not see things quite so clearly. They see no wrong with Government. Government could never do anything inefficiently or ill-advised.

Take, for example, on this side of the aisle, there are politicians who want to strengthen Medicare, make it a better program, and allow seniors more choices in making their own health care decisions. On the other side of the aisle we have some politicians who passionately defense the status quo, even though the status quo is 30 years old without revisions. They would rather deny Medicare to those in need down the road than do anything to fix it now.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for this irresponsibility. Medicare is in serious need of reform. Republicans want to fix Medicare and make sure it exists for many years to come.

ATTACKING MEDICARE AT EXPENSE OF SENIORS

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans' plan to hold just 1 day of hearings on Medicare is an attack on democracy.

I ask where are our priorities? We had 10 days of hearings on Waco and 11 days of hearings on Ruby Ridge so far. Even more alarming, we held over a month of hearings on Whitewater, an issue that most Americans don't care about. Yet, we had only 1 day of hearings for Medicare.

Americans are scared about cuts in Medicare, scared about their future. There should be more than 1 day of hearings on an issue that will affect 37 million seniors. Lets come clean and let Americans know that the real reason Republicans are cutting Medicare by $270 billion is to fund corporate welfare, defense spending, and tax cuts to the rich—all at the expense of the health and well being of senior citizens.

□ 1215

PROMISES MADE AND PROMISES KEPT

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, these claims coming from the other side of the aisle would have a little more credence if in fact House Democrats had put forth their own plan for preserving and strengthening Medicare. And let us get one thing straight right now. We have had dozens and dozens of hearings in the House of Representatives on what we must do as a nation to preserve and strengthen Medicare.

I wanted to rise today, though, to point out that 1 year ago I and more than 300 Republican candidates for Congress stood outside the steps of this historic building and signed our name to a Contract With America. Let me read the very first sentence of the contract: ''As Republican Members of the House of Representatives and as citizens seeking to join that body, we propose not just to change its policies, but even more important, to restore the bonds of trust between the people and their elected officials.''

Mr. Speaker, last January a new majority took control of this House. We came, we saw, and to date we have kept our word. So let us never forget, Mr. Speaker, the power of promises made and the power of promises kept.

ALLOW MEDICARE TRUSTEES TO REVIEW PLANNED CUTS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, let me answer the prior speaker in the well. The trustees of Medicare said $89 billion was necessary to fix it, and so they are cutting $270 billion to save it. They only had 1 day of hearings on this very important issue that affects 37 million people. They have had more hearings on the Chinese prison system that we cannot do anything about from here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that as they wave the trustees report saying they needed to fix it, they better not do anything unless they run the new bill and the new proposal in front of the trustees. That is how we take it out of politics. Take the bill, I say to those on this side of the aisle, take the bill to save Medicare and put it in front of the trustees and see if they believe the $270 billion are really needed.

I think what is happening here is they are trying to get the cake to the fat cats and the cuts to the middle class.

SUPPORT H.R. 743, TEAM ACT

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, when the National Labor Relations Act passed in 1935, the idea of the high performance workplace was an unknown concept. Management either issued orders from on high or bargained with the unions over terms and conditions of employment. Since that time, however, and especially during the last 10 years, the concept of employee involvement has blossomed in workplaces all over America. How ironic, then, that the National Labor Relations Board has determined an employer may solicit employee input on what changes are needed in the workplace but it is illegal for an employer to make changes developed in consultation with employees unless those employees are represented by a union.

Mr. Speaker, why should employees be barred from dealing directly with management? The TEAM Act allows employees and employers to resolve workplace problems through team-based employee involvement and enables American companies to compete in the world marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the TEAM Act.

THE DEBT CEILING

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Pat Buchanan's America First campaign, move over. The Speaker is going one better by launching the America Second campaign.

Friday, in New York, he stood, defiant to default. ''I don't care what the price is,'' he proclaimed. ''I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days—not this time.''

True, the dollar immediately plunged 5 percent and interest rates shot up. The Wall Street Journal coined a new term, the ''Newt Factor.'' I would call it a ''Newtron bomb.''

But not to worry. Drive the dollar through the floor, let the interest rates soar, because America and its needs must take second place to the political posturing of the Speaker. America second, NEWT first. That is the spirit of these zealots who say it is NEWT's way or no way.

TEAM ACT DOES NOT APPLY WHERE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ALREADY EXISTS

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the debate over the application of the TEAM Act to American workplaces, let's be clear at the outset on one important point.

This bill has no application to companies which currently operate under a collective-bargaining agreement with an organized group of employees.

Opponents of the TEAM Act claim that the bill would let employers undermine established unions by creating workplace committees or sham company unions to take their place. This claim is false. The bill does not address work relationships in union settings.

It only affects employer/employee relations in nonunion settings. The bill would leave untouched restrictions prohibiting employers in unionized settings from dealing directly with employees.

To establish an employee involvement program in a unionized company, the management would still have to work directly through the unions or else be guilty of an unfair labor practice.

The language of the TEAM Act makes it clear that employee teams