

able to pass the largest tax increase in American history. Republicans, on the other hand, wanted to reduce the deficit by cutting spending.

Republicans believe that government is too big; in fact, way too big. They believe that Washington wastes too much of the taxpayers' money. One would think that this is an obvious point. After all, even the President himself said, in his 1996 State of the Union address, that the era of big government is over. If only that were true.

We can see now that this declaration was nothing more than words. Big government is alive and well; in fact, bigger than ever. In fact, the Democrats have come back with still more ways to increase the size and power of the government every year since.

While we can say that government is not quite as big as it would be if the Republicans had not taken control of Congress in 1995, the truth is that government continues to grow. Any attempts to cut government, no matter how wasteful and counterproductive the program, the liberals will immediately attack them as extremist or mean-spirited.

It has never occurred to them that it is perhaps mean-spirited on the part of politicians to have so little respect for the working man's labor that Washington takes between one-fourth and one-third of the middle class family's paycheck just to pay off Uncle Sam.

So that leaves us with the question, how did we go from \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see only 2½ years ago to the budget surplus we now enjoy. It is true that there have been some reductions in spending, but almost all of them have come out of one place that it should not have come out of, the Pentagon.

Defense spending is now dangerously low, and our military forces are not what they used to be, but liberals, in their boundless faith in human nature, ignore history and simply do not believe in the fundamental precept of peace through strength.

As for other spending, Republicans did manage to limit the number of new spending initiatives by President Clinton and the Democrats over the past few years. But the primary reason why the budget is in surplus today is because revenues are way, way up.

Liberals will point to the President's 1993 tax increase as the reason revenues are up, hoping that we will not examine the budget tables to see if in fact it is true. Revenues are up primarily from the number of people who are taking advantage of low tax rates on capital gains, the part of the economy that is the lifeblood of a dynamic, growing economy.

President Reagan cut the tax on capital gains and the Republicans cut it again just last year. Savers, investors, entrepreneurs, and other job creators have taken advantage of that. The economy is benefiting from jobs. Jobs are being created and revenues have soared. That has been the primary rea-

son why the budget is now in surplus, when it was deep in red only a few years ago.

I would invite any of my Democrat colleagues who dispute these findings to come forward and show me otherwise. Perhaps the liberals have access to another set of government documents with a different set of statistics, but if they use the same Treasury figures that I do, they will have to admit that the Reagan tax cuts and the Republican tax cuts are the most significant reason behind our current economic boom.

With all due credit to Alan Greenspan, chairman of the Federal Reserve, for his outstanding stewardship of monetary policy, we should mostly thank President Reagan for turning around an economy that was in the ditch. We are still benefiting from his decision to make the United States a low-tax, low-regulation economy, and thus able to compete in the world better than any other.

□ 1945

The Republicans forced President Clinton to renounce his own budget with \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. We are grateful that he at least accepted the need for the government to balance the budget and put its financial house in order.

We would like to encourage him to continue on this path. Especially if he accepts the view that Washington can still afford to cut spending, cut taxes, and make good on its promise that the end of big government is over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. PELOSI addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

WORDS OF SIR THOMAS MORE SHED LIGHT ON CURRENT DILEMMAS

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the hearing held in the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to impeachment, a few words were uttered by Mr. Shippers. He said,

I'm no longer speaking as Chief Investigative Counsel, but rather as a citizen of the United States who happens to be a father and a grandfather. To paraphrase Sir Thomas

More in Robert Bolt's excellent play, 'A Man for All Seasons': The laws of this country are the great barriers that protect the citizens from the winds of evil tyranny. If we permit one of those laws to fall, who will be able to stand in the gusts that will follow?

This was, as Mr. Shippers indicated, a paraphrase. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it was a lot more than that. It takes Robert Bolt's words, it takes the life of Sir Thomas More as recounted in the play, "A Man for All Seasons" and turns it upside down.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members who has cited a "A Man for All Seasons" and Sir Thomas More's life in my own remarks on this floor previously, I would like to actually read for the RECORD what was said by Sir Thomas More as conceived by Robert Bolt.

He describes More's son-in-law as William Roper, as follows: William Roper, a stiff body and an immobile face with little imagination and moderate brain, but an all too consuming rectitude, which is his cross, his solace, and his hobby.

That may very well apply to some of the individuals who are taking and twisting Bolt's words, particularly as paraphrased by Mr. Shippers.

What actually takes place is More, in discussion with his daughter and with his wife and with his son-in-law, concerning the law. The daughter says at one point to him, "Father, that man is bad," referring to another individual. Sir Thomas More said, "There is no law against that." The reply from Mr. Roper is "There is, God's law." More says, "Then God can arrest him."

Thinking that perhaps More is trying to set himself up above God's law with man's law, he remonstrates with More. And More says, "Let me draw your attention to a fact. I'm not God. The currents and eddies of right and wrong, which you find such plain sailing, I can't navigate. I'm no voyager. But in the thickets of the law, oh, there I'm a forester. I doubt if there's a man alive who could follow me there, thank God." His daughter says to him, "While you talk, he's gone," referring to the evil man to whom she had first referred.

More says, "And go he should, if he was the Devil himself, until he broke the law." His son-in-law says, "So now you'd give the Devil benefit of law." And More said, "Yes. What would you do? Cut a great road through the law to get after the Devil?" Roper said, "I would cut down every law in England to do that." And More said, "Oh? And when the last law was down, and the Devil turned round on you, where you would you hide, Roper, the laws all being flat? This country's planted thick with laws from coast to coast—man's laws, not God's—and if you cut them down—and you're just the man to do it—do you really think you could stand upright in the winds that would blow then? Yes, I'd give the Devil benefit of law, for my own safety's sake."

I suggest to Mr. Shippers what is at stake here is our law as embodied in

the Constitution. The President, all of us, are fully entitled to the protection of that Constitution. It is not the President, it is not those on the Democratic side of the aisle in the Committee on the Judiciary deliberations that are trying to cut down the law. They are trying to protect the law. They are trying to see that the law is implemented the way it was written, and it was written to protect all of us.

If we allow Mr. Shippers, or anyone like him, to cut down the protection of law, then how will we be protected in turn? Yes, it is more than just the President's right to the rule of law being at stake here. What is at stake is whether or not we will, in turn, defend those laws. Because in doing so, we defend ourselves.

So, I recommend, Mr. Speaker, to you and all who are interested, that we take up Sir Thomas More's cross, the one he bore, the one which he paid his life for. And that was that we obey the law in such a way as not to lose our sense of humanity in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to you, and I commend to all, Mr. Bolt's "A man for All Seasons." I commend to Mr. Shippers and his defenders that they not twist the words, but bring them into the reality that reflects the best that is in America and the best that is in our Constitution, and that is the protection of one and all.

A VERY PRODUCTIVE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, government does not have to be as complicated as we here in Washington make it. In fact, the only thing that counts to the folks that we represent, and the district that I represent runs from the Mississippi River across the top of the State of Illinois to within one county of Lake Michigan, and the people there are just like the people in the rest of the United States.

They get up early in the morning, go to work, pack their lunch bags. Then on Friday night, the husband and wife will sit down and say, you know, we do not understand it. We are both working and yet we are taking home less money and it cost more to live than ever before.

What those people want is what most Americans want. They want a tax rate that is fair. They want a government that is efficient. They want to be able to use the fruits of their own labors.

That is why this very productive Republican Congress is allowing the taxpayers of this country the ability to keep more of their hard-earned dollars, as opposed to sending it to Washington to be wasted on one of the 10,000 Federal programs that are here.

I was at a luncheon for Scott Forge, a major forge back in our district in McHenry County, and talked to a great

number of the work force. I asked, "How many here have children under 17 years old?" And about half of them raised their hands. And I said, "Do you believe that you as parents can make a better decision as to how to spend money on those children than 535 Members of Congress 820 miles from here?" And they all said yes.

Then I said, "For those of you who raised your hands, for every child you have, this year you will pay \$400 less in income taxes and next year \$500 less in income taxes." And they looked at each other and I said, "Sir, how many children do you have?" And he said, "I have 4." I said, "Next year you will pay \$2,000 less in income tax," and the place started to cheer.

I asked, "How many here have kids in the first 2 years of college?" Several people raised their hands. I said, "Would you not be better off spending your money on your kids' college tuition as opposed to paying income tax?" They said yes. And I said, "That is exactly what this Republican Congress has done. They are called Hope scholarships. Up to \$1,500 per year for the first 2 years that you can use towards your kid's college education as opposed to paying taxes."

That really is the Republican message. A productive Congress is a Congress that does things for people, not for itself. Do my colleagues think it is productive just because a Congress meets more and more and more days and passes more and more and more laws?

Mr. Speaker, more laws usually mean bigger government, more regulations, and higher taxes to pay for those new programs.

So, while the Republicans are being assailed as a "Do Nothing Congress," we do nothing liberal on the Republican side. But we are doing everything possible for the working people out there. The people that I represent, the ones who are working that Scott Forge who get up very early in the morning and go to work and work there doing all kinds of great things with their hands.

I can look them in the eye and say, "I am your United States Representative of Congress in Washington, and I helped craft and I voted for legislation that lowers your taxes and allows to you keep more of your hard-earned dollars."

That is the message. That is the message that people in this country want to hear. It is a very simple message. I could talk about the President and all the new programs he wants to institute and this and that. But we have to ask, who is going to pay for it all? Do we really think that all the new things that he proposes are going to be free? Who is going to pay for it all?

That is what matters to the people that get up in the morning and go to Scott Forge and work very hard. And I would suggest that these are the people who count. These are the people who have made America, and these are the

people that are the beneficiaries of this Republican-led productive Congress.

EDUCATION

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, in time, the American people will grade this Congress on its performance toward improving education. Teachers, parents and even students will examine what this Congress has or has not done to make our educational systems better. Sadly, I must report that, as of tonight, this Congress is failing.

Why is this Congress failing, you might ask? This Congress is failing because we have done nothing to decrease class sizes or to repair deteriorating school buildings.

Schools across the Nation are struggling because student enrollments are dramatically increasing. Evidence shows that there is a direct correlation between class size and learning ability. Students in smaller classes, especially in early grades, make greater educational gains, and maintain those gains over time. Smaller classes are most advantageous for poor, minority, and rural community children. However, all children will benefit from smaller classes. In addition, the greatest impact on learning will only occur if the new teachers brought into the classroom are qualified teachers.

In these final days, Congress still has a chance to correct this deficiency and improve its grade. The Class-Size Reduction and Teacher Quality Act of 1998 can and should be passed before we leave for adjournment. We could even pass it in the Suspension Calendar.

This bill would help States and local school districts recruit, train, and hire 100,000 additional well-prepared teachers in order to reduce the average class size to 18 in grades 1 through 3. Creating 100,000 new positions for teachers is important in order to meet the increasing enrollments. The process will occur over the next ten years. The need for this legislation is paramount. America needs more teachers. More teachers is so critical to maintaining and improving our educational system.

In addition to working to increase the number of teachers and reduce class sizes, we must also work, before we leave for adjournment, to facilitate the rehabilitation and construction of school buildings, many of which are in a critical state of disrepair. Too many of our students in grades kindergarten through twelve are in overcrowded classrooms, with poor curriculums, limited equipment and deteriorating schools. Because 90 percent of our children attend public schools, we must strengthen and improve those schools, particularly school structures.

We have an all-time record school enrollment of 52.2 million students today. The strain on school systems and the impact on learning will be felt for years to come. Poor school buildings discourage learning, with leaky roofs, broken windows, peeling paint, inadequate heat in winter and poor cooling and ventilation in spring and summer.

According to a 1996 Report by the General Accounting Office, some sixty percent of the Nation's schools are in disrepair. American students are falling further and further behind