐ 2200

So here we have EPA, taxpayer funded, requiring groundwater systems to do the same tests as surface water systems. Absolutely absurd.

The same act also requires that EPA post new regulations for 25 contaminants each 3 years, whether the regulations are needed or not. It is just absurd. It goes under what you are saying, we do need regulation, but we do need common sense in the regulatory authority.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Even in addition to common sense, which I laud the gentleman for mentioning, and which many observers would say time and again seems to be absent not only from this Chamber at times, but also through the vast bureaucracy, we need a proper reassertion of constitutional authority. That is why every proposed regulation should not be enacted by bureaucratic fiat, for as my two colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, what oft

times happens is you have a shift in the power. Instead of the power being conferred by the people on their duly elected representatives to make laws, the power is bequeathed or ceded to the regulators who can come up with regulatory expansion, as my friend from Georgia mentions, that exceeds what the average person would deem to be reasonable. In doing so, it subverts the whole notion of laws and by the expansion of what I choose to call the tyranny of the bureaucracy and the power being conferred on government bureaucrats, what we have done is allowed those bureaucrats in essence through the issuance of regulation to make laws, because as my two colleagues know, certainly my physician friend from Florida understands, those folks with the sanctions of imprisonment or fine are basically enacting laws.

Of course I yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I very much applaud you in your efforts to reassert the authority of the Constitution of the United States, because I feel very strongly that not just for years, but for decades, the language of our Constitution has been either subverted or totally ignored. There is probably no better example than the rampant, wanton, overwhelming number of regulations that have come from Federal bureaucrats that have tremendous impact on the day-to-day lives of American families who are very, very often just struggling to make ends meet.

You were talking about tax policy before. What is so amazing to me is that the callous, casual attitude that many politicians have about raising taxes, when many families, they are on such a tight margin that those slight increases in taxes mean a cutback in their ability to plan for a vacation, to plan for higher education for their children, to plan for an expansion on their home.

But getting back to the subject you were talking about, regulations, the other body, their Governmental Affairs Committee recently reported out that Federal regulations cost the average American household $6,000 annually in higher prices, diminished wages, and increased taxes or reduced services.

Furthermore, under the Clinton Administration, there has been a record increase in the number of Federal regulations. They have increased at 4.6 percent per year during the Clinton administration. This is a record, it stands at an all time record of now 67,518 pages of regulations, 18 percent higher than what they were in 1992.

Some people think this is just an abstract concept. But when you talk to a small businessman who is trying to start a new business and discovers that he has to fill out form after form after form of regulations dealing with multiple different layers of bureaucracy, and that inability to get himself started in his business frequently results in lost income for his family, and sometimes in bankruptcy, businesses not even being started, jobs not created because of the burden of Federal regulations, this indeed I think is one of the silent crimes of our government against our people, the fact that there has just been this endless amount of regulation issuing forth from Washington, DC.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think my friend from Florida, indeed on the front lines of not only health care as a physician, but also on the front lines here representing very capably the people of this district, again points out something which we should note with more than curiosity, indeed with widespread concern, for taking the model offered by our dear friend from Illinois, who preceded us here in the well, who said well, let us set up the construct, if you are paying from January to May for the tax bill, it is money well spent, there is in fact a hidden tax, and this is what the gentleman from Florida refers to, a hidden tax of overregulation that by many estimates means that the average American is really in essence working for governmental entities far beyond May, indeed past the day upon which we celebrate our independence, and that the true Independcence Day for the American citizen in terms of taxes and fees levied by excessive regulation, either through higher costs or other things, does not come until really mid-July.

So there you have it, more than six months, in reality, six and a half or almost seven months, where the hard working people of the United States work and labor essentially to propagate a system of excessive regulation and a system of centralized control.

What we offer in the new majority is very simple, and this is something that we need to articulate here once again, free from the diatribes and the playground taunts and the interesting interpretations that some of our friends in the media would offer. What we are simply saying is this: Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the United States of America work hard for the money they earn. They ought to hand onto more of that money and send less of it to Washington, and they should have not only the money in their pockets, but they should ultimately decide what is best for their families and their futures, instead of ceding that power and that revenue to a centralized governmental authority.

Let me yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. A story of one of your freshmen colleagues really fits in there, and that is that of SONNY BONO, one of your better known freshmen.

He tells the story of leaving Hollywood and going to Palm Springs to start a restaurant. He needed to make some changes in the building that he bought and so forth. So he went down to the city hall to get building permits, thinking that he was going to be creating jobs and additional tax revenues and all kinds of positive things for the area that they would say ''Mr. BONO, we are so happy to have you in here, we need entrepreneurs, employers. This is a great boost for our economy.'' Instead, he was given the runaround. ''Why do you need these permits? How have you chosen the contractor who is going to do the work?''

They started nickeling and diming him and micromanaging the project. He thought it was going to take 15 minutes. Six months later he still had not gotten his permits for his building, the renovation and building permits, from the city there.

Mr. BONO. tells a great story of walking in one day and saying ''I have got my permit problem solved.'' The bureaucrat behind the desk said, ''No you don't.'' SONNY BONO said ''Yes, I do''. The bureaucrat said ''No, you don't, Mr. BONO. Nobody solves permit problems without me. I am the one who decides. I represent the government. You can't do anything on your own without me.''

SONNY BONO looked at him and said, ''Oh, yes, I can. I have solved my permit problem. I am going to run for mayor, and I am going to fire you.''

That in essence is a true story of how SONNY BONO got into politics. He did run for mayor, he was successful. He points out, he is not inhumane. He did fire the guy, but turned around and let him be his gardener, so all was not lost.

But the point of the story is you have in the U.S. Congress now people who have experience with real world bureaucratic red tape. They have not been raised in the political ranks, where they have chief of staffs and administrative assistants and directors who protect them from the dirty world of red tape which the real world has to contend with.

So as your 73 freshmen Members came to the House floor, you have fought for less regulation and more individual responsibility and more indivdual freedom. I think you have made it. You have got a securities reform litigation signed by the President, the Paperwork Reduction Act signed by the President. We have stopped the practice of passing local laws and making local county commissions pay for it after we decide how to run every county in Arizona and Florida and Georgia. We are trying to back off that.

So the impact of the 73 freshmen has been tremendous, and yet it is just a start as to what we need to do to truly get government off the back and out of the pocketbooks of small businesses all over the country.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, my friend from Georgia makes an excellent point, and indeed relating once again to us the real life experience of our colleague from California and what prompted his entry into pursuit of elective office I think is especially appropriate.

But there is something that undergirds it entirely, Mr. Speaker,

and that is the notion of those who put together this document, the notion of our Founders, which was unique in human history. For in contrast to our English forbearers, or our British cousins, as some of us affectionately refer to our friends across the Atlantic, in this new Nation, in this constitutional republic, we did not choose to recognize one person or one family as sovereign or as sovereigns.

Instead, in this Nation we operate from the assumption that, first, power is conferred upon us by a creator, and that in this Nation, the people are sovereign and they in turn confer their power, or political power, if you will, on governmental institutions. Yet, as our friend from Georgia relates the story, what all too often happens is that notion is twisted or turned to where American citizens are suddenly accountable to unelected career Washington bureaucrats, instead, Mr. Speaker, of what was intended, and that is for government to be accountable to the people.

So, indeed, this so-called revolution, which, by the way, can only be defined as extreme in terms of the context of making extremely good sense, what is in fact a resolution not born of something radical but something entirely reasonable, simply says that the power, indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is reminiscent of a popular slogan in the 1960's, that power belongs to the people, and that power goes to the people.

Let me yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just want to add to your comments about the so-called revolution. In my opinion, the revolution that people talk about here in Washington is nothing more than a dose of common sense coming from the people that you talk about, which is where the power truly lies with, a dose of common sense coming to the people of this city.

This city is insulated from the people that put them here. This so-called revolution is nothing more in my opinion than the people that work in Washington at the bidding of the governed who elect them and put them here, finally having to start acting on some of these things that people have been crying out for for years and years and years and years, like reforming the Congress itself, making the Congress live under the laws that they have been passing on to the people.

Madison, in Federalist Paper Number 37, which I am sure as a student of history as you are, J.D., you would know that he said in that federalist paper that the Congress should not be allowed to pass any law that does not have its full operation on themselves or on their friends. In reality, as we know from the past 25 or 30 years, they have repeatedly passed major pieces of legislation, including the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Family Leave Act, even the labor laws themselves and OSHA regulations they exempted themselves from.

And OSHA regulations, they have exempted themselves from it. As I understand it, the people from OSHA right now are beginning to do their audits on all these buildings here on Capitol Hill, and that some of them have some very, very serious problems. And those problems would have never been recognized if it had not been for the fact that this so-called revolution, which I think is nothing more than common sense reform coming to this body and coming to this city, and it is something that the American people have been asking for for years and years.

□ 2215

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Florida and I would be happy to yield to my good friend from Georgia after I offer this parenthetical note to quantify what the gentleman from Florida just said.

Indeed, if we were to define this, Mr. Speaker, despite the sensationalistic notion of revolution, what in essence we have here is rather than revolution, a reclamation, a reclaiming of this government for its rightful role in society, and that is what is at stake here and a reevaluation of the role of government.

I thank our good friend from Florida for joining us, making those points, and once again I am happy to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from Florida had mentioned OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and for years this has been the group that was kind of the government watchdog on health and safety in the workplace. Certainly it came into being under the Nixon administration. It was a pro-worker law, but it was not an anti-business law either. It just had some common sense.

And yet we are now in a situation where over 60 percent of the OSHA fines are for paperwork violations. You have to list such hazardous substances as that of the ink that you use in a Xerox machine. If you store that, you have to have a material safety and data sheet. And if you do not fill that out properly, you are fined. There have been cases of OSHA coming in and laying a heavy hand on small businesses and putting them in some cases almost out of business because of the financial crunch, litigation, and so forth. Yet in the agriculture side of our economy, there is the Soil Conservation Service which gives farmers technical assistance to prevent erosion, which is a pro-environment type agency, but giving technical assistance to farmers, which they need, a very good working relationship between soil conservation and farmers.

And here you have the same type relationship between OSHA and businesses, only it is an antagonistic one. What we would like to do is have OSHA be more like Soil Conservation is to the farmer, helping the businesses make their worker environment safer, because one of the things I learned when I sold workers compensation insurance is that the price of the accident, a hundred dollars for stitching up somebody's thumb, is four times when you consider the time lost and the problems with worker morale and so forth. Businesses have every motivation in the world besides government to take care of their employees; if nothing else, just from the production standpoint.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming the time, I thank my friend from Georgia for making this fundamental point, for as certain as the sun rises in the morning, there are those who will willfully distort or mischaracterize what we are saying here tonight.

And the gentleman is quite right, Mr. Speaker, for he talks of regulation that is there to establish order and also there to offer a helping hand, not in terms of money or tax dollars allocated to business, that is not what we are talking about, but to work in a cooperative fashion with business and industry as opposed to an adversarial relationship, or a game that is ofttimes played in the Nation's press, in the common vernacular it is called a game of ''gotcha''. So that we pass so many regulations, so cumbersome, so out of touch with what is reality or in any way, shape or form reasonable so that those responsible for enforcement can come in and say, ''Ah, 'gotcha'.'' Part B of subparagraph 1 of section 325 states this. You made an effort but you did not quite reach what I believe, as the regulator, as the arbiter of this, to be the right decision.

It comes back not only to this document, our Constitution, but also to the simple notion I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker. And it is this question. What is reasonable? What would a reasonable person do?

As my friend from Georgia mentioned a second ago, even if we accept the notions that some in our society seem to adopt, that business, by its very existence is greedy or motivated out of avarice; even if we were to accept that notion wholeheartedly, we would have to understand that it is in the best interest of business to make sure that employees are productive. And to be productive they need to work in a safe environment.

So even if we were to proffer the notion, as some in this Chamber do from time to time, that the profit motive is inherently evil or selfish or somehow misguided, even if we were to accept that notion, there would be the corollary offered by my friend from Georgia, which is this: Those folks owning the business would like to keep it productive, and to do so there has to be a modicum of worker safety.

I want to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. The other thing is that if we want to help workers, we do want to have a safe work environment.

Everybody, an employer, government employees, everybody will agree on that. But if we want to help the workers across America, the key thing we have to do is honor why they are working, and that is to make money and make a better society.

Now, if we want to help those workers, let us let them keep more of their own paycheck. And the President has vetoed a $500 per child tax credit. He has vetoed an earned income tax credit that would have helped America's working poor. He has vetoed a balanced budget amendment which would have brought down interest rates so that they could borrow money less expensively for their cars, for their homes and so forth. But I think one of the things that really adds insult to the American workers is his veto of a bipartisan welfare reform bill, a welfare reform bill which would have only required people to work 20 hours a week.

Now, I ask the gentleman from Arizona, is there anybody in Arizona who can provide for their families working 20 hours a week?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I know of no one who works from dawn to dusk to provide for their families who could do that for 20 hours a week.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to make sure the American people know this, because here we are talking about workers' safety and we are talking about the quality of the job done, allowing workers to keep more of their paycheck, and the President of the United States says it is not good enough to require able-bodied people on welfare to work 20 hours a week.

The working men and women in Georgia and Arizona are working 40, 50, 60 hours a week. They are in debt. They are barely getting by, and the President says I am not going to make people work 20 hours a week for their welfare benefit.

Now, for crying out loud, here it is an election year and he is saying 20 hours a week is too much? I think that is absurd, and I think the people of Arizona are probably just as outraged as the people in Georgia are about it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, and again I thank the gentleman from Georgia for bringing forth this very cogent observation. And again, Mr. Speaker, we should note this is not said with venom nor vitriol, not in the form of a playground taunt, but, really, Mr. Speaker, just to examine the record of the gentleman who resides at the big White House at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, for if words are to mean something, actions should correspond to the words.

And, indeed, as my friend from Georgia points out, we have a President who campaigned in 1992 on balancing the Federal budget in 5 years. Yet when confronted with a realistic plan that actually gave him a 2-year grace period, if you will, a balanced budget plan which was introduced by the new majority, back I believe last October, the President chose to veto that; instead putting in its place a document of suspicious foundation from this standpoint, Mr. Speaker.

It would be akin, and I will use a personal example, I am fighting the battle of the bulge around my waistline, it would be akin to saying to someone we are going to give you a year to lose 50 pounds. We ask you to lose two pounds in the first 50 weeks of the year, and in the final 2 weeks of the year we ask you to lose the remaining 48 pounds. On paper the mathematical operation can work, in real life that would be very difficult.

That is what we are dealing with. And as my friend knows full well, we have, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, a President elected by saying that middle class taxes were too high and that people should hang on to more of the money they earned, yet adopting the philosophy upon his inauguration of those proponents of big government who said, oh, no, no, no, more of your money should come here to Washington. Thus, the largest tax increase in American history.

But especially galling, as my friend from Georgia points out, and this is something that happened on my watch, if you will, after I was elected to the Congress of the United States to represent the good people of the 6th District of Arizona, we provided this President, Mr. Speaker, with a welfare reform plan, taking him at his word when he said we should end welfare as we know it, and as my friend pointed out, with a modest work requirement.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. He chose to veto it not once but twice. And I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield. What is interesting is, last September, I think it was September 15, 1995, it was on Larry King Live, the President said about the Republican welfare bill, I like it, it would end welfare as we know it.

And that welfare bill passed the U.S. Senate, which certainly is not an activist conservative body. It passed the U.S. Senate by a vote of 87 to 12. We had all the liberals voting for this one, and the President indicated he was going to sign it and he vetoed it. Vetoed that tough requirement for 20 hours a week work. Vetoed that tough requirement saying illegal aliens could not get taxpayer dollars. And vetoed that tough requirement saying that teenagers need to identify the dads so that they could participate in the uprearing of that baby financially, if nothing else.

But you know what? I think it is probably our fault, and I will tell you why, Mr. HAYWORTH. When the President said I am going to end welfare as we know it, we were not listening. He said I am going to extend welfare as we know it. We missed the E-X-T. I think what he really meant was not end welfare but extend welfare. Because in the 3 years that his watch has taken place on Pennsylvania Avenue, all that we have seen is an extension of welfare, more folks who are able-bodied staying home than ever before.

The poverty rate is up 2 percent higher than when Ronald Reagan was President, and we have now spent $5 trillion on welfare since 1965 and we are not bringing down the poverty rate.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, little wonder, then, that the so-called credibility gap of the 1960s, Mr. Speaker, has expanded to this credibility canyon involving the President of the United States who says one thing and then has actions totally, totally in opposition to his rhetoric.

And, Mr. Speaker, again this is not said to score partisan points. Indeed, the irony of what has transpired in the last year and a half is that this new majority has moved to enact many of the programs that our current President championed on the hustings only to abandon once he moved in to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

But it is especially galling to have this situation. And now, in addition to the credibility canyon, now in addition to the reality of this President extending welfare as we know it rather than ending it, you have the whole new wrinkle known as the Clinton crunch. For, yes, Mr. Speaker, there will be a day of reckoning.

□ 2230

When this President has the audacity to come back to this Chamber, after standing here at this podium a few short months ago telling us the era of big government is over, and insist that this government, already in arrears to the tune of $5 trillion with the national debt, should expend yet $8 billion more of those dollars which we do not have, it is an incredible assertion, not something to be championed or applauded, but something to be questioned for its very absurdity.

It is indeed frustrating to find those who would give lip service to reform and think not of the next generation but instead of the next election. That is something that my friend from Georgia and I are not here to do, for we are not career politicians.

Let me yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. As the gentleman pointed out, with the veto of the balanced budget and not offering an alternative, what you have done is you said no to lower interest rates because a balanced budget would have lowered interest rates 2 percent. Businesses would have been able to expand. Jobs would have been created. Therefore, you are saying no to lower interest rates, no to new jobs. And also, you are saying no to the $500 per child tax credit, the much-needed tax relief to the middle class in America. That is what we need so desperately.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, when you talk about that $500 per child tax credit, I cannot help but

think of the people of the Sixth District of Arizona who send me here to represent them. I cannot help but think of a single mother who may have three children, whose spouse may have deserted her, who is working hard, playing by the rules, trying to provide for her family and yes, seeking outside educational skills to heighten her earning potential, despite the trauma that has most assuredly occurred in her personal life.

By denying the $500 per child tax credit, the champions of big government, the champions of expansive and excessive bureaucracy are saying to that single mother, ''No, indeed, ma'am. You do not need that $1,500 to spend or save for your family as you see fit. That money instead should be taken from you and given to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C.''

How fundamentally cynical, how philosophically bankrupt, how essentially immoral that notion is. For what we do here is to establish the primacy of the State, the primacy of the bureaucracy instead of the power of the people. In a free society, that young lady struggling to provide for those three children should have that money to spend on those children as she sees fit.

Let me yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, as things go, had our bill passed into law instead of been vetoed by the President, your constituent would have in her pocket today $1,500 extra which she could use for clothes, for textbooks, for college education accounts and so forth. Instead, that $1,500 did not go to deficit reduction, it went to welfare expansion, other programs such as the AmeriCorps program which pays ''volunteers'' $26,000 a year, and most of them who end up going through the program end up working for the government, and just countless other bureaucratic, Washington-based command and control programs. You know, I have a lot of faith in the people of Arizona. I have never lived there. I have not visited your fine State as much as I want to.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, we absolutely invite you to the great State of Arizona, Mr. KINGSTON. I hope you will visit often.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would like to do that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. You will be back.

Mr. KINGSTON. But I have just as much faith in your folks as I do in mine, and my people would do fine without Washington command and control bureaucrats telling them how they need to run education, telling them how to run the environment, telling them how to run health care, telling them how to run welfare. We have ideas of our own in the First District of Georgia, and we can do fine without Washington bureaucrats.

Just think about what we are doing. We send our money to bureaucrats and then they tell us how to spend it. They get their cut and they send part of it back to us to run programs, and we know these people better than they do. We can do a better job on poverty, right down the street, than people in Washington can.

I often think about that story, and you have heard it, ''The Star Tosser.'' I do not remember the author, do not even remember the name, but the guy walks up and down the beach picking up starfish and he throws them in the water. Every morning he does that after high tide. He throws these starfish back in the water.

Somebody came up to him one day and said, ''What are you doing? You cannot save all these washed ashore starfish. There are thousands of them. On a good day, you maybe get 150 of them back in the ocean. What difference could you possibly make?''

The man picked up a starfish and said, ''I do not know what difference I make, but I am going to make a heck of a difference to this one right here,'' and he threw it in the ocean.

Now, the point is, I cannot clear up poverty in Arizona or in California or all over the country. I might not even be able to do it in my own hometown, but I know this: I am going to have a heck of a lot better shot at taking care of poverty in my hometown than I will in your hometown.

Mr. BILBRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. What the bureaucrats in Washington are telling us is they are so smart, they can do it in all of our hometowns.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I will be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. The gentleman from Georgia was just pointing out that the people in the community know how to serve their poor the best and that Washington does not know best.

Let me tell you, as somebody who was a county supervisor in a county of 2.5 million plus people, that we operated a welfare system larger than 32 States. When we ran into welfare fraud, we actually ran into a situation where we realized we did not have pictures on the identification cards that welfare recipients use.

Maybe being a little naive, I, as an administrator of a large welfare system, decided that it was time that we brought the system into the 20th century and put pictures on welfare cards. That is all we were saying, the ability to try to reduce fraud. Washington, D.C. said, ''We are not so sure we can allow you to do that because it might violate the privacy of the welfare recipients.''

Now I want you to remember that every time you look at your driver's license, and think about the fact that do you honestly think your government is violating your privacy by having you take a photo? I think that common sense approach that we fought so hard for in San Diego, in trying to get the Federal Government off our back and allow us to administer these programs in a reasonable, logical way, just really has to ring true here of saying guys, it has gotten out of control.

Washington is not the only well of wisdom and compassion, and we have got to allow people to address the problems they see in their community and in the programs. As a past administrator, I sure hope this city learns to finally understand to trust the people with freedom and trust them to do the right thing. The American people are good people, and if Washington would just give them enough latitude to do the right thing, American people will do the right thing.

I appreciate the time. I would just like to point out and to say to the gentleman from Georgia, I would like to offer him happy birthday tomorrow. I hear it is the gentleman's 41st birthday.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BILBRAY. Go ahead.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Forty-one for the youthful visage of the gentleman from Georgia, it is truly amazing.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes, but I still like rock and roll and do so any chance I get. I just do not want my 13-year-old daughter to know about it.

Mr. BILBRAY. Well, I would just like to say congratulations, and I would like to say it must be the fact they do not get as much sun in the West, so they are better preserved for a while, right?

Mr. HAYWORTH. It could be that, reclaiming my time, or the fact that our dear friend, as my friend from California knows, is just the perfection of physical fitness, as you are, spending time as I know that you do, surfing. I also know that my colleague from California and my friend from Georgia——

Mr. KINGSTON. I hear people laughing through the camera at this point, but I just want to say one think you two could do is eat a little more Vidalia onions.

Mr. HAYWORTH. We would be happy to. I thank my friend for the offer and I am expecting those Vidalia onions, providing they do not violate the gift ban any day now.

Mr. BILBRAY. We will make that ambition our goal.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, to my friend from California and also my friend from Georgia, as we talked about what in essence has become the act of extending welfare as we know it, and my friend from California especially knows this, we are not only extending welfare benefits to American citizens. No, indeed. We have extended those benefits to folks who are not United States citizens, to those who commonly cross our borders in illegal fashion. I know that is a problem within the State of Arizona and also within the area my friend from California represents.

Mr. BILBRAY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I gladly yield to my friend.

Mr. BILBRAY. As somebody who grew up on the border, the absurdity of the way local governments are required to handle these situations, to give you an example, you have the mother of a person born here in the United States, but she is an illegal alien. She will get the check for that child. But the law says that while she is here in the United States, she cannot work and she cannot spend one cent of that money on herself.

Then we wonder why the studies in Los Angeles show that over 70 percent of the recipients that are receiving welfare checks that are illegal aliens are committing welfare fraud. It is because the law is absurd, and I want to point this out.

I think the one thing we do is, we focus on the illegal alien issue or the immigrant issue. It is the absurdity of the rules we make in Washington and that they do not apply in the real world. This is a situation where we may be called mean-spirited, but the fact in Washington is stupid and it is irresponsible. We need to change these things and do something that is maybe a little radical to somebody, and that is do the reasonable thing in Washington, so those of us in California and Arizona and Georgia and across this country can do the reasonable thing.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, what is radical within this beltway is reasonable to the people of the United States. I thank my good friend from California for mentioning that fact, and I thank my friend from Georgia for offering real-life experiences of his constituents and the challenges they face.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, that brings me back to H.R. 2727, the Congressional Responsibility Act, which I sponsor, which simply again redesignates and reemphasizes what Article 1, Section 1 of our Constitution says: All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 272 does not outlaw executive agencies enacted by this very Congress which now exist within the executive branch. All it does is say that all of those proposed regulations, before they become in essence law published in the Federal Register, should come here to the Congress of the United States in expedited fashion for an up or down vote.

Now, the government experts say, ''My goodness, that would require too much time on the part of the Congress of the United States.'' But, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as has been my honor on several occasions of preside as Speaker Pro Tem of this house, I have presided on at least two occasions where this body was engaged in largely ceremonial debate for a ceremonial vote to name Federal installations after noteworthy Americans. Now, I do not criticize that process, but instead I ask this simple question, Mr. Speaker: If this Congress, in the wake of over the last year having cast more votes than any other Congress before it, still can find the time to expend hours of its energy on largely ceremonial votes, cannot this same Congress take the time to fulfill its constitutional obligation as stated in Article 1, Section 1 of the sacred document we call the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, it is about this: Reclaiming this government for the American people. As my friend from California pointed out earlier, it is nothing radical; instead, it is reasonable. Indeed, the only way it can be called extreme is in the fashion of making extremely good sense.

Let me yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to get back to the gentleman's statement and also Mr. BILBRAY's. He said the Washington bureaucracy is stupid and irresponsible. I do not think anybody paying taxes back home would disagree with that. It is also inefficient.

What really happens, though, I know there are a lot of good people involved in government, elected and unelected. A lot of good folks are called bureaucrats. But you know what I think of having been around a lot of teenagers? I know a lot of teenagers who individually are fine folks, but when you get a pack of them in your living room or a pack of them in your kitchen, strange things happen and all those individual good people turn out to do some pretty stupid things as a pack.

□ 2245

That is what happens in Washington. These folks need to go back home so they can continue to be good folks, because when they get together the association causes some real inefficient and irresponsible results.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, who fast approaches his 45th birthday tomorrow, and again provides the wisdom of his age in the interaction of the teenagers in his household.

Mr. Speaker, I simply thank my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] and my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], who joined us during our special hour.

Mr. Speaker, it is all about this document, the Constitution of the United States, and people being free to decide what is best for themselves and their families, instead of relinquishing that power to a centralized authority in Washington, DC.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for April 17, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOGGETT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DICKEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on April 24.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes each day, on today and April 24.

Mr. RADANOVICH, for 5 minutes, on April 24.

Mr. COX of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MARKEY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following members (at the request of Mr. DOGGETT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Ms. MCCARTHY.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. LIPINSKI in three instances.

Mrs. THURMAN.

Mr. DELLUMS in two instances.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. HOYER in two instances.

Mr. BONIOR

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DICKEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. BACHUS.

Mr. WICKER.

Mr. ZIMMER.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. NETHERCUTT.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. BAKER of California.

Mr. PORTER.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.