Equally important in any shared power in a democracy is a judiciary system of some type. And I am sorry to report that a judiciary system which was always feeble and quite weakened and subject to some corruption because there was not much pay involved in being a member of the judiciary in Haiti is even more enfeebled than it was before. It is a system that is broken down. It is not even dysfunctional. It is nonfunctional.

Sadly, a critical part of that judicial system would be the law enforcement system that people rely on in Haiti for law and order. That would now be the police force, the HNP. I am very sorry to report that the HNP recently lost its minister, who was, I gather, forced out of the country of Haiti for political reasons and because he was not kowtowing to the wishes of the behind-the-scene de facto dictator of that country.

So, consequently, we have a very thin reed to lean on when we talk about law enforcement, which is the Haitian National Police. We understand that the incidence of drug use and the incidence of drug smuggling and drug trafficking has expanded very considerably and that, in fact, Haitian citizens and visitors, we have many Haitian Americans who spend time in both the United States and in Haiti, are reporting alarmingly and increasingly that there is not sufficient protection and law and order in Haiti for them to go about any reasonable business, particularly after dark. And certainly if they are involved in any political expression, that is very dangerous.

I am sorry to say there has been a continuing incidence in increased levels of political assassination, intimidation, and harassment, so much so that a former senator from Haiti has come to this country and I recently visited with him and he explained to me some of the very serious problems that are ongoing there, which confirm many of the other reports we are getting from citizens, visitors, business people and so forth that the corruption has become so bad it is very hard to get a loan to do any type of business in Haiti. So even if they want to help out and provide jobs and quality of life, the opportunity is not there.

This is a subject that I will visit again this week in other 5-minute special orders.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. C.J. BROOKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an American citizen of humble origin who developed himself into a scholar, a great preacher, an inspirational leader, a person who was a developer of people, as well as a builder of institutions.

The Reverend Dr. C.J. Brooks was born in Monticello, Arkansas, on February 1, 1934. Being an only child and living in rural America, he developed a great relationship with his dog and other creatures of the animal world.

As young Cleodus grew up in a Christian home, he developed an early interest in preaching and often practiced on his dog and the other animals who followed him around.

Cleodus attended the Drew County High School at the age of 17, realized that he wanted to spend the rest of his life preaching and teaching the gospel. He was licensed and ordained that same year.

After high school, he attended the Morris Booker Memorial College in Dermott, Arkansas, which is about two blocks from my father's home and where my father continues to work, although he is 88 years old, and he never misses a day from going there to do his volunteer work.

He also attended the Arkansas Baptist College in Little Rock, the University of Heidelberg, in Heidelberg, Germany, where he served in the Air Force from 1954 to 1957.

Upon his return, Reverend Brooks attended Arkansas A.M. & N College in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, where he earned his bachelor of arts degree and graduated in 1961.

I might add that Cleodus and I were classmates and he was the president of our freshman class.

Before coming to the Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church in Chicago, Reverend Brooks held pastorates at the Sunset Baptist Church in Texarkana, Texas; Mt. Carmel Baptist Church, Warren, Arkansas; Rosehill Baptist Church, Dermott, Arkansas; and the New Hope Baptist Church, at Chicasaw Plantation in McGhee, Arkansas.

In addition to leading and guiding the Shiloh Baptist Church from 1969 to his death in 1999, Reverend Brooks was an instructor for the Illinois Baptist General State Congress of Christian Education, instructor for the Greater New Era District Baptist Association, Parliamentarian of the parent body of the Illinois Baptist State Convention from 1990 to 1999, and treasurer of the Greater New Era District Association.

During his 30-year tenure at Shiloh Baptist Church in Chicago, Reverend Brooks developed a reputation for being an astute and creative leader. Under his tutelage, the church moved into a new facility, paid off all of its mortgages, developed the Board of Christian Education Ministries, instituted a full service missionary department, a weekly food and clothing ministry, a young people's department, and he personally served as mentor to many young persons, several of whom followed him into the ministry.

On March 25, 1991, the Shiloh Baptist Church Board of Christian Education conferred upon him the Doctor of Divinity Honorary Degree.

Yes, C.J. Brooks, born in rural Arkansas, went from the back roads to the high roads, became a tremendous scholar, great teacher, one of the first leaders that I ever knew, the leader of our freshman class in college, and he continued to lead the rest of his life.

C.J., it was a pleasure knowing you. You have done yourself and your family extremely well. I say may you rest in peace and may the memory of your being always rest with your wife, Carrie, and the members of your church.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, tonight we need to talk about pizza, not just any pizza, but pepperoni pizza. I mean the hot, juicy, fresh-from-the-oven, thick Friday-night, after-the-football-game pepperoni pizza.

Because if you are like millions of Americans and you engage in that habit on weekends and other nights, you probably have great comfort in knowing that that pepperoni pizza was inspected by the United States Department of Agriculture to make sure that the pepperonis on that pizza were fresh, clean, and pure. I am glad that they do that, because food inspection is safe.

Now, if you have a vegetarian in the family and that person wants just the cheese pizza, USDA cannot inspect that one. That pizza is a special pizza.

□ 1930

That pizza is inspected by the Food and Drug Administration. Now, you may be saying to yourself back home, Wait a minute. You mean to tell me if I have pepperoni on my pizza, the Department of Agriculture inspects it but if I have a cheese pizza, the Food and Drug Administration inspects it. Why is that? Is that not inefficient? Is that not a duplication? I would say yes. And if you are asking that question, you are probably in the great majority of people in the United States of America from Miami to Maine to California and back, but there is one great exception and that is this place called Washington, D.C., because inside the Beltway of Washington, D.C., people think differently. They think, ''Pro-government, grow government, grow your

agency, grow your department and then along the way if you create a little waste, don't worry about it.''

Well, we have got an interesting phenomenon that the Congress is faced with tonight, Mr. Speaker, because we are in what I hope is the home stretch of the budget negotiations. In these budget negotiations, you have two schools of thought, that school that wants to spend more money and that school that wants to spend less money. Now, both schools of thought, I am sure, are good people. They both want a better world for our children. They both want security for our seniors. They want the uninsured to be insured and the unemployed to be employed and they want to make sure the uneducated get educated and those who have need, they want those needs answered. So I would say both sides are good people. But one side wants to spend more money. Now, the question is, where does that money come from?

Well, we are in a situation, Mr. Speaker, where the only place to get new money in this town is Social Security. We on the Republican side of the aisle have said to our colleagues, ''We don't want to spend Social Security money on non-Social Security surpluses. And it is time for Washington to stop that habit.'' There is plenty of waste in our budget, such as the pizza program that we could get some additional savings out, so that the kids who need public services can get those services and the seniors can get them and the children can get their education. We can do this, but we are going to have to squeeze a few pennies out of the dollar. In fact I say few, only one penny. Let me show my colleagues a chart, Mr. Speaker.

This chart, Mr. Speaker, shows what we are trying to do. We are saying in $1 to the United States Government, we want you to save one cent. That is not hard to do. I know it is not hard to do because I have lived on budget. I have got four children, two teenagers, then two children who still love me, and if you are the parent of a teenager, you know what I am talking about. My teen kids are very expensive and my little kids are very expensive, too, and I am not talking about buying clothes for them, I am talking about fixing the drier, getting a new refrigerator, getting new tires for the car because driving the car pools back and forth. That is real expensive. So it is not unusual at all at the end of a month or the beginning of the next one for my wife Libby and I to sit down at the table and say, ''Okay, we've got to save some money.''

Where are we going to come up with some money? Usually on $5, we have got to come up with 2 or $3 worth of savings and we have to forgo nice things. My daughter, Mr. Speaker, is 16 years old. She thinks I am the worst dresser in the world. I might be except my dad is still alive and I still dress better than he does. But I say to my daughter, ''Hey, look, I used to dress well, until I had children, and I cannot afford to anymore. But you ain't looking too bad. I see the nice clothes you're wearing to school.''

But we have got to sit around the table, Mr. Speaker, and find money in our savings, in our expenses. All we are asking the Federal Government to do is the same thing, get $5 and find a nickel out of it. Is there anybody in the sound of my voice who could not do that if you had to? If you had $5 and you had to come up with a nickel savings, could you not do that? We do it every day. Do you want the large drink or the medium-sized drink when you go through the McDonald's fast food line? ''I don't know. I'm not sure what the money looks like.''

Do you want the large French fries or the small French fries? Do you want lettuce and tomato on your sandwich? ''I don't know. Is it extra?'' Should we pump the gas here at $1.07 a gallon or move down the street where it might be $1.05 a gallon? This is what the American public does every single day all over the country, except in Washington, D.C., where asked if you can come up with a penny out of a dollar, it becomes impossible. Let me show you proof of this.

The President of the United States has a Cabinet. Those are his key advisers. One of the Cabinet members who has been asked to try to come up with a penny on the dollar is Secretary of Interior Mr. Babbitt. He was in a discourse with a reporter the other day, I say the other day, I am talking about October 27, so it was last week. The reporter said, ''Is there no more waste in government in your departments?'' A simple question. ''Mr. Secretary, you're telling us there's no waste in your department.''

Secretary Babbitt, and I quote, right here on the chart: ''Well, it would take a magician to say there was no waste in government and we are constantly ferreting it out but the answer,'' remember, the question is, is there no more waste, ''but the answer otherwise is yes, you've got it exactly right.''

Ladies and gentlemen, I just want to ask you this: If you believe that there is not waste in the Department of Interior, I would like you to e-mail me and tell me your story, because I have never gone to a government business or even a private business where I could not find a way to save some money. I mean, it might be as unimaginative as turning off the lights a little earlier at night. It might be as unimaginative as putting on a valve on some of the water faucets. It might be as unimaginative as having to do a swing shift instead of paying the overtime all the time. I am not sure what the best solution is for the Department of Interior, but I know this: As somebody who sits on the Committee on Appropriations overseeing it, they have a lot of needs, and I can promise you, they have a lot of good projects, and they do not waste lots and lots of money, but I would still say to that very good department that runs our National Park Service and our Fish and Wildlife, ''You can still find a penny on a dollar. I know you can. You're good people, you've got that ability, so let's don't fool ourselves. But if you don't, where is the money going to come from?'' And the money is going to come from Social Security.

Now, imagine, if you will, that we are in a room that is the size maybe of a triangle, and I am kind of thinking out loud on this, Mr. Speaker, but on one side of the triangle, you have a position staked out and that position is no tax increase. Then on the other side of the room you have a position that says you cannot take the money from Social Security. The other point in the room inevitably says you have got to cut your spending in order to balance the equation.

Now, there are those in this body who still think Social Security is a cash cow for purposes that do not have anything to do with Social Security. In fact, the President of the United States in January in his State of the Union address stood right behind me in the well of the House, Mr. Speaker, right in front of you, and says, ''There's going to be a surplus in Social Security. Let's protect 62 percent of it.'' Well, why not 100 percent? And most Members of Congress opposed the President on spending the other 38 percent of Social Security and said, ''We're not going to do that. We're going to preserve 100 percent of it.'' And the President did not like that idea, but we pushed and now we have not spent one nickel of Social Security.

The President tried a tax increase. The tax increase fell on the floor of the House by a vote of 419–0, Democrats and Republicans saying ''no'' to a tax increase. So now you have got to go back to cutting the penny out of the dollar. That is a savings. I had mentioned the pizza thing, but it does not stop there. Ben & Jerry's ice cream gets this program, government program where they can spend $800,000 exporting their ice cream and advertising overseas. I think it is great for people overseas to have the opportunity to munch down on good old Ben & Jerry's, but I do not think that the taxpayers need to be paying for a private business to do that.

Another example, the President went to Africa last year. I am glad he is traveling and I think it is important to keep our international relations up, but who were the 1,300 Federal employees he took with him to Africa at a cost of $42.8 million? This was not a military exercise. This was good will. One thousand three hundred people to Africa at a cost of $42.8 million. It is absurd. Under our radical plan, all he would have to say to the 1,300 is cut it out, cut it down 1 percent, 13 of you will have to stay at home. I know the gentleman from Colorado has joined me and he is not going to like what I have to say probably, but the mayor of Denver went on the African trip. I want to know, what is Colorado to our Africa policy? Not to pick on your lovely

State where my sister and my mother live, but I can tell you one thing, that if the good people of Colorado were interested, then they ought to pay for their own Denver mayor to go to Africa.

I feel the same way about the President's trip to China. He took 500 people to China at a cost of $18.8 million. Who were the 500 people? Why did they need to go? I know the First Lady took a lot of members of her family and friends, but why not say, okay, some of you have to stay at home next trip, and that is not a radical idea. But if they do that, you can save Social Security. Let me yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank the gentleman for being as adamant as he has been and prolific in terms of the information he has provided for the American public on this issue. Certainly I should tell the gentleman that I had no input into the decision made by the mayor of Denver to go on that trip and certainly there have been no positive ramifications of that trip, to the extent that I am aware of it, anyway. I am a freshman and have only been here now for about 10 months. There are a lot of things that seem peculiar to me and a lot of things that when I come here and try to go home and then explain to my constituents about what went on and how this debate proceed on various issues, it is sometimes hard for them to understand it. I find myself often in a situation where I will be listening to the debate on this floor or in the committee and there is something about it that just does not ring true. You say to yourself, now, how would this play, how would this debate play out? What if I had to go home and explain this particular debate to the folks back home? And it really, when you think that to yourself while you are sitting there, it has this great effect on you, because it brings you back to reality. I do not know how many times I have said to myself in the last week or so, how would I go home and explain to folks the fact that I did not think that the Federal Government could afford to reduce expenditures by 1 percent? How could I do that?

There is a test I have, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is one you have paraphrased in a different way. I say, how would this play in the Arvada Republican Club? This is a group of gentlemen that have been meeting for years and years and years, gentlemen and ladies now, it used to be a men's club for a long time, it is now co-ed. I have been going to that club for 25 years, meeting on Monday mornings, in the Applewood area at a little restaurant. These are great folks, these are salt-of-the-earth-type people, and I think to myself, how would I stand up in front of them and say, ''In order to avoid the possibility of raiding the Social Security trust fund, we have proposed a plan to reduce spending by 1 percent, all agencies, and I think that that would be terrible. I think that that would somehow or other affect the operation of the government.''

How would they respond? I mean, they would look at you and say, ''Are you kidding? What plane did you just land on? Was it the one from Washington?'' Because no one out there, Mr. Speaker, no one out there in the heartland of America thinks for a moment that there is not 1 percent in waste, fraud and abuse. Most people would say that the figure is quite a bit higher than 1 percent, quite a bit more than 1 percent.

□ 1945

They are right. It is far more than 1 percent that we could save if we just put our mind to it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me claim back my time for a minute just to underscore your point. The Pentagon had to report as missing two $4 million aircraft engines, two $850,000 tugboats, and one $1 million missile launcher. Anybody seen the missile launcher? We are looking for one missile launcher, $1 million worth. And the tugboats, the missile launcher blew up the tugboats when they put the aircraft engine in it, apparently.

It is absurd. Erroneous Medicare payments waste over $20 billion annually. It is ridiculous.

One example that I think is absurd, in Washington, D.C., which is largely funded by the Federal Government, they appointed a group to find jobs for people who are on welfare. This group had no employment placement experience at all. They got a contract, this is Federal dollars we are talking about, $6.6 million, to place 1,500 people. One year later they had spent $1 million and placed 30 people.

I think the folks in Colorado would run you out on a rail if you said you could not find waste in government, as I know the people in Georgia would do to me, and most Members of Congress.

Mr. TANCREDO. The gentleman is certainly correct in that. And, again, it is one of those peculiar things that you run into as a freshman when you end up here and people argue with great fervor against a 1 percent cut. People suggest that it will be the end of civilization as we know it, that people will be thrown out into the streets, people will go hungry if we in fact were to try to reduce this huge budget expenditure by 1 percent.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, I wonder sometimes whether or not people really and truly are concerned about the 1 percent cut, or they are worried about the possibility that this could start a trend. What if you could cut 1 percent and nobody could tell the difference? Did you ever think about that?

Mr. KINGSTON. I think the gentleman has raised a good point. I believe you could cut 1 percent and most people would not know the difference. It is interesting that here is a quote I wanted to bring up, when asked why Democrats will not support finding a penny out of every Federal dollar in waste, fraud and abuse, even when the defense budget is $1.8 billion higher than the President requested, the House Democrat leader, Dick Gephardt, responded, ''They don't want 50,000 to 70,000 people to be let go at the Department of Defense.''

Well, here is the President, his own budget was $1.8 billion less, and now we are asking them to find 1 cent on the dollar, and the Democrats are claiming it is going to lay off 50,000 people. What was their budget going to do? It is just absurd. Only in this town can you have these kind of conversations. Out there in common sense America, you know, this would have been resolved in August, and we would be home by now.

Mr. TANCREDO. If the gentleman will yield further, there is a situation that is analogous to this. I was appointed in 1981 as the regional director for the United States Department of Education, and I resigned my position in the legislature in Colorado to take that responsibility. One of the things we were told we had to do was to try to reduce the size and scope of the Department of Education to more accurately reflect its constitutional role. Well, of course, most of us realize that its constitutional role does not exist. There is not a single word in the Constitution about the Federal Government's role in education.

But, anyway, we began the process of reducing the size of the department. This was, as I say, September of 1981 when I took over the responsibility in Denver. Region 8, it is responsible for six States, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Utah, and the Dakotas. We interact with all of the State departments of education and with school boards all over those six States.

There were 222 people employed in the regional office at that time. In the course of about 4 years, because of budget cuts and transfers and a couple of other things, we were able to actually reduce the number of people in that agency, in that region, by 80 percent. We went from 222 to approximately 65, if memory serves. And, you know what? Here is the important point I want to make.

After that I would go to each one of those six States, to the chief State school officer and to the State boards of education, and I would say, By the way, have you noticed any difference in the service you get from our office, in the quality of the workload, the output, the quality of our work? Have you noticed any difference? And never once, not just with the State departments of education, I would give this speech all the time and I would say, Has anybody noticed a difference? We had gone down 80 percent and no one knows.

That was my point about the 1 percent reduction. The fear is that you could actually reduce the Federal Government by 1 percent, and nobody would know the difference. What would

that tell you? What would that tell people who actually want to see the Government expand constantly? It would say to them that we have got a problem here. People recognize it.

That is what I often say, when we, ''shut down the Government,'' this happened several times while I was the regional director of the Department of Education. The President of the United States, President Reagan at that time, and the Congress could not come to closure on the issue. We did shut down the Government at least twice, and it may have been three times. And, you know, I keep asking people, could you tell the difference? Did you know that in fact this happened?

So the frightening part of this whole thing is that you could do it, and nobody would know the difference. That is what scares some of my colleagues.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me clarify and make sure people understand, you are not saying to shut down the government. You are saying just reduce.

Mr. TANCREDO. No one is even suggesting, not even the most ardent supporters of the President's plan or the ardent opponents of the 1 percent cut, have suggested this would mean a shutdown of government. I am saying if you did, and when it has happened, you wonder to yourself, who knows the difference?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me read you another quote that is interesting. Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder, when asked if the administration's position is we should not reduce the size of the Federal budget, he responded, ''That would certainly be the view of the administration.'' That was a quote from last Tuesday, October 26.

You know, we are just saying get the waste out of here. I have got a quote right here from DICK GEPHARDT that was from October 24, 1999, and when asked about spending Social Security funds, he says, ''I understand there is a feeling now that since we have a surplus, and since we got to get ready for the baby-boomers, that we really ought to try to spend as little of it as possible, and none, if possible.''

Well, you know, that is leaving the door cracked. And, you know, again our budget says cut out the waste and you can do it.

A couple of other examples. I do not know if you are aware of this, but approximately 26,000 dead people receive food stamps to the tune of $8.5 million. That would feed a lot of live people. Maybe we should concentrate on those who are not dead and maybe more people would do better. That would be a little healthier.

Supplemental Security Income fraud, and this is a special, basically, payment to people, fraud that exceeds $1 billion a year, including a convicted murderer who has been on death row for 14 years and received $75,000 a year in SSI benefits.

Another example: the Government lost over $3.3 billion on students who never paid back their student loans. Then here is a story of a defense contractor who charged the Government $714 for an electric bell that was worth only $46.

All we are saying is let us go after this before we go after Grandma's Social Security.

I see we have been joined by the gentleman from Minnesota, the heart of Hormel and Spam country.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. KINGSTON, thank you for yielding and having this special order. I was listening in my office to this, and I really had to come over here for a couple of reasons. First of all, to just highlight how far we have come.

Since I came to Congress in 1994, in fact, next Tuesday we are going to celebrate the 5-year anniversary of the elections of 1994, November 8. We are going to have a class reunion. I am the class president now of that class. I am happy to report virtually all the members are coming back. It is going to be a great reunion.

But, because of that, I have been thinking a lot about what it was like in 1993 and 1994 when Washington believed that Washington had all the answers, whether it was talking about health care reform, we were going to have a government-run, State-run, Federal bureaucratized health care delivery system. And it was interesting, too, I need to make the point about that, when that was first introduced, it was supported by an overwhelming majority of Americans. But then they started to get the facts and public opinion changed.

We were talking then about larger and larger bureaucracies and more and more government spending, more and more government borrowing. Finally, the American people in November of 1994 said enough is enough, and they sent a whole new team of us, 73 Republican freshmen to Congress. They said, You know, we don't expect much from you, but at least balance the budget.

We said, If you will elect us, we will balance the budget by the year 2002, in 7 years. And let us go back and remind ourselves and some of our colleagues of what other folks were saying then.

The folks in the White House were saying you cannot balance the budget in 7 years. You might be able to do it in 10, maybe 8, but not 7. Well, then we went back and forth. But basically what we said is if you dramatically slow the rate of growth in Federal spending, if you begin to reform the entitlements, like welfare, that you can actually balance the budget and provide tax relief at the same time.

I remember the argument that we had about tax relief. You probably remember it well, and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) was in Colorado, but you remember some of the arguments raised. They said if you lower the capital gains tax rate, you are going to deny government the tax revenue. This is the quote used over and over again: ''You are going to blow a hole in the deficit.'' Remember that?

We lowered the capital gains tax rate; we lowered it 30 percent. On top of that, we said to every family in America, we are going to make it easier for you to raise your kids. We are going to give you a $500 per child tax credit, and that is now in effect, so that every family in America has more money to spend themselves, because we said that if you limit the growth in Federal spending and you allow families to keep more of what they earn, guess what? The economy will grow faster. And it has.

As a result, we did not have to wait until 2002 to balance the budget. We actually balanced the budget last year. On top of that, we did it for the first time in 40 years without raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. That was a huge milestone.

I know some are saying, Yeah, you balanced the budget. You didn't use Social Security, but what have you done for us lately? That is no small accomplishment. It was accomplished principally by dramatically slowing the rate of growth in government, by letting people keep more of what they earned, and allowing Americans to do what they do best, produce, consume, and create jobs. So the economy grew.

That is a huge accomplishment. But sometimes, though, we as Republicans talk in terms of dollars and cents, percentages, debits and credits; and we start to sound like accountants. Balancing the budget without using Social Security is really about generational fairness, because what it is saying to our parents is you are going to have a more secure retirement. It is saying to working people like ourselves, middle age folks, baby-boomers, the people who are actually working right now, it means you are going to have a stronger economy. And it means to our kids that they can expect a brighter future.

So it is not an accounting exercise; it is really about generational fairness. And that happened because we have slowed the rate of growth in government so that not only do we have the first balanced budget without using Social Security, here is another amazing statistic that most of our colleagues do not know, so I just assume that most Americans do not know it. But for the first time in my memory, I think in my adult lifetime, this year the Federal budget will grow at a slower rate than the average family budget.

In some respects that is an even more important statistic, because we are finally allowing families to catch up. For too long the Federal Government was growing at 2, 3, sometimes almost 4 percent higher than the rate of the average family budget. They could never catch up. All they could do is pay more and more taxes. That is why more and more families had to have both Mom and Dad working so they had less time to spend with their kids. All of a sudden you had more social problems.

□ 2000

So we have accomplished a great deal. What really got me excited when I listened to the gentlemen over there, when people say that we cannot find 1 percent of waste in the Federal bureaucracy, and we stepped up and we said, listen, Members of Congress, we have to lead by example, so we said, congressional pay raises should be on the table, as well.

Nobody else's pay raise is on the table. I want people to understand that. Nobody's social security cost of living adjustment is on the table, nobody's veterans benefits, just congressional pay. But I think it was the right thing to do. We have to lead by example.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is the White House or the executive branch's salary included?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I do not believe they are included in that as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would ask the gentleman, has the President made the offer?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I do not remember that he has.

Mr. KINGSTON. So the position on the social security money, do not cut spending?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. All I am saying is, we will lead by example, regardless of what the White House may do. That has been the example all the way through. When we said you have to reform welfare, we sent them a bill. They vetoed it. We sent a second bill, they vetoed it again. The third time, public opinion and the pressure of the polls forced the President to sign the bill. As a result, we had welfare reform.

As a result of that, we have got 50 percent fewer people on welfare today than we had just 4 years ago, 5 years ago. That is an amazing accomplishment.

But back to the story of waste. It bothers me when people with a straight face can say that there is not 1 percent worth of waste in the Federal bureaucracy. Try explaining that to any farmer in America. They are tightening their belts to the tune of 10 percent, 15 percent, maybe 20 percent over what they were receiving just a few years ago for their crops, and so the idea that they cannot trim spending 1 percent really outside of the beltway is not even a funny joke.

So I want to thank the gentleman for what he is doing, and I want to encourage the gentleman to continue to press this case in looking for ways that we can eliminate the waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal budget.

At the end of the day it is easy to forget in Washington, it is not our money. We are spending other people's money. They work very hard. It is easy to forget, and my colleague mentioned one of my favorite luncheon meats which we serve every Thursday here in the Capitol. I have gone there where they make that luncheon meat. I have watched those people work. They work very, very hard for their money. I think we owe it to them to make certain that we do not waste it. For too long that has been the standard here in Washington. We need to change that standard.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I want to elaborate on the point he has made on how incredibly important it is that we have accomplished something so significant, and it has to be heralded. That is that we have not only been able to do economically what the gentleman has suggested, balance the budget far before we thought we were ever going to be able to, not raid the social security trust fund, but we have done something more important than that, I would suggest. We have actually changed the way people think and talk about the social security fund, trust fund.

Before, as the gentleman knows, since 1965, actually, or 1964, it was an accepted practice around here to spend all of the money that came in as a result of social security, FICA taxes, to spend it on government programs, not put it away for social security but spend it on welfare, and spend it, well, not all that much on the military, because that actually went down in the last few years, but spend it on programs.

But now we have the other side fighting on our turf. This is an enormous accomplishment. If we can get the people in this country to concentrate on the fact that social security should be held inviolate, that we should never be able to spend social security dollars on anything but social security-related issues and the trust fund itself, we will have changed the course of history in America, because we will have stopped the government from growing by about $2 trillion over 10 years just because of the way people think.

If they hold our feet to the fire, if everybody out there says, next time, next Congress, 5 years from now, 10 years from now, if they say, no, no, what are you talking about, spending social security trust fund money on something else; if all of a sudden that catches hold and they stop the Congress from doing that just because of public pressure, and frankly, there is nothing else that can stop us, we all know that, if they can do that, we will have accomplished an incredible thing for our children, our grandchildren, and for America.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it is historic in its own right that we are even having the debate about not spending the money.

Mr. TANCREDO. It is.

Mr. KINGSTON. Republicans, we have been guilty, and Democrats, they have been guilty, have spent this money in the past. But this Congress has not done it, and so the fact that we are having this dialogue is great.

Here is a chart from the Congressional Budget Office that certifies that we are not spending social security money. This is a number that came from the Congressional Budget Office or our congressional bean counters on October 27, last week.

It said, projected on-budget surplus, $1 billion, under the congressional scoring system. This is from a neutral third party saying that we have not spent social security money.

But again, this is historic that we have this opportunity. I kind of get a little bit charged up, and we do have some finger-pointing, some good bipartisan finger-pointing, in the morning, in the 1-minutes, where Members are saying, they are spending the money, they are not spending the money.

Well, it is good that at least we consider this debatable, because it has not been. Again, both parties have been guilty of it, but this Congress is different. It is such a great position to be in now. But we have to continue with the waste and abuse or we are not going to be able to have these bragging rights come adjournment next week or next month.

We have been joined by our good friend, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE). I know he has been a leader in cutting out fraud and waste in government, and also one who has insisted on not spending the social security money.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me. I am glad to join in with my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, and my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, with whom I serve on the Committee on Agriculture. That is an issue that is important to our part of the world.

We have found within the existing budget resources we have the wherewithal to fund those important priorities. I do think it is important that we note in this whole debate that we are willing to fight the good fight, to continue this effort to make the Federal government smaller, make it more efficient, find those places in the budget that are wasteful, where the taxpayer dollars are not being used for the best return on the dollar, and guided by a very simple principle, which I think is what is so remarkable about the debate we are having this year.

That principle is this, that we are going to, for the first time in 30 years, not raid social security. I think that the American people whose retirement security, the trust fund, is ought to be delighted. I think this is really a cause for celebration in the Congress, because it is the first time it has happened in 30 years, and it is a tribute to those who have come before, people like the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), who came here in the previous classes of Congress and said, we are going to get this Federal budget under control and we are going to make those hard decisions to bring

Federal spending into control, and to a place that allows us to be where we are today, and that is the first balanced budget in a very long time.

I think that is historic. It is significant. We need to stay the course. As we all know, and I do well know now, having been here for 3 years, there is a tremendous inertia here in this city to spend money. It is the way it is. Washington spends money.

My dad used to say, when I had a dog that I could not get to behave the way I wanted it to, he would say, it is the nature of the beast. The nature of the Federal beast is to spend money. The only way we can tame that beast is to apply discipline. It takes discipline.

Those decisions are hard, those choices are hard. Yet I feel again very proud of the fact that we have been able to come up with a budget this year which meets all the important priorities: which actually spends more on defense; which beefs up our national security, which is a concern we have all had; which addresses those needs like law enforcement, education, and actually puts more into education than what the President requested in his budget, and yet does not go into or raid the social security trust fund.

In order to do that, what do we have to do? We have to come up with a 1 percent across-the-board reduction in discretionary spending, 1 percent off of all the array of Federal Government agencies and departments as they go through their budgets. They do not even have to look at program areas, they can do this in the form of rooting out bureaucracy and getting rid of a lot of the administrative waste that exists in the government.

I think the American people will believe, and I think most of us in the Chamber here this evening believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can find 1 percent, that we can find that 1 percent in welfare spending and root it out, and thereby allow us to protect our pledge and our commitment to the American people that we will not raid their retirement security.

I do not think Members can see this from there, but there is a chart there which essentially shows the same thing, but this is the amount of the social security trust fund which has been spent over the last 15 years. That chart drops off dramatically, and it is down to zero today because we again adopted as a matter of principle in this debate over the budget that we are not going to raid the social security trust fund, that that is too important to the future of the people of the country who make the investment, who pay the payroll tax at every check. They deserve to know with confidence and assurance that when the time comes, those retirement dollars are going to be there for them.

As this debate ensues, my understanding is that the President will in fact veto this legislation that we will send him, this proposal to reduce spending by 1 percent across-the-board, but I understand that he will be willing to sit down with us and to figure out exactly how we can fund the programs of government, and do it in a way that does not in any way jeopardize social security.

I think that is a critical point. I do believe again, as a matter of practice, in the last several years since the Members came to the Congress, since I joined the class and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) joined it most recently in the freshman class this year, there has been a conscious, deliberate effort to bring Federal spending under control, and do it in a way that allows us to shrink the overall cost of government, make it smaller, make it more responsive to the American people, and to shift power out of Washington, D.C. and back into the homes and families of so many Americans who I think have spent a lot of dollars over the years of their tax dollars.

They need to know, again with some degree of certainty, that those dollars are going to be set aside for their retirement security. We do that in this year's budget. I think it is historic, and I look forward to the debate that ensues.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, what we are doing here, it is not only historic, it is very difficult. If it were easy to balance the budget, it would have been done 40 years ago. If it were easy to balance the budget without using social security, it would have been done a long time ago.

But we have lowered the bar on ourselves and made it more difficult to balance the budget by, for the first time in 40 years, saying not only are we going to balance the budget using the old way of keeping score, we are going to change the way we keep score.

That is the point the gentleman from Colorado was making. That is why it is so important, because once we change that in the minds of the American people and in the minds of the folks even here in Washington, that that now is off limits, all of a sudden we have changed the game for a long time to come. That is a very historic and important thing. But it made it more difficult.

A couple of things that made it even more difficult, because sometimes we forget it, and the American people certainly forget this, and I think many of our friends on the left would like to forget this, but part of what made it so much more difficult is we have had so many ''emergencies'' in the last couple of years.

It is not just about hurricanes and earthquakes and floods and droughts and pestilence and the other things that we have had for emergencies, but we have had an emergency in the farm community. It happened for a variety of reasons.

I know some of our friends say, well, it was all freedom to farm. Freedom to farm had nothing to do with the fact that we have had three consecutive worldwide surpluses, and crop prices and commodity prices have dropped through the floor. We had to respond to that. That was an extra almost $9 billion.

On top of that, we have been involved in something like 33 different military adventures over the last 7 years. One of them just in Kosovo and Bosnia has ultimately cost us $16 billion. That $16 billion was not accounted for in our original budget plans over the years.

A lot of our friends are saying, well, but even with that we had to use some gimmicks. I do not like the term gimmicks, but there are some things in the budget I wish we did not have to do. I wish we were not talking about a 1 percent across-the-board cut, though I think we should do it. I wish we were not talking about advanced funding or forward funding.

But the truth is the President put some of those things into his budget when he submitted it back in February.

Mr. KINGSTON. Actually, $18 billion comes right out of the Clinton White House budget. It is interesting that when the White House does it, it is sound accounting procedures, but when Republicans do it, it is a gimmick.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The point is, we have all of a sudden been confronted with some expenditures, whether it was in agriculture or other emergencies here in the United States, and people say, what about the Census? The Census is not an emergency. That is correct, but do Members know what, for some reason, and it was an honest mistake I believe on the parts of all the negotiators, when we negotiated the balanced budget agreement in 1997 with the White House, which in itself was an historic agreement, and I was there the day the President signed it, but for some reason we did not include that $4 billion in our future spending plans, so some way or another we have to figure out a way to pay for it. Whether we call it an emergency or take it in regular spending, it still amounts to total spending.

What we have said is, we are going to limit total discretionary spending to about $592 billion. That is still a lot of money, and I am convinced in my bones that there is more than enough money in that budget to meet the legitimate needs of the Federal government and everybody who depends upon it.

There is not enough room in there for all of this fraud and waste and some of the things Members have been talking about. But the point I want to make is we have made it more difficult on ourselves to balance the budget because we have lowered the bar with the social security trust fund.

The President and some other factors have made it even more difficult because of Kosovo, because of Bosnia, because of emergencies, because of what is happening out in farm country.

□ 2015

But you have got to hand it to our leadership. They have found a way, and in some respects using creative accounting, I will admit that, but they found a way to make room for all those needs and requirements to take care of the legitimate needs of our veterans, take care of the legitimate needs of educations, funding education at a higher level than the President asked for, funding veterans programs at $1.7 billion more than the President asked for, actually finding more money for defense, trying to squeeze other areas of the budget.

Frankly, I am very, very proud of this budget; and I am very proud of this Congress, because we will have done something and hopefully started a new chapter for America that it will take many, many years to reverse. In fact, I hope it never goes back to the way it used to be.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, in Colorado, we passed several years ago, I think it was 1994, we passed something referred to as the Tabor amendment. It simply says that the government of the State of Colorado cannot spend more than it takes in, nor can it increase taxes by any more than a percentage equivalent of increase in population growth and inflation. That is it. If we take in more money than that formula allows, it must be returned to the people.

Now, first of all, during the course of that debate, we heard the same kind of things from the people opposing it as we heard from the people who are worried about this 1 percent savings that we are proposing here, that it could not happen, that government cannot operate under such constraints, that there would, in fact, be people out in the street, there would be people hungry at night, that essentially it would be the end of civilization as we know it.

Well, we passed this in 1994. Every single tax increase above that budget cap that is set now in the Constitution allowing growth only for population and inflation, and inflation has been very low, every budget increase at any level, State of Colorado, local districts, special districts, whatever, has to go to a vote of the people.

Now, what has happened, the people in their wisdom have accepted some things, have passed some budget increases, and have rejected many others. It was not as if there was a wholesale disregard. No, people understood very well that some aspects of government needed an increase and some did not.

But my point is this, that not only did we avoid the dire consequences that were suggested as a possibility if we were to pass such a draconian measure, but the economy has gone wild. Jobs increased tenfold. Every single good thing that could possibly happen in the economy has happened in the State of Colorado.

We are paying the price in a way because, of course, now we have the problems with infrastructure catching up to the economy's growth. But those are good problems to have. They are in the exact opposite of the kinds of things that people said would happen if we were to try to constrain ourselves.

I assure the American public tonight that if we took 1 percent off of next year's budget, that there would not be the kind of dire consequences that our friends on the left suggest would occur, that we can live within a 99 percent budget. We can do it. Believe it or not, America, it can happen.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have about 3 or 4 minutes left, so I wanted to give everybody a chance to close. But one of the things I want to point out is that there are many Members on the Democratic side of the aisle who say it is hard to argue against 1 percent reduction. We think we can do it. We, too, do not want to spend Social Security. So it is really a matter of let us work through it with the White House and get this thing done because I think that so often we look at this as Republican/Democrat, but there is this Congress, legislative branch versus the executive branch.

But the vision is clear. Do not spend Social Security money. Do not increase taxes. But balance the budget through spending less. There is a lot of bipartisan agreement on it. What we need to do is finish the agreement up and leave town. I think the people in America feel a lot better when Congress is out of session rather than when we are in session.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would also add, too, to what he just said that, another thing that is important, and I hear all across South Dakota when I travel the State is, why do you guys not do something about paying down the Federal debt?

That is something now for 2 years in a row we are actually going to pay down debt. The reason that we are able to do that is because, again, through the hard work of the American people and generating the surplus and to agree that Congress has any control over this, it is in the area of controlling fiscal or Federal spending and keeping the tax burden under control, which we did, and we reduced taxes.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) noted earlier that reducing the capital gains tax actually increased revenues and put us in a position now where we are running surpluses. But the reality, of course, again is that we would not be in this position if we had not exercised control over Federal spending.

It allows us to pay down Federal debt, which is a huge, huge priority, ought to be, so that for the next generation on whose back all of this is going to fall someday, we are actually lifting that load.

So there are a lot of awful good things in here. I think, again, in the interest of trying to do this in a responsible way, asking Federal agencies and departments to come up with 1 percent in savings, we have all heard about the illustration, some of my favorite ones, $850,000 for Ben and Jerry's ice cream to go to Russia and the $1 million outhouse at the top of Glacier National Park. Those are examples of things that we are talking about, finding that 1 percent that allows us to balance this budget without raiding Social Security.

That is a huge accomplishment. Again, at the same time, couple that with allowing us to pay down the Federal debt. So these are all things that are incorporated in this budget process this year, and we ought to do the best we can to resolve the differences with the White House and to go home.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, just in summation, I would say that, really, the central questions are these: What are we going to do to guarantee our parents a more secure retirement, and what are we doing to make certain we leave our kids a legacy that we are proud of in terms of debt?

I think the answer is we have to dramatically control, slow and control the rate of growth and Federal spending. If we do that, then everything else gets so much easier. The economy is stronger, interest rates are lower, everything gets better.

We have made it clear, and if the President does not like our 1 percent plan or some of the other things, we have made it clear is simply this, we will not raise taxes. We will not raid the Social Security. We will not close down the Government. Everything else is negotiable.

We are willing to meet the President more than halfway. We are not saying our plan is the only plan. But we are saying we are going to stop the raid on Social Security. We are not going to raise taxes. We are not going to close down the Government. Beyond that, we will negotiate in good faith, and everything else is on the table. Really, it is about what kind of a future we are going to leave to our kids.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just a second, once again, I wanted to reiterate something that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) said earlier, and it is so important to remember, that when we are talking about numbers here, people have a tendency to just sort of glaze over and say, ah, it is just numbers. It does not matter. But it does matter. It matters in people's lives.

What we do here, the actions we take here, the votes that we cast every day have an impact on what happens in the lives of Americans all over this land. If we can actually slow the growth of Government down, if we can reduce the amount that the Government would have grown in the next 10 years by $2 trillion, by simply holding Social Security sacrosanct, it is more than just a paper accomplishment.

It means lives will change. It means that people will be able to buy homes that would never have been able to buy a home because interest rates will go down. It will mean that people will be able to take vacations they never thought they could take. They will be able to leave to their grandchildren and children an estate that is worth something, worth real dollars, because the Government will not confiscate it all in the process. It actually matters when we talk about reducing the size and the scope of Government. They are not just words. They affect the way people live.

I want to say, as a freshman, once again, I am proud to be a Member of this Congress. I am proud to join my colleagues here who have done yeoman's work before I ever got here to get us to the point where we are today. I realize I can take very little credit for what we have accomplished. It is a result of the efforts that the gentlemen here, my colleagues, have put forward over these years to get us where we are.

I simply want to tell my colleagues that, I mean this from the bottom of my heart, I thank them all for their patriotism, for their love of America, for what they have done for the country.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot add to that. But I would say, on behalf of the people that I serve in the State of South Dakota, that we believe, again, that, as a matter of principle, that the Federal Government is too big, and it spends too much, and that we can find ways to continue to reduce the cost of government, making it more efficient, find that 1 percent in savings that enables us to protect and preserve and safeguard the retirement security for every South Dakotan, for every American by not having to dip in and to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. That is a principle that is nonnegotiable.

I hope that in these negotiations that will come up now with the White House that we can come up with a solution that serves the people of this country who depend upon programs that are essential but at the same time allows us to balance this budget, stay on the track that we are on, the course that we are on, and do it in a way that keeps us from going into Social Security, which is a change, a long change, a departure from precedent that has been on the books for a long time, again, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) noted, going back to the 1950s, I think, where we actually are going to be able to do this and say, that going into the new millennium, the new century, that this is the new way of doing business around here; that when we create a trust fund, that we want to keep it for that purpose.

So, again, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for yielding; and, hopefully, again, we will wrap this thing up soon and get this process completed.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) for playing a part in this vital negotiation and this great debate that we are having, and it is worthwhile.

We are trying to save Social Security. We are trying not to increase taxes. We are trying to ferret out waste in government. Who are we doing it for? We are doing for that family that drives an extra block to buy gas for $1.05 a gallon instead of for $1.07. We are doing it for that family who pushes to order medium Cokes instead of large Cokes at restaurants, chicken instead of steak. We are doing it for that family who gets three quotes a year on their automobile insurance. We are doing it for a family that does not buy a new suit unless the clothes are on sale. Finally, we are doing it for that family who will never buy cereal unless they have a 20-cents-off coupon that they clipped out of the newspaper.

That is what this is about, 1 cent on the dollar. It is not hard. American families do it every single day. Congress can certainly do its part here in Washington, D.C.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues, good men, good men all, and certainly articulate advocates for their position. I am pleased to be able to represent a different view because, quite frankly, there is more to this story than we have just heard, and I want to represent it in the next hour.

What I will do in the course of this hour is spend most of the time talking actually about the Social Security program, its vital importance to America's families, the need for addressing and strengthening Social Security, and also putting in perspective the absolute baseless attacks being waged by the majority on the minority relative to this important program.

At the outset, however, having sat patiently while the preceding side was making their points, there are some things that, frankly, must be said to put their presentation in perspective.

I want to start by saying that here on November 2, we are now more than 1 month into the new fiscal year. That fiscal year, of course, starts October 1. That is the time when Congress and the President are to have all the new spending bills in place, funding the Government for the new fiscal year. It is a 12-month fiscal year. We are 1 month into it.

We do not have all the spending bills in place. In fact, a very substantial portion of the Federal budget has not been put in place.

Why is this? Well, frankly, the responsibility falls on the majority party to pass the budget and to get the appropriations bill out. We saw, even as late, as late last week the fumbling around, the frantic scratching for votes, the efforts to get the majority behind the appropriations bills. They have done this, taken us well into the new fiscal year without meaningful negotiations with the White House. There have been talks beginning very recently.

□ 2030

But for the most part it is one side setting down their side, the other side setting down their side; and at least to some of us, it looks like never the twain shall meet. We know it will be broken sooner or later. But rather than have these bills passed in a timely measure last summer, so that the differences with the White House could be ironed out in September, putting the bills in place by the new fiscal year, we are now well into the new fiscal year and no end in sight.

That is why it concerned me deeply to hear a member of the majority say in the preceding presentation that during the two Government shutdowns of 1995 nobody noticed, nobody cared. I will give him this. The gentleman that said that is a freshman. He was not here at the time, and so maybe he was not simply paying attention. But every Member of Congress knows that shutting the Government down was a failure of Congress.

At that time, Speaker Gingrich was the leader of this chamber, and it was a distinct failure of Speaker Gingrich and the Republican majority, one that will live in infamy in the days of this chamber; the House of Representatives unable to get its work done causing the Federal Government to shut down. Taxpaying Americans unable to even enjoy the national parks or, for that matter, to go up in the Washington Monument down on the Mall because of the political gamesmanship and the abdication of responsibility to get the spending packages put in place.

So here we are, once again under a Republican majority, once again deeply into the fiscal year without the new spending bills in place, and now we have Members of the Republican majority saying this government shutdown is not such a bad idea. It really leaves me concerned about where this outfit is heading. Because I would hope, as long as I am in this chamber representing the State of North Dakota, we never, ever see such a pathetic time when this body shuts the Government down because it cannot get its work done.

The failure of this outfit, the majority, to fund the government is only part of their failure up to this point. Let us look at the legislative record. What do the American people want? I