

league that we choose to break ground in. The sky is the limit for our young women in sports, in business, in politics, and now in space. I am proud to be here this evening with Congresswoman MEEK and my other colleagues and to be able to work with them, to continue to open doors for women and for all Americans.

APPLAUDING THE AUTHORS OF TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have all benefited from the historical perspective that has been given to us this evening. It is certainly my honor to be able to associate with the remarks of my women colleagues to honor my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Even more exciting for, I hope, all of us who have had the pleasure of being on the floor, was to see her energy in recounting this historical recollection of the challenges and the battle, if you will, of what she had to overcome to bring us to this point. I particularly enjoyed the gentlewoman's emphasizing that she was a woman and a mother. When it came to her daughter, her daughter was first, but she did and made all of these sacrifices because she wanted to see young women who were coming up behind her to have the opportunities that she might not have had.

So I want to join my colleagues, and I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her vision and leadership, along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for giving us this opportunity to come and honor the existence of Title IX, the landmark legislation that bans gender discrimination in school academics and athletics, and to applaud the authors of this legislation.

□ 2045

I might say to my good friend and colleague, the vote did not count, but the vision, the words, and fight that she puts in place were really what counted. We thank her for that. Might I say to former Congresswoman Edith Green, our appreciation as well. Their leadership ushered in a new era of appreciation for women in sports in academia.

The Speaker has been listening patiently. As many of us proudly like to talk about our children and home towns, let me say that I am from Houston, Texas. I want to share a personal moment of pride, or two personal moments of pride; one, when the WNBA Comets won their first championship, I had the pleasure of being in the arena.

Mr. Speaker, I am not embarrassed to say as a slightly older woman than

21 years old, I cried, I cried, because for the first time I saw women in a competitive sport, with the excitement, the energy, but also to see the community, men and women, cheering for women sportspersons, not because it was basketball, which seems to have taken the world by storm, but because women were engaged in a competitive sport, and we all were cheering.

Might I say that I have a young daughter, a young woman for whom I had the pleasure of being a mother on the sidelines, watching her play basketball and engaging my husband and my younger son in what she was doing wrong and what she was doing right. How many of us had that experience 20, 30 years ago, when I relished the opportunity to participate in sports in my high school and in college, and Mr. Speaker, I simply was not asked to participate. Yet, I have the opportunity to sit along the sidelines and applaud my young daughter, and watch my young son engage in debate and cheering his sister along.

I stand to congratulate the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and Ms. Edith Green for what they have made and what the future holds. I also congratulate the Women's World Cup team champions. Their historic win a few weeks ago over China was watched all over the world, and certainly serves as a testament to the importance of Title IX.

Might I apologize to my constituents who invited me to be a guest speaker, and unfortunately, there was a television in the room, and I asked everyone to stop, stop the program so I could see the final minutes of the World Cup, and watch the women bring it to a close and slap 5, and I congratulate them as well, many of whom are from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. No, I am not from North Carolina, but my daughter attends that school, and the soccer women made me aware of that when we visited with them, and joined them in traveling to NASA last Monday to see off and to offer words of congratulations to Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to pilot the space shuttle. She is flying above us now.

I might congratulate her because I think the charge of Title IX helped to propel women all over the country and the world to do great things. We saw her go off in space last Friday, but I was with my colleagues, both colleagues who were here on the floor, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) to travel down to Florida to see her off.

Let me quickly finish by saying each of these accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, have served to remind us that only 27 years ago there was no Title IX, and women were still second-class citizens. We have come a long way from those days when only men were expected to

be legislators, excel in sports, and fly in space.

This is truly a great day for women in America and all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one thing, it is vital that we do not pit the value of women's sports against the needs of men's sports. I want to say today, tonight, this evening that what the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) did and Congresswoman Green, both of them in the United States Congress, was a great thing. Let us not turn it into a wrong thing or a bad thing by pitting those two needy efforts against each other.

I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, as I come to a close, there is much that we need to do. I will cite the number of women that got medical degrees, and 43 percent of law degrees and doctoral degrees, 44 percent. All of this I think is generated by the energy and enthusiasm when women get into a competitive mood.

But we have a long way to go, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we need more women CEOs. We need to address the question of pay equity, more engineers and scientists. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to elect the first woman president of the United States of America.

So I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and former Congresswoman Green, as authors of this energetic legislation. They dreamed and we believed and we accomplished. Today we honor them for their work, and our commitment and challenge, Mr. Speaker, is that we go forth to do better, to do great things, and to create equality for men and women in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the Women's Caucus in honor of title IX, the landmark legislation that bans gender discrimination in school academics and athletics. I also wish to applaud the authors of this legislation, Representative Patsy Mink and former Congresswoman Edith Green. Their leadership ushered in a new era of appreciation for women in sports and in academia.

I also stand to congratulate the Women's World Cup Team champions. Their historic win a few weeks ago over China was watched all over the world and certainly serves as a testament to the importance of title IX.

Finally, I would like to offer words of congratulations to Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to pilot the Space Shuttle.

Each of these accomplishments serve to remind us that only 27 years ago, there was no title IX and women were still second class citizens. We have come a long way from the days when only men were expected to be legislators, excel in sports and fly into space. This is truly a great day for women in America and all over the world. It is vital that we do not pit the value of women's sports against the needs of men's collegiate sports.

Since title IX passed, we have seen that there have been significant increases in women's educational achievements. In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees, 43 percent of the law degrees, and 44

percent of all doctoral degrees. In 1972, the numbers for professional degrees were in the single digits (9 percent for medicine and 7 percent for law).

In athletics, we have also seen more opportunities for women in intercollegiate sports. Institutions now must ensure that there is adequate athletic financial assistance, accommodation of athletic interests and abilities of women, and that the opportunities and treatments afforded to sports participants must be equivalent.

Some other program components include providing access to equipment and supplies, opportunity to receive academic tutoring, medical and training facilities and services, adequate support services and publicity. These benefits are some of the ways institutions ensure that sport participants receive equivalent treatment.

We know that title IX has had an important impact on women's sports. We have seen the success of the Women's National Basketball Association and the Women's Soccer Team as evidence that access to these programs in college is crucial to professional development.

I am proud to stand here today to applaud this important legislation and these women who have blazed the trail of achievement for other women. These athletes will inspire a new generation of girls to engage in sports. CEO's, pay equity, and, yes, we have yet to elect this Nation's first women President.

I am grateful to serve in Congress with Representative PATSY MINK, one of the authors of this legislation. She must have only dreamed that we would be here today in honor of the great accomplishments of women due to her work. Today, we honor your work and the work of other women who have fought hard to give more opportunities to women.

TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, the discussion about tax relief has been brought to this body tonight in very eloquent terms. What I would like to do is to talk to one of my colleagues, one in particular, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), who is headed this way, to discuss the practical side of tax relief.

As I go about my district, and I have seen the discussions brought about, both the pros and cons, I am perplexed by the fact that people are saying we do not need tax relief.

I want to state at the front of this that there are three reasons that I can see for tax relief that is needed at any time, and especially at this time.

One is to support the economy. We have surpluses now that have never been so great. They were not obvious in that the projections 5 years ago, even 3 years ago, were that we were going to have deficits, a continuation of deficits. But we have surpluses now.

The economy is growing from a lot of different sources. There is a lot of money in the stock market. It is over 11,000 now, which is unheard of. When I came in 1992, I think it was right below 3,000. So it is a factor that we need to support the economy so that it does not go down, so that we can keep the surpluses. Tax relief is one way of doing that.

Secondly, we must shrink the government. We are doing a good job. It is not simple. We are doing it over a lot of objections. We are doing it through elections after elections, when people are saying, from the other side, you do not care about this, you are mean-spirited, you are this or that. But we have started bringing the cost of government down.

There is one sure way we can do that. That is to stop the blood supply or stop the money from coming in. Tax relief will provide that, and it will also help and give freedom to the people who work.

We have too many people who were finding their families in disarray. They are not spending enough time at the breakfast table, the dinner table, the supper table. That is because they are having to work two jobs. They keep talking about let us bring costs down, but our inflation is under control.

We have a lot of different factors that are being mentioned, but the big problem is that we are just taxing people to death.

This particular tax relief package includes something called estate taxes. That is something that I hope, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) gets here that we can talk about in more detail. But we have to support the economy, keep the surpluses in place, shrink the government, stop spending so that we will have smaller government, less bureaucracy. It will be less burdensome to the individuals, and give freedom to the people who work so they can have choices for their families, because we must build the families back.

The excuses that we have seen in the past have been, well, let us wait until we balance the budget. That seems safe for those people who want to keep taxes at a high rate. That seems safe because the deficit was projected for years and years and years. I think in 1998 the deficit was projected at \$377 billion, and we came in, or maybe these are not the accurate figures, but we came in at like something like \$72 billion for a surplus, a swing from a deficit to a surplus.

So it was safe for people to say, we won't have the taxes, those people who believe taxes are the way for government to operate. They were saying that is fine, let us just keep it there. Let us keep the taxes there until we can eliminate the deficit. Well, we have a balanced budget, we have eliminated the deficit, and we are progressing in that way. We need to keep it.

Also we heard that social security was a factor, we must protect social security and Medicare. That has been mentioned time and time again. At one point the administration proposed that we put 62 percent aside on social security. We have said, no, before we do anything, before we have tax relief, we have more spending, we are going to put 100 percent of the social security aside.

That comes from years and years of using social security for the wrong reasons. Not one year has one dime been set aside to protect social security until we have passed the lockbox, not one year. The trust fund has been used for all kinds of things. It has been used to finance the Vietnam War, to finance spending programs, to finance the government getting bigger. It has brought about more and more deficit, more and more debt, and greater and greater government, and less and less control of our lives. But we have taken care of that with the lockbox. We are taking care of social security and Medicare.

Now we are told, let us wait until the debt is paid off. Here comes another excuse, another delay for these people who want taxes. Now what we have done in this bill that is coming up is we have plugged the tax reductions into whether the debt is coming down. So if the interest on the debt is not reduced in certain years, then the reductions in the income tax or the 10 percent across-the-board tax will be delayed 1 year.

So then we are faced with the fact that we are going to benefit from our keeping the debt down because the interest will be lower, and from that point, if we spend too much, we will suffer from it, so we are going to have a good and a bad consequence.

I just think what we have as the problem and the thing that is perplexing, as I have stated, and I see that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is here. But what I am saying, some people, when they hear the word "taxes," they say, yes, that means I am going to get something. Some people, when they hear "taxes," they say no, I am not in favor of this because somebody is going to take something away from me and take my incentive for working.

What I would like to discuss in this time we have here with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is the pros and cons of it. We happen to have appeared before this body one other time, when we discussed another issue, and we had a friendly discussion. People called my office and said, why are you so friendly with somebody on the other side? He got the same kinds of calls.

I would just like to propose to the gentleman that maybe he could make an opening statement, and we can just start talking in front of the American