HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Sunday, October 11, 1998*

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 11, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable KEVIN BRADY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of the Psalms.
Praise the Lord.
Praise the name of the Lord, give praise, O servants of the Lord, you that stand in the house of the Lord, in the courts of the house of the Lord!
Praise the Lord, for the Lord is good; sing to his name, for he is gracious!
O give thanks to the Lord, for he is good, for his steadfast love endures forever.
O give thanks to the God of all gods, for his steadfast love endures forever.
O give thanks to the Lord of lords, for his steadfast love endures forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SANDLIN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

GOALS FOR A GENERATION

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, goals for a generation is the future of America and it is the responsibility not just of the Republican Party but this Congress as a whole, for it alone will build the bridge to the 21st century.

So far adhering to these goals has brought us, the American people, a balanced budget, tax cuts, a Patient Protection Act, education reform that brightens the future of every child in America and legislation that will help save Social Security.

Under this agenda, we are continuing to improve our public and private schools by sending money directly back to classrooms for more teachers, more computers, safer buildings and teacher testing.

We will also expand the notion that every American should have the financial security that comes from secure jobs. This job security, coupled with a simpler tax code and a fairer IRS, will keep our economy strong and boost savings and America's investments.

Our government should reflect rather than undermine the values that have made America great, faith, family, personal freedom and responsibility. By protecting and strengthening a Republican government and citizen accountability, the Republican Party will continue to deliver on its promises that made these goals a reality for all America.

ON CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe what I have just heard. The Republican Party, which has used its majority in Congress to deny people access to education, to deny them access to health care, refuses to take any steps to deal with HMO reform or the seniors, a quarter of a million of which have lost their health insurance, comes here and claims they are doing a good job.

Harry Truman could not find a rating low enough for this Congress. We should not leave here until we deal with the education issues, until we deal with the health care issues. You had time to try to give big tobacco a $50 billion tax cut. We ought to spend a few hours in these last days to make sure that senior citizens do not have to be frightened every day about whether or not their HMO is going to drop them. The gentlemen on that side of the aisle get the same kind of constituents as I do. They look to us for help. I do not know what answer you are going to give them. This new freedom that is out there in the health care system means doctors and hospitals and patients have no rights. We have got to change that. The country is going to judge us on that. I hope everybody watching at home calls their Congressman and tells them they want the education package and they want HMO reform. It is the only way to move this group, to let them know that the American people are angry and frustrated, and now is the time to act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair, not to the television viewing audience.

DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would beg all the Members to roll up their pants. It looks like it is getting heavy around here. The party of bigger government and higher taxes disagrees with the party of less government and lower taxes. The party of bigger government and higher taxes is threatening to shut down the government if the party of less government and lower taxes stands firm against creating more big government, more Federal bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., more spending on Federal programs.

Well, I got some news for the President and the party of bigger government and higher taxes. My constituents did not send me here to do exactly the opposite of what I have promised I would do. They sent me here to reduce the size of government, not expand it. They sent me here to cut the size of Federal bureaucracy, not make it bigger. They sent me here to give local schools more say over how they run their affairs, not less. They sent me here to make sure that the government lives within its means, not find new ways for government to get around its budget agreements. Regardless of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

excuse the Democrat agenda is always the same, more spending and more government.

DEMOCRATS OFFER EDUCATION INITIATIVES

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity last night to go back to my district in New Jersey and I explained to my constituents that I saw at a function last evening how this do-nothing Congress was looking to adjourn and go home as quickly as possible because the Republican leadership refused to address education initiatives, refused to address the need for HMO reform and was talking about a tax break for the wealthy at the expense of Social Security. We need to save Social Security for future generations. But I was told by my constituents that the one thing that was the most important, that they did not want to see this Congress adjourn until we addressed it, was education, and the Democrats have two initiatives. One is to hire 100,000 teachers, new teachers across the country with Federal dollars that would reduce the size of the classroom, and the second one was to try to provide some funding to help local school districts to modernize their schools, to either build new schools or additions or to upgrade the schools that need to be restored. We are going to make sure that that happens here. We are telling the Republican leadership and our colleagues on the other side we are not going to run out of this place quickly. This has been a do-nothing Congress but at least before you go home, try to do something, put some sort of down payment on these education initiatives that are so important, not to Democrats, not to Republicans but to the American people.

These are the kids. We have to think about the future of this country. The future of this country is in its children and in public education, not vouchers for private schools but public education, and doing things to upgrade public education, doing things to help in the classroom, doing things that make it possible to have safer and smarter schools. That is what the Democrats are all about. We have been talking about this for a long time. President Clinton brought it up in his State of the Union Address. Now is the time to do something about it.

TIME FOR ACTIONS TO MATCH WORDS

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the President said in his 1996 State of the Union Address that the era of big government is over. I suppose that depends on what the definition of "is" is. I suppose that if you look at his recent attacks on Republicans in Congress, especially on education, the President and his liberal allies in Congress are threatening to shut the government down if Congress does not spend more money on education and create more education bureaucracy right here in Washington. Republicans want to send more money to the classroom. Liberals want to give the Federal Government an overpowering role in local schools. Republicans think that Federal bureaucrats have done enough damage to education, thank you very much. Liberals want to spend the money by taking it away from Social Security, while Republicans are happy to stay right here and continue to work to get more money into the classrooms, while keeping the budget agreement caps which means that there must be spending offsets by not taking money away from Social Security. If the era of big government is over, then it is time for the President's actions to match his words.

UNDERACHIEVING CONGRESS

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, by the calendar it says Sunday but in fact it is spin day, the day the Republicans come before the American public and try to spin their way out of this do-nothing Congress. Well, they get offended when you say do-nothing, so let us say underachieving Congress. The fact of the matter is we on the Democratic side want to stay here and deal with the issue of education. We need to invest more money in public education. The Republicans will try to tell you that they want to send money back to the States because money is going into bureaucracy. That is not true. Less than 2 percent of the Department of Education's budget is spent on administration. Ninety-eight percent goes directly to the States and localities. That is our position. The States and counties and local communities need more money to hire teachers, to train teachers, to put computers in classrooms. If we want a world-class education system, we have to make a world-class investment. That is why we are fighting. That is why we are here. The White House and the congressional Democrats say we must invest more in education. The Republicans simply want to go home and do nothing.

PLEA TO PRESIDENT: HELP US FIND REAL SOLUTIONS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague from Maryland. His math comes up short. Only 2 percent of Federal spending goes to administration? That is just not true. But then again there is a lot that goes on here that seems to be part of the spin cycle.

Mr. Speaker, I noted with great interest this morning the President met with the minority leadership. In 2 years' time he has never bothered to sit down with the people who run the House of Representatives, members of the majority, to craft a policy for America's future. It has been very interesting, Mr. Speaker. In fact tomorrow on the President's itinerary are two fund-raisers, one in Florida, the other in New York. The final one is to benefit a Member of this House who sits on the Judiciary Committee and who has aspirations of joining the other body. Now even in a town as cynical and as hard-bitten as Washington, D.C., can people not see some conflict of interest? We are happy to stay as long as it takes to make sure that education is left up to the people, not the Washington bureaucrats. Mr. Speaker, we implore the President of the United States to join us to find real solutions.

LET US MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN KIDS' LIVES

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this is absurd. Republicans taking credit for improving education is like saying that Jerry Springer is in the business of improving television. It really is quite extraordinary. My Republican colleagues say that the President wants to shut the government down. Friends, American public, understand: This government is shut down. Let me tell you what the Republican-controlled majority has not been doing in the last 2 years of the 105th Congress. No budget. No budget. No appropriations bills. No managed care reform. No campaign finance reform legislation. No tobacco legislation to help to save your kids. No education program. They say, "Let's raid Social Security to pay for other things in this budget."

Let me just say this to you, that yes, what we need to focus on in these last remaining hours of this Congress is our kids' education. Let us in fact reduce class size. Let us get 100,000 more teachers. Let us make a difference in our kids' lives.

WHERE IS THE PRESIDENT?

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I say to my good friend from Connecticut that this

is a do-nothing-that-the-liberal-likes Congress, that is for sure. But I am here working today. I do not mind. I was elected to do a job and I am going to do it. But what about the President, where is he? Maybe in Martha's Vineyard, Aspen, Camp David? Where is the President? I bet the American people do not know that he spent 152 days out of the 283 days this year fund-raising, traveling, and on vacation. On top of that, I bet the American people do not know that he had only two Cabinet meetings this year. We know what those Cabinet meetings were. He shows up the day before adjournment and starts talking about education. The day before adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is another workday, and alas according to reports the President will be in Palm Beach in the afternoon for pina coladas, for raising money, and then he will be jetting off to New York City for dinner for more fund-raisers. Enjoy yourself, Mr. President. We know how draining those two cabinet meetings were this year. But we will stay here as long as it takes and work on the budget. After all, the American people expect nothing less.

□ 1415

THIS CONGRESS HAS ONLY WORKED 108 DAYS THIS YEAR—FIRE THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not a mystery why this has been one of the least productive congresses in history, why this is a do-nothing Congress, because this Congress has only worked 108 days this year. Most working people worked in excess of 225 days, 250 days this year. This Congress only worked 108 days. Now they find out after 108 days of working that they did not do their work, that they are not done. They say, "Where is the President?" The President has been waiting for the appropriations bills. The President has been waiting for the budget. This is the first Congress since 1974 that had no budget. This is a Congress that cannot pass seven of its appropriations bills. There is nothing for the President to sign because they cannot get the appropriations bills out of the House of Representatives. They cannot get agreement among the Republicans in the House or the Republicans in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, if most Americans worked as few days as this Republican Congress, they would be fired. Their employers would ask for their money back. Maybe that is what the public ought to do is fire the Republican Congress.

REPUBLICANS PASSED 21 INITIATIVES GIVING GREATER CONTROL TO LOCAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, as I look back over the last 2 years, one thing is very clear. The Republican majority in the House and Senate has given a 21-gun salute to education, passing 21 initiatives to give greater local control to local education and put dollars in the classroom. While the Democrats want to put more money in Washington bureaucracy, we want the dollars to the classroom. In fact, 30 cents on the dollars today that we appropriate here in Washington stay in Washington on government bureaucracy. Thanks to this Republican Congress we now have the lowest loan rates for student loans in 17 years. We have been doubled that the last 3 years the amount of Pell grant, grant money to help low-income students go on to college, and we provided $500 million more this year for special education.

Earlier this year, just 2 weeks ago, the House of Representatives passed an effort to save Social Security and to help education. Found it very interesting that the President called our efforts to make prepaid college tuition programs tax exempt, to help with school construction costs, the President calls that squandering that extra tax revenue and squandering the surplus.

It is interesting our effort to help schools with the tax cut plan would have cost $7 billion in surplus. Our President wants to spend twice as much, $14 billion, on defense spending, the State Department and a computer fix for government bureaucrats.

PRESIDENT RAISING BIG DOLLARS IN PALM BEACH FOR TV ADS THAT DO NOT TELL THE TRUTH

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from Palm Beach County joining the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) also representing Palm Beach, we are quite surprised that the President would assume that the negotiations to continue the good work of this Congress would be held in the island of Palm Beach. CLAY SHAW and I stayed here to work on the people's problems. We are here throughout the weekend to solve the budget crisis. Regrettably the President and, I understand, the Vice President are traveling to Palm Beach, Florida to raise more money. In fact, the chairman of the Florida State Democratic Party suggested that they should probably not come because they were bleeding all of the dollars out of the State and bringing them here to Washington, D.C.

So let us understand what this is all about, not about working, not about saving this Nation, not about helping our children, not about helping education. It is about going down to Palm Beach, Florida, a place that I love, to raise big dollars to come back and assault the integrity of the American public with more money on TV ads that do not tell the truth.

So, if the President wants to solve the government's problems, stay in Washington tomorrow, work through the weekend, like we are. We can make some significant gains for the American taxpayers.

HOW MEAN HAS THIS COUNTRY GOTTEN?

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise this Sunday afternoon here in Washington with, like the rest of us, probably really missing our families and wishing we could be with them. But I happened to think about my daughter who was about the age that I was when this town and this country was calling out for the best in people, asking them to bring out what is the best in America by joining the Peace Corps. I did that.

In the Peace Corps I lived as minority in another land, and I learned the greatness of the United States. Incredible to see how much we can do around the world. And I knew then that I was going to enter a political career to try to right wrongs and make life better.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the 105th session, and I look back, and I think, oh my God, how mean has this country gotten? How mean is their right-wing leadership in their party? They want to take away public education and privatize it, remove the safety net. They want to make Social Security neither social, nor secure. They want to have people in their medical careers have to deal with insurance companies rather than doctors.

I plead with my colleagues to get away from the meanness. Go back to the dreams of America. We can cure a lot.

WAG THE DOG

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, it would be really helpful if we did not attack each others motives. I do not consider myself a mean person. I consider myself like other Members of this body on both sides, deeply committed to the issues we believe in, and we confuse the

American people because they do not understand what is going on right now. They look at this and say this looks a lot like the NBA strike lockout where we have people on both sides with strong differences of opinions. But they are adults; why can they not sit down?

Obviously we both care about education. We differ how to do it. We obviously both care about health care. We disagree how to do it. We obviously both want to see a form of government; in this case some of us are more local than state-oriented and some are more federal, but it is not that we are not trying to do a good government.

In 1995, actually right after the 1994 elections, we had a historic point in American history. For 40 years we had had a Democratic Congress, and all of a sudden we had a conservative Republican Congress and a liberal Democratic President, and we had those passions on both sides tested, and we went through this before. This is now our fourth time. There is no reason that we cannot come to an agreement unless there is another political reason, unless there is a wag-the-dog problem going on right now where the President is trying to distract attention.

We know he feels passionately, we feel passionately. Let us be adults and get it resolved.

WITH A $500-PER-CHILD TAX CREDIT THIS IS A DO-SOMETHING CONGRESS

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the fact that Congress does not pass a lot of laws does not mean it is a do-nothing Congress. Did my colleagues ever stop to realize that a Congress that passes a lot of laws is the same one that passes a lot of regulations? Creates more programs? More bureaucrats? Evidently to some people on the other side, they think that that is a productive Congress.

But, as my colleagues know, for every family in the United States beginning this year that has a child under 17 year old the parents will be able to keep $400 more of their taxes, and after that, $500 more of their taxes, a $500 child credit. We Republicans believe the American people know how to spend their hard-earned dollars a lot better than the United States Congress. With a $500 per child tax credit, they can keep that as opposed to paying taxes. That is a do-something Congress.

FOR LIBERAL DEMOCRATS EDUCATION IS ABOUT MONEY, MONEY, MONEY

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, education is a perfect example of an issue where liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans disagree. For a liberal Democrat education is about one thing and one thing only. It is more money, more money, more money from Washington, D.C.

Now last year they were here arguing for more money for education, and so we gave it to them. Education did not improve. The year before it was the same argument. We gave them more money. Education did not improve. And the year before that, and the year before that, and the year before that, and the year before that, and every single year for the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, my question for the liberals is at what point do they conclude that maybe, just maybe, it is not the money from Washington, D.C.? The answer, of course, is that it is not the money, and even the liberals know it. They have created more Federal bureaucracies, more Washington, D.C. programs of dubious value and more administrative extravagances.

Education achievement has not improved, but that is no surprise at all.

A DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting over in my office looking at my clips from the newspaper, and I come across one here I thought I would mention to my colleagues. This is the Washington Post, October 6, in their editorial section: A do-nothing Congress whose year has been spent deflecting good bills while barely pretending to legislate is now down to the task it cannot avoid. It has yet to pass 9 of its 13; well, really it is 7 of its 13; regular appropriation bills, and they go on and say on most of this stuff the President would be wrong to yield, he should veto the Republicans.

Now the Republicans are out here today saying that we are trying to pick a fight, and so the paper says the Republicans say the President is trying to pick a fight on these issues, even to the point of shutting down the government to divert attention from their own failures. They seek thereby to disarm him. In fact, it is they who seek to divert attention from their own record which for most of the year consists of thwarting legislation that deserves to pass and now consists, in too many cases, of trying to sneak into law provisions that ought to fail. The President should swat them on it.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WHAT REPUBLICANS HAVE DONE FOR EDUCATION

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk a little bit about what the Republicans have done for education. We have heard a lot about how we were trying to eliminate public education. Nothing could be further from the truth. We want to make strong public schools with local control, local authority.

Now if my colleagues compare what the President is proposing with his hundred thousand teachers, we have heard that number before. We heard about the Cops On The Street Program which promised 100,000 police on the streets. Well, according to Attorney General Janet Reno, we never did get 100,000 police to the street. In fact, we only got 18,000 police to the street, and for those 18,000, they were only partially funded. The first year they got 75 percent, the second year they got 50 percent, the third year they got 25 percent, and the fourth year the local governments had to completely fund those 18,000 policemen. Well they only got partially funded. They went ahead and hired the policemen on good faith. Then the amount of funding from the Federal Government got reduced, and the portion of the local funding continued to increase. So what happened in all these local governments that were trying to do the right thing by hiring these police is they ended up raising their taxes. So they got fewer policemen that they were promised and higher taxes than what was anticipated. Now we have the plan for 100,000 teachers, again partially funded, and over the next few years the funding goes down, down, down while local government taxes go up, up up, and along with that comes the bureaucracy.

Now the average employee in the Department of Education here in Washington, D.C., makes $52,000 a year. Go home and ask the children's teacher if they make $52,000 a year. They do not make that in Wichita, Kansas, not the average teacher, but yet that is what the average bureaucrat does here, and they do not educate any children. All they do is demand more paperwork, more paperwork, more paperwork.

Well, let us just go over a little bit what we have done just this year, in the 105th Congress what the Republicans have done. First of all, we put some common sense into the concept of

national testing. This fast track nature of what the White House had initiated was unverified. It took a long process, it started many educations on an alarming rate of trying to do things that they had, that they could not put a final bottom line on. It was like hitting a moving target.

Now we have done testing in Kansas. We have a program called QPA. It measures progress. It has testing requirements. Other States are already doing it. So here we have a duplication of effort in Washington, D.C., on education standards. Well, we put some common sense to that in the Republican Congress.

The next thing we did is put dollars into the classroom. The purpose was to consolidate 31 top-down programs into block grants to the States, and under this bill at least 95 percent of the money coming from the Federal Government had to go into the classroom for classroom activities or services. Now for Kansas that meant an extra $2½ million going into the classroom. Well, it is not being spent here in Washington, D.C., which is the big difference in philosophy between what happens between the Republicans and the liberals. The Republicans and conservatives would like to see the money get into the classroom, not being spent here in Washington, D.C. on a bloated bureaucracy.

□ 1430

Another thing that has occurred here is we have the Higher Education Amendment of 1998. The purpose of this is to reauthorize the Higher Education Act of 1965 with the lion's share of the Federal funding going for higher education. This year it is in excess of $40 billion a year, where the Republican Congress wants to get money into higher education.

Another program was the Community Service Block Grant and Low Income Housing Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, to help some of the local communities revitalize their high poverty neighborhoods and empower low income individuals and communities to become self-sufficient. It had new initiatives in it for literacy, youth development, fatherhood and community policing.

Another program was the Reading Excellence Program. This legislation developed in response to the President's America Reads Program to use volunteers to improve the reading skills of children, where we would reform the way reading is taught in our Nation's schools. Working together, we perfected a program.

Another program was the English Fluency Act. This legislation is directed at reforming the current Bilingual Education Act to provide funds to states to address the needs of English language learners and ensure that they learn English as soon as possible.

Another program, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act. The purpose of this legislation is to help local areas have safer schools.

I could go on for another 10 or 12 programs, but the bottom line is the Republicans believe in local schools and local empowerment. We think you can spend your money more wisely than any government agency and that you will love your children more than any government program.

PROGRESS REPORT ON CONGRESS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we can talk all we want here, or the Republicans can talk all they want, about what they are going to do in terms of education, because most of the legislation that was just read by the gentleman in the well is legislation that they have proposed, it is legislation that may have passed this House, it is legislation that they cannot get agreement with the Senate on, or it is legislation that has come out of the committee but their caucus is in disagreement on much of that legislation.

I appreciate and I was at the signing with the bipartisan delegation of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. That is what Congress is supposed to do. Congress is supposed to reauthorize that act when it comes due and there is no Congress that has failed to do that.

But this Congress has failed to do much more. It has failed to meet the needs of America's schoolchildren by failing to address the need to reduce class size for our younger students. It has refused to meet the need to improve our schools, the crumbling schools, some $12 billion worth of construction that is immediately necessary, not only to make schools safe, not only to make them healthy for our children, not only to modernize those that need it, but also to make them ready for the technology that is the key to much of the educational opportunity for the students.

So this Congress has struck out on education. This Congress has struck out on managed care, where they decided they would go with the monied interest of the insurance companies and the HMO companies against the American people, against the American people and their desire to once again have a doctor-patient relationship, a doctor-patient relationship that deals with the health care problems of the patient, as opposed to the bottom line and the stock price of the HMO corporation or of the insurance company that keeps meddling with the decisions of doctors to prescribe medicine, to prescribe treatment, to prescribe tests or to prescribe surgery.

Each and every time the doctor wants to do this, he has to pick up the phone, the doctor has to call an 800 number, get some bureaucrat on the phone and say can I have an MRI? I believe this person may have a tumor. Can I have surgery? We have discovered a tumor and now we would like to cut it out on a timely basis.

They say no, you are going to have to wait 30 days. No, send them out for massage, send them to the whirlpool. Send them anywhere except to surgery, where they need it to try to stem the ravages of cancer or other malignancies.

That is what the American people have asked us to do. This Congress could not do it. This Congress could not do it because they decided they would deal with the money interests, just as they decided they would deal with the monied interests and they would kill campaign finance reform, they would kill the ability of the American people to have a greater participation in the election process, to develop grassroots, to make sure the people in our districts are not overridden by all of the soft money that comes in in the last days of a campaign. This Congress struck out in that effort.

This Congress struck out on the effort for tobacco legislation, to try to recover for the Federal taxpayer some of the billions of dollars that they have spent in the Medicare program taking care of the victims of tobacco, taking care of the victims of cancer that is related to tobacco. The states are recovering that, but somehow the Federal Government is unable do that. Why? Because they could not stop the flow of the tobacco contributions to the Republican party. They just could not get off that addiction that they have, not only to tobacco, but to tobacco campaign contributions. So this Congress struck out on that.

Finally, as Americans are working harder and harder and more Americans are working more than ever, we thought they ought to at least get a wage to allow them to support their families. But this Congress could not see it that way. It decided that once again it would go with their campaign contributions from the Small Business Association, from the Restaurant Association, and they would deny America an increase in the minimum wage, so those people who are working at the minimum wage would be able to support themselves and their families.

These are people that go to work all week long, all month long and all year long, but at the end of the year, they end up poor. So what do we do? We have the government subsidize them in food stamps, we have the government subsidize them in housing, we have the government subsidize them in medical care, because their wages do not allow them to procure these basic necessities

of life for them or their family. Why? Because the minimum wage is not high enough.

But this Congress, this do-nothing Congress, chose not to do anything about the minimum wage, not to do anything about managed care, not to do anything about campaign finance reform, not to do anything about the crucial bills dealing with the improvement of education and bills to protect the environment.

So this Congress that has only worked 108 days this year, this Congress that has chosen to be out of town more days than it has been here, this Congress that has chosen to come to work Tuesday night at five o'clock and leave Thursday night at five o'clock, this Congress that chose to extend the August break an extra week, this Congress that chose not to work in January, February or March more than a couple of days, this Congress now cannot find time to deal with the basic necessities of our children's education, to get a budget and to pass the appropriations bills.

That is why this Congress is being hailed by editorial boards and people all over the country as a do-nothing Congress. And I would just ask the same courtesies on time that you give the Republican Members on the other side of the aisle. The Chair belongs to the whole House, not to one party or the other.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). The Chair will attempt to enforce strictly the five-minute limit on both sides of the aisle.

REPORT ON BIPARTISAN LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I will lower the decibels. I do not have any reason to make any political statements. I do not have that need. The President, on the other hand, has misled the American people with a radio address yesterday, and I think I should try to make sure the American people truly understand what is going on. In his speech, in which he dealt primarily with education, he said we should be able to make real bipartisan progress on education.

Well, Mr. President, in the entire history of this body, there has never been a greater effort at bipartisan legislation in relationship to education, and in the last 24 years, I can assure you there has never been a better effort.

So, Mr. President, we sent you the Higher Education Act, a bipartisan effort. We sent you special education, IDEA. We sent you the Workforce Investment Act. We sent you loan forgiveness for new teachers. We sent you quality teaching grants. We sent you emergency student loan. They are all law, Mr. President. We sent you seven.

We also have awaiting on your desk school nutrition, including help after school, so that we can try to deal with the problems of juvenile delinquency. We sent you charter school legislation, Mr. President, in bipartisan fashion, $100 million extra every year for five years. We sent you quality Head Start. And what are your people trying to do? They are trying to eliminate the quality from the Head Start bill that we sent to you.

We have sent you vocational education for the 21st Century, not the 20th or the 19th. We sent you community service block grant. We sent you $500 million extra for special education, and you sent a budget up here which as a matter of fact reduced spending for special education.

We have a Reading Excellence Act waiting for you to sign, Mr. President. All you have to do is decide whether that is truly your first priority, and it surely should be your first priority. All of those bills, 14, and a lot of them in a bipartisan fashion.

Well, you said in your speech that our Nation needs 100,000 new highly qualified teachers to reduce class size in the early grades. Mr. President, where do you get your statistics? Every study I have seen has indicated that there is no shortage of elementary teachers now or in the foreseeable future. We have more than 100,000 elementary teachers now who are working in department stores, who are working at fast food places, who are working in offices, because they cannot get a teaching job.

Now, Mr. President, there are some places where they need teachers, but these 150,000 who are out there who do not have a teaching job did not want to go to center city, did not want to go to rural America. So what did we do to try to help that situation? If you read our higher education bill, Mr. President, you will discover that we give some breaks in relationship to your loan that you have if you will go to center city, if you will go to rural America.

Now, Mr. President, if you know the Elementary Secondary Education Act, you also know that Title I allows them to employ teachers. If you wanted to do that, why not increase that amount of money?

You see, as I said at the White House, who gets credit is not important if you are trying to help improve the quality of education. So you do not need something special that says, "I get credit because I did this." It is there. It is in Title I. All you have to do is put more money in that particular area.

In the higher education bill we also dealt with quality, because you mentioned quality. We made it very clear to all teaching training institutions, this is the 21st Century and we expect you to turn out quality teachers for that 21st Century. Right in the bill, Mr. President. You signed it. I was there.

□ 1445

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President in the second person.

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL MONEY IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to my statement that I made in the 1-minute on the spirit I felt in this country when I remember first getting involved and getting committed.

Many of us are sitting here as parents. I think we have children growing up, and as a parent, we are more worried about the future of this country and this world for their livelihood. We all want to make the world better. I do not think that our Congress, with all the capability we have, a lot of very bright people elected on both sides of the aisle, are really focusing in on trying to bring out the best that is in America. I think that is where we are failing.

We can get into the specifics of a program, and whether it is a mood to go to what I think is a fear of privatization, let us remove the safety nets, the gentleman is right. The last speaker talked about it. It is not who gets the credit. I believe that. We can accomplish a lot in life if we do not care who gets credit for it. But we have to accomplish it. What we are doing is not accomplishing it.

One of the speakers earlier said we have too much Federal money in education. That is just factually wrong. That is wrong, wrong, wrong. Of all the money spent in education in America, the Federal contribution is 7 percent. Seven percent. That is not too much money. There is not anybody in America that will not tell us that if we have a top priority, it is educating our kids to prepare them for the 21st century.

We have heard a lot of reasons. It has been debated and it will be stated here again today, I am sure. Why can we not do that? The one thing we have never done in this country, the Federal Government has never put one Federal dollar into school construction, not even a penny.

If we are going to have overcrowded classrooms, and we all agree they are,

if we are going to have more teachers to have smaller classrooms, which everybody agrees we need, then we have to build more space. We have to do that by offering incentives other than the mechanisms that are there.

My colleagues, the gentlemen from California, know that we have a requirement in California that to pass the school bond issue to construct school buildings, you have to get a two-thirds vote. In a lot of communities where the need is great, they can never get the two-thirds vote. There is no option. There is no option. Nobody is out there volunteering to build public schools for free out of their own private contributions.

Mr. Speaker, we have to put some money into the school construction effort. The President, as we all learned in high school when we took government classes, the President proposes and we dispose. The President stood here in this very room and proposed to us that we put money into school construction.

He had a clever idea, that we would give tax incentives so private individuals could pick up the interest rates on school bonds, as an incentive for schools to use more of the money for school construction, rather than less.

What happened to it? It was destroyed here in Congress. We talked about putting 100,000 new teachers in the classroom. People say that is too much Federalism. If we go to a police chief in the United States today and ask if the Cops on the Street program is too much federalism, all of my chiefs of police that have received these Cops in the Street program told me they have never seen less bureaucracy. It is very easy, once you have made the decision that you want them, to get them. The program for schools would be the same way. There is not a lot of Federal bureaucracy there.

Do Members know what it would do over the next 7-year period if we took the President's proposal and adopted it here? It would provide in our State alone, in California, 9,271 new teachers by the year 2005. We need those teachers. We need those classrooms. We need computers. We need all of the things that people talk about. But we are not going to get there if we are going to try to say well, the Federal Government should not help.

I am passionate about this, because I think what we do in this country that is so great, and we are picking away at it and wanting to lose it, is that we have one Nation, indivisible. That indivisibility, it seems to me, is the safety net; that we will treat everybody, at least in this country, with a minimum amount of care.

If we look at the education programs that we have created in the United States, they are that safety net. They are Head Start, they are ESEA Title I, they are grants to college students, Pell grants, they are things that are out there as safety nets. They are not the education system. The gentleman is absolutely right; America's education is run by the local school districts. But they cannot do it alone. We need to help them. Do not deny them the opportunity to do that.

EDUCATION HAS BEEN A PRIORITY TO THIS CONGRESS

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have often listened to the debate in these Chambers. Sometimes I feel like I am in a schoolyard where we have fourth-graders taunting each other back and forth, saying my program is better than yours, and you are a bad guy because you are not saying my program is a good program. We just have to remember that today is an election year, and we are just 3½ weeks away from that date.

I also noted that one of my colleagues tried to elevate the debate by quoting the Washington Post. Once I did that. I was back home in a town meeting back in my district. I quoted the Washington Post, and I kind of realize at times when I read the Washington Post that they don't like anybody. Two weeks ago they were calling on the President to resign. Now they are saying Congress is bad.

Whether or not Members want to quote the Washington Post, folks in Hegewish and south Chicago, they don't care what the Washington Post says. They are looking for a solution.

One thing I found from town meetings, meetings at the union hall, the VFW, the grain elevator, or a suburban women's club meeting, they are saying that they are tired of partisan politics. They are looking for solutions. That is why they are pretty proud of what this Congress has done in the last few short years.

If we think about it, think of all the things we were told that we could not do. I am one of those who was elected in 1994, this new Republican majority for the first time in 40 years.

I was told by the Washington Post and the New York Times and all the other liberals in the world that we cannot balance the budget, but we did it. They told us that we could not cut taxes, but we did it. They told us we could never reform welfare, but we did it. They told us we could not restructure the IRS, but we did it.

If we think about it, this Congress in the last 2 years has done some big things that we were told we could not do by many of those on the other side of the aisle. We balanced the budget for the first time in 28 years, we cut taxes for the middle class for the first time in 16 years, we reformed our welfare system, helping kids and families for the first time in a generation, and we restructured the IRS, taming the tax collector for the first time ever.

Those are pretty big accomplishments, something I am really proud of, because it took a Republican Congress to do that, and I am pleased that a Democrat President joined with us in a bipartisan effort to bring those four accomplishments and those four solutions home.

We are often asked, what is our next challenge? What more can we do to change how Washington works and to make Washington more accountable to the folks back home? Clearly, education is a priority for all of us.

When I am back home and I am walking through, whether it is Lincoln Way High School, which is one of the best in the Nation, in New Lenox, or in the south side of Chicago, in the Chicago public schools, or LaSalle Peru in the Illinois Valley, and I talk to local school board Members, administrators, teachers, and parents, they say, Congressman, about 4 to 6 cents of every dollar we spend on our public schools comes from Washington, but we also want you to know that with that 4 to 6 percent of the funding we spend on our local public school comes two-thirds of the paperwork we have to fill out.

If we look at how those dollars actually get spent when we appropriate them in Washington, only about 70 cents on the dollar actually reaches the classroom. Thirty cents on the dollar gets spent on bureaucratic overhead before it gets back to Illinois schools. Something is wrong. We need to do a better job.

Over the last few years we have made a difference, trying to change how Washington works to make sure when we appropriate funding that it counts, and education was a big winner last year when we balanced the budget. Not only did we make education a priority, but we increased funding for education in our budget by 10 percent, a $5.4 billion funding increase over the previous year, even while balancing the budget.

Unfortunately, 30 cents on the dollar stays here in Washington. One clear message from the folks back home is we need to leave less money in Washington and get more money back to the classroom. That is why I am proud that we passed earlier this year legislation that will put more dollars into the classroom by streamlining the process, not saying 70 cents on the dollar, but actually 95 cents on the dollar reaching the classroom.

I am proud that this Republican Congress has given us the lowest student loan rates in 17 years, and that we have doubled Pell grants to twice what they were when I was sworn in 4 years ago to help low-income students better afford college with an outright grant. This year while the President ignored special ed, we provided $500 million

more for special education in our local public schools.

Last year, while we were working to balance the budget, we created the first ever school construction bond program, providing almost $1 billion in helping build new classrooms for our schools. We increased funding for Head Start low-income kids in my district.

Mr. Speaker, education is a priority. We have given it a 21-gun salute. This House has passed 21 initiatives to help education in just the last 2 years. Education is a priority.

A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STILL TOO BIG, WITH A DEFENSE BUDGET TOO SMALL

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department will announce that the Federal budget is in surplus for the first time since 1969. Only 2 short years ago the President of the United States submitted a budget with a $200 billion deficit, as far as the eye can see, if Members will recall.

What happened? There are a lot of Americans, and most Americans, including us, who really do not care where the credit falls, just as long as this Congress stays committed to a balanced budget and reducing the size of government. But it is important to understand how we got here, where we are today, so we can continue on the path of sound economic recovery.

Remember when the country was faced with large, chronic deficits at the beginning of the 1990s? Congress faced a choice. To cut the deficit, lawmakers had one of two choices to make, to cut spending or to raise the taxes. President Clinton and his allies here in the Congress chose to, remember, raise taxes. Congress at that time was still under the control of the Democrats, so President Clinton was able to get through the largest tax increase in the history of this great Nation.

Republicans, on the other hand, wanted to reduce the deficit by cutting spending. Republicans believe that government is too big and too bossy, and they believe that Washington wastes too much of our money. One would think that this is an obvious point to us, because it is to the American people. After all, even the President himself said in his 1996 State of the Union Address that the era of big government was over.

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

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

It has never occurred to them that it is perhaps mean-spirited on the part of a Federal government to have so little respect for the working men and their labor that Washington takes between one-quarter and one-third of their precious money every month from their paycheck.

So that still leaves us with the very important question, how did we go from $200 billion deficits, as the President had proposed, as far as the eye can see, only 2½ years ago, to the budget surplus that we now enjoy?

Let me tell the Members, remember, it is true that there have been some reductions in spending, but almost all of them have come out of one place it should not have come out of, Mr. Speaker. That is the Pentagon. Defense spending is now dangerously low, and our military forces are not what they should be.

Mr. Speaker, we know that to be the truth, but our Democrat colleagues, in their boundless faith in human nature, ignore history and simply do not believe in the fundamental precept that America must achieve peace through strength.

□ 1500

As for other spending, Republicans did manage to limit the number of new spending initiatives of 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, way up. Liberals will point to the President's 1993 tax increase as a reason why revenues are up, hoping that we will not examine the budget tables ourselves to see if, in fact, this 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 any 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 are taking advantage of that, and the economy is benefiting from that. Jobs are being created, and revenues have soared. That, Mr. Speaker, is primarily the reason why the budget is now in surplus when it was in deep red only a few years ago.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time previously allotted to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that, if we go back before the battles that have raged in the last several weeks, there has to be a fundamental question of why we came to Congress.

I grew up in the town of Bozrah, a town about 2,400 people. I knew that, oftentimes, those neighbors of mine could not compete when they were trying to deal with large corporations or an oppressive government. It seemed to me the obligation of an elected representative is to come here and be their voice, to fight for our friends and neighbors when they cannot do it on their own.

What is our answer to what is happening to seniors on Medicaid HMO programs? What is our answer to the average family that lives in fear that the health care program they have paid for will not protect them when it is necessary?

My wife went in for a 4½ hour operation. They removed a disk from her neck. They took a piece of bone from her hip. They put it back into her neck. A 4½ hour operation. She gets back to the hospital room around 5 o'clock.

The doctor comes by 6:30 and says, you know, I would really like to keep you here, but I know the insurance company is not going to pay. But I am going to try. You will probably get stuck with a bill. She was all wired up with all the things that kill pain and what have you that you need after an operation. So she said fine.

The next day, of course, the claim was rejected by the insurance company. That did not shock us, frankly, because we thought that was going to happen. What shocked us is what happened to the doctor. The doctor got a letter from the insurance company saying do not try to do this again. Do not worry about what your patient needs or what the long-term impact is. Just dump them out on the street.

My wife would get along. We have got family. We would find a way to help her. But there is some people that do not have a lot of family. When we were going back for a checkup, we saw this woman. She could not have been 4-foot tall. She had a piece of metal in the front of her chin and two pieces on the back of her head. She had the marks from that halo when you have a serious neck operation.

My wife said to her, "What happened to you?" She says, "Oh, I came in for a hernia operation. I am 76 years old. It is same-day surgery, you know. As soon as I had the surgery, they sent me home. I walked in the door, passed out, and broke my neck. I spent the last 4 months in the hospital."

Most times, when we are dealing with an issue, it has such a limited impact that we have to seek out those who have been victims. We have to go out and hold hearings. These just come at us from our family and everybody else.

My brother runs the family dairy farm. One night, Ike felt his entire right side of his face losing all muscle control. He is 40-some years old. That kind of thing scares people. I do not know if it would scare a doctor, but it scared the heck out of me.

Ike thought it was serious. He drove down to the emergency room. The insurance company said, "No, no, just because you lost all sensation in the right side of your face, that is not serious."

I am not a doctor. Again, I cannot tell my colleagues what would have happened to my brother's girlfriend had she had a real medical system. She was 38 years old when she died after they refused to look at her tumor, after they refused to test her tumor.

What is this Congress doing? This Congress is sitting around here, and its leaders are fighting about whether you can fire or prevent the hiring of a former Democrat for a job downtown. Is it not wonderful, we have a fight where the Republican leadership is trying to tell public corporations they are not supposed to hire Democrats.

If you have been a Democrat, the rule is you cannot have a job. Do my colleagues know what? If this was organized crime, we would call it a RICO operation. My colleagues are out there trying to deny people health care; and when people want to work here, they want some kind of sign-off from the Republicans.

I am telling my colleagues this country needs health care reform. This is not about good politics, which it is. It is about people's life and death.

The leadership of this Congress is spending more time trying to make sure somebody does not get a job downtown than taking care of the health care of people of this country.

The same goes for education. The same goes in 100 different areas. We have not done the work we ought to do on pensions. In my district, a company closed, and the same day 100 people were notified they had no jobs. They found out their pension had been absconded with, been stolen or lost by the individual who managed it.

We need to make some changes to make sure that will not happen again. But not this majority Congress. They are worried about whether Dave McCurdy, former Congressman, can get a job downtown.

It started this way when they took over. The first thing they told people was fire the Democrats. They got rid of all the assets that poor people and workers had to gather information here. They want to represent powerful people, and that is just fine, but do not kid the American people. Do not go into that well and tell me you care about health care.

COME HOME, MR. PRESIDENT

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very helpful to all of the constituents in my district to sort of cut through the shrill rhetoric on the other side of the aisle today and kind of get behind what is driving all of this political force.

See, it appears to me that the Democratic leadership and the President have placed petty politics above the interest of American children, America's veterans, America's seniors, and recently America's farmers.

The farm bill that was just vetoed recently had more money in it than the President's request, but it did not spend it on the programs that the Federal Government and the President wanted, so he vetoed it. It was not that it was anything in the best interest of America to do, but he vetoed it for politics.

Let us just take a look at what is behind this injustice to the American people. The principal motivation for the President and the Democratic leadership's intended shutdown of government is sort of to take the spotlight off the scandals that the President has gotten himself into.

It is also evident that the President has been AWOL, absent without leave, from his duties during most of the year. Let us consider this. The first 282 days of 1998, Mr. Clinton spent 45 percent, or approximately 127 days, working for his employer, the American taxpayer.

So what has he done with the majority of his time as President this year? Let us take a look at that. Fund raising. I think the new motto of the White House ought to be "Show me the money, Mr. President."

Mr. Clinton has spent 56 days away from his job raising money, gaining millions and millions of dollars from wealthy elitists, big business tycoons, liberal special interests, and media moguls.

Note that most of these fund-raisers, of course, were outside of the Washington, D.C. area. All totaled, Mr. Clinton has attended 97 today. Tomorrow in Florida will be number 98. Special interest fund-raisers gathering up those millions and millions of dollars, rather than working with Congress on problems facing all Americans.

The "Show me the money, Mr. President" ought to be here working with the working Congress. Let us take the vacations that he has had. Please do not get me wrong. There is nothing wrong with a much-needed break from a hectic work schedule. But there is something wrong when the vacations start interfering with the job of being President of the United States.

Not many hardworking men and women around this country have the luxury of working only 127 days and getting 32 days vacation, paid at that by the taxpayers of the United States.

Let us see, that would include 13 days at Martha's Vineyard, 9 days in Camp David, 5 days in the Virgin Islands, 4 days at a Utah ski resort, and, oh, yes, 1 day in Aspen, Colorado. Obviously, the only thing that got in the way of all of these vacations was his fund-raising schedule.

All this is bad enough, but it does not end there. Let us take the travel abroad, overseas junkets. During this time frame, the President spent 45 days abroad visiting 13 different countries, including Ghana, Chile, Uganda, Senegal, Germany, Rwanda, England, Ireland, Russia, Northern Ireland, and, oh, yes, a $50 million trip to China just to pay homage and tribute to the barbarians of Tiananmen Square.

But, my colleagues, that is not all. Outside the fund-raisers, vacations and expensive junkets abroad, the President has spent an additional 22 days on the road at photo-ops in telegenic settings outside of the Washington area. Most of these photo-ops were strategically placed with an eye to upcoming elections like New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, Texas, and even the scenic area of Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that the duties of the President are being pushed aside at a time when there are critical issues facing America's children, veterans, seniors, and, yes, even farmers today.

Even as we speak here today, Congress is in session working, doing its job to help save Social Security, promote and improve our children's education, and to provide for America's veterans.

Yet, the President is once again preparing to go to another fund-raiser tomorrow in Florida. That is right. The President is once again planning to be AWOL while we here in Congress are hard at work solving our Nation's problems.

Clearly, it is time for America's part-time President to clear his travel calendar, clear his fund-raising calendar, clear his vacation calendar, and stay home so that we can get the Nation's work done.

INVEST IN AMERICA'S CHILDREN AND EDUCATION

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, American children, American education, what better investment could we make? What higher priority could we have in the United States Congress than in our children?

Mr. Speaker, today, we have heard a lot of talking back and forth about the name of this Congress. I do not know about that, and I do not particularly want to get involved in that, but I do know this, we have an opportunity today to be known as the "do something good Congress," because we can take one vote, take one day, and we can invest in America's children, and we can invest in education.

We have had a lot of talk today about who controls education. Education is properly controlled at the local level. In Texas, local citizens elect a local school board that hires a local superintendent, and they have local teachers that teach local children of local parents that support our local schools.

But that does not mean that the Federal Government cannot be helpful. We can be a junior partner in education. We can help provide the tools and the capital that our local communities need to address local problems and educate local children.

A junior partner is not controlling, but he is important. We need to meet our important responsibility and obligation to America's children by joining with local communities in education.

Let me talk briefly about four areas of concern. Number one, smaller classes. Studies confirm that young students in classrooms between 15 and 20 students learn more rapidly, and they learn better than other children.

The Federal Government, as a junior partner, can make capital available, can make funds available to help communities hire more teachers on a cost-shared basis, on a cost-shared basis. $7.3 billion over the next 5 years would put us on track to hiring 100,000 new teachers to spread across this country in grades one through three and will reduce the class size to 18 children.

If we ask teachers how best to bring down violence in school and how best to teach children, they say bring down class size.

School modernization. In order for our students to learn and compete in the economy of the 21st century, schools must be well equipped. A 1996 GAO study found that, over a quarter of Texas schools have at least one building in need of extensive repair, and over half of the schools in Texas have schools with at least one major building feature that has to be replaced, such as all of the plumbing, all of the air conditioning. There are similar problems across the entire United States.

To address this shortfall, the Federal Government can provide tax credits. We can give credits to folks to pay interest on nearly $22 billion in bonds to build and renovate public schools. We have an obligation to build schools in this country and to make those facilities available for our children like our parents did for us, because, Mr. Speaker, nearly one in every three schools in America today was built before World War II.

□ 1515

That is just not right, and we can do better and we must do better for the children of this country.

Let us talk about safer classrooms. Drug use among our 12th graders, over half of whom have already tried drugs, is up. Only 30 percent of public elementary schools in this country have after-school programs and in rural areas, such as where I am from in Texas, the number drops to 12 percent. The Federal Government should continue to make grants available to work in partnership with local government and communities for prevention, for early intervention and enforcement efforts.

Further, we should authorize funding for school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and school districts to combat crime, to combat drug activities and to make sure that our children have a safe place to learn.

Finally, better technology. Give our kids the skills they are going to need for the jobs that are coming up in the next century. We need to ensure that our children have the necessary technology in the classroom. That means modern computers, Internet connections, educational software, educated, well-paid, enthused, encouraged teachers that are ready, willing and able to teach our children.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF TAKING SPECIAL ORDER

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

HMO REFORM

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the tone that we heard from the gentleman from Connecticut.

I am a physician. I still practice. What we were supposed to have received from Mr. GEJDENSON was that the problems in the health care field today have come about because of this Congress. They have come about because of a law called ERISA that this Congress a number of years ago passed. And the thing that strikes me rather peculiarly is what we hear as HMO attacks instead of attacks on physicians who are not doing their job.

The number one job of a physician is to do no harm. I want to tell my colleagues, if I do an outpatient surgery, which I do almost every weekend, and my patient is not ready to go home, I fight and fight and fight, but I do not give up. My patient stays there until they are ready to go home. Do you know what? I win those battles with HMOs. I do not lose those battles. What we are really hearing is the inability of physicians to have backbone to stand up.

The law that created the situation that we have today was created several years ago, not by a conservative Republican Congress, but by a rather liberal Democrat Congress. I do not usually say anything partisan on this floor, but the tone of the speech is inappropriate for this august body. To not challenge that tone will do more to destroy this institution than anything I know. We passed a bill, it is called the Patient Protection Act. It is not designed to put more lawyers at work and increase health insurance costs by lining the pockets of people who are going to challenge HMOs through the court system. There is no question we have to make changes. Those changes are being made. They have been made with this Congress. But the very idea that this Congress, this Republican Congress, is responsible for the emotional diatribe that we just heard is anything but the truth.

The truth is, we have tremendous cost pressures on health care in this country. HMOs have done a lot to help us solve those problems. Are they perfect? No. Have they made mistakes? No. Is there any physician before HMOs were created that has not made a similar mistake of letting someone go home too soon? No. So we can emotionalize these issues. We can try to make them a campaign issue, but what we do is serious damage to the real problems that we have to solve in this country.

And my heart is broken that we have the kind of discourse that we have in this House that creates a false paper tiger and then sets it down. To the American public, I apologize for what we heard in the past 30 minutes from the gentleman from Connecticut. It is my hope that we can carry on conversations in this House that come up to the level of integrity, honesty and maturity that this House deserves.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF TAKING SPECIAL ORDER

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

ON THE EDUCATION AGENDA

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very unusual occasion that we are experiencing today, that this House would be engaged in discussing important issues on a Sunday. It is even more unusual because we had expected to adjourn on October 9, Friday. We were given a calendar that so indicated.

The reason that we are all here on a Sunday and expect to even be meeting on a Federal holiday tomorrow is that the Republican-controlled Congress has not been able to work out its own differences with respect to very, very important bills, particularly those that the Constitution requires that we pass before we go home having to do the funding of government.

I rise today to pay special attention to the items that I am concerned with on the education agenda. I came to the Congress initially in 1965 because I was deeply concerned about the future of education at that point. Ever since then in the 20 years that I have served in Congress, I have spent almost the entire time by serving on the education committee. I also serve on budget. I asked to be assigned to budget because I felt that so many of the issues that related to education were dependent upon funding. So some years ago I sought a seat on the Committee on the Budget and I was so honored to serve. We worked very hard. We produced our budget resolution and for the first time since the budget process was enacted in the early 1970s, this is the first time that the Congress has not voted on a budget resolution.

So something is happening within the Republican majority that has caused us to be here today on a Sunday and not to be able to finish on time. One of the major bills that we have not been able to pass is the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill. It never came out of our House Committee on Appropriations and it is still locked in tremendous disagreement within the Republican conference, as well as with the Senate and with the administration and with House Democrats.

Earlier there were comments about the President's schedule and how he was not attending to the business at hand. I would like to say that this Congress has a record of only being in session 106 days this entire year up to Friday, October 9. This is a record of sorts. I have not gone through all the history, but certainly this must be a record of inattention to the country's business and certainly by the number of bills enacted, this is one of the shabbiest of all records. We have only enacted 241 bills.

So getting back to the appropriations bills, I want to point out some of the real differences. The appropriations bill, as it came out of our House Committee on Appropriations, cut about $2 billion from the administration's education budget initiatives. Goals 2000, for instance, the school reform bill, the appropriations bill cut funding for Goals 2000 by $245 million or by 50 percent below fiscal year 1998 levels. It would have reduced the ability of 6,000 schools to serve 3 million students nationwide to implement the school reform efforts. Goals 2000 has been a primary target of the Republican majority. It was one of those programs that was included in the so-called Dollars to the Classroom effort which eliminated, consolidated 31 programs into one gigantic block grant authorizing the States to spend that money in any way they wished.

So here again Goals 2000 has been cut back. School to work cuts, the appropriations bill cuts funding for school to work by $250 million, 63 percent below fiscal year 1998 levels, undermining the ability of over a million students in 3,000 high schools to experience this exemplary program. Here again, schools to work was one of the programs listed in the Dollars to the Classroom bill which consolidated 31 programs in a block grant. So again the appropriations bill kind of expresses the sentiment of the Republican majority that they want to wipe out this program.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF TAKING SPECIAL ORDER

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DEEP DISAGREEMENTS

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, once again it is important to point out why we are here. We have a Democratic President and a Republican Congress with disagreements. We have disagreements that are deep and heartfelt. However, we have known these disagreements since at least January 1, probably for the last 4 years since. Every year at this time we come down to the same disagreements. It is over protection of human life. It is over national testing, over the census. It is whether to and how to spend the budget surplus. It is over tax cuts, over IMF and U.N. funding. This list is no surprise. We have known it all year long. So where have the negotiators been? Why can we not sit down, or is there something else going on? Is there something that maybe perhaps the President of the United States would like to take attention away from and try to relive 1995, where we can try to say the Republicans are trying to do a shutdown.

It is pretty clear that we have surrendered almost everything in this appropriations bill and that there is an election going on and those of us who are in the House have to run this year. We are not the ones holding up the process right now. We have been trying to negotiate. We have been trying to work through. Later on today in a special order I want to point out something that I have been going through, this new book on the tapes of Richard Nixon, which were released for the first time. Thanks to the efforts of the author, Stanley Cutler, we can now read in actual words much of the abuse of power that goes through.

I am struck by the similarities that have occurred in this White House. I want to just kind of give you an overview of what I want to go into in more detail later.

One, limit the testimony. This is Haldeman talking to Nixon. So they have granted Sloan temporary immunity and he is going to cover what he knows about the Watergate stuff, which is nothing, and that gets him out of the thing. Two, limit the scope of the investigation, just as the FBI director and Mr. LaBella have alleged this Justice Department is doing. Peterson of the Justice Department is working with that knowledge directing the investigation along the channels that will not produce the kind of answers we don't want produced. Three, finish now, no fishing expedition. This is about a year and a half before the impeachment hearings. Nixon says it is over, otherwise it is a fishing expedition. We have had enough of this. Four, early on they were overstating the potential damage. They talk about trying to build up expectations of indictments and then pulling it back. Five, they complained about spending too much money on investigation. Dean tells the President the resources that have been

put against this whole investigation to date are really incredible. It is larger than the JFK assassination. Six, build up expectations so the news is less damaging as it comes out. Seven, October 13, 1972 discussion, they complained about the press obsession. Eight, they took advantage of the public's belief that Presidents actually act logically.

I will go through the actual transcripts later. Nine, this is incredible, what is is, December 11, 1972, Nixon, Haldeman and Erlichman. Erlichman says the Watergate thing, I don't think there is anything to add to what we have already said. Haldeman says, you might resay it. Erlichman, that nobody in the government did this thing. Haldeman says, the White House. Nixon says, what do you mean Watergate White House. Nobody currently in the government. Haldeman says, currently employed in the government, say currently employed. Nixon says, ever involved in the government. Erlichman says, now you have Liddy and Hunt who were at one time employed.

□ 1530

Nixon says, but while they were doing it even, while they were doing it. Erlichman, that's right. Then employed I could say. Nixon says, no one who is an employee of the White House, who is an employee of the White House. And Erlichman says, either at the time of the incident or since? And Nixon says, or since, that's what I mean. Erlichman says, yes. 10, the everybody does it defense. Our Democratic friends said a lot of these things, too, and never got caught, Nixon says. 11, this is just partisan politics. Haldeman tells Nixon, because for the first time in our history we have one of the political parties using the machinery of government to investigate the other political party. Boy, I've been hearing that a lot. 12, coordinate the witnesses. 13, conspiracy to commit perjury. They discuss that. 14. Hidden clues in their testimony and how Sam Erwin was able to pick it out. 15, unapologizing. Nixon says in a conversation with Ray Price, the President, the only problem is that if you get sackclothed too much then you know you no longer can be President. If you go too far in terms of saying, well, I take all the blame and I don't blame these poor fellows and all that, then you think, well, this poor dumb President, why didn't he resign? 16, whining about the special prosecutor and the grand jury. 17, the country is fed up with all this. Haig tells the President, the country is just fed up with all this. It just wants to get on. That is all through the book, by the way. 18, is that all they're doing back there? Dole tells the President, May 23, 1973, Dole, my farmers have criticized, you know, is that all they're doing back there, all they're talking about is Watergate, what about the farm bill, the REA bill, they're sick of it. 19, rally the party's Members of Congress. This is coming towards the end. They say, why don't we go down to the Hill and talk to all the, Dole and Bush are meeting with the President and Dole says to talk just frankly about how important this is that the Republicans, not for Richard Nixon but for the presidency and the party that we do something, and Bush says, I like that, it's a great idea. Then there is even the loyal scheduler, Nixon and Rosemary Woods. He says to take something home. And she says she has it already home, at his request.

I want to go into these quotes more later because I personally think this is Wag the Dog.

DEMOCRATS NEED TO GROW UP AND HELP REPUBLICANS SOLVE NATION'S PROBLEMS

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say it is wonderful to be here today, but I like most of you on both sides of the aisle would much rather be home attending church with my family, but we cannot be there because we have got work to do. I am not going to stand here and say that this Congress has accomplished everything that I wanted it to accomplish. In fact there are a lot of things that it could have and should have done that it did not. But as far as the rhetoric is concerned, when I listened to some of the folks, especially those on the other side of the aisle flailing their arms around and squealing in high decibels much like Barney Fife on the Andy Griffith Show, I now know why people are disenfranchised, why they decide they do not want to go to the polls. They are sick and tired of these people back in Washington, D.C. acting like a bunch of juveniles. For the last 4 years since I have been in Congress, I think of all of the things that the Democrats have said about the Republicans. Number one, that the Republicans want to starve the children. Remember back with the school lunch program, that we just want to decimate all the programs for the kids because we do not love kids. We must be child haters. That we wanted to pollute the environment. Somehow that we who are Republicans have some different kind of biological system that is impervious to the pollutants and carcinogens in the atmosphere and in the water, that we somehow would like to pollute the water, that we get glee out of making people suffer, that we want people who are being covered by health care to die, to be sick, to be thrown out of the hospitals, that we do not want to educate the children. If you believe all of these things that the Democrats are saying, then you must believe that we are the worst kind of human beings, somewhat a combination of Jeffrey Dahmer and Charles Manson. You guys need to give it a rest. You get on the verge of being ridiculous. Nobody believes that there are people like that in this country that want to come back to Washington, D.C. and cause mayhem on the American public. It just sounds silly and you need to stop it. I came here as an American first, not as a Republican, as an American, to come here and get the job of the people done. I have four kids in the public schools. I am proud of the job that my public schools do for my children. But I juxtapose that with what I see the results of the American education system producing. Forty percent of our children are dropping out of school across America. Then I look at the TIMS report, and I see that we end up 20th in the math and sciences, scoring 20th, and we are beaten by war-torn Slovenia. Why is that? If you believe what the Democrats are saying, they want to just go ahead and give you more of what we have been getting. Keep dumping money into this bureaucracy back in Washington, D.C. Keep giving you more of what you are getting. Forty percent dropout rate, 20th on the international test scores in math and sciences. Enough is enough. What we are doing is not working. Let us give parents a little bit more say. Let us give the local school boards and the local teachers a little bit more say in how to handle the classrooms. I think it is a crime that teachers have to go to school worried for their lives. I think it is a crime that we have so tied their hands in the American political system that they cannot discipline children, that when children try to poison them or children try to hurt them, that they cannot really do anything for fear of lawsuit. We have a lot of work to do. I think it is a crime that a teacher can be a terrible teacher, can produce the most substandard of results and not be fired, that a teacher can be grossly incompetent and because of tenure, they are protected. I think there are a lot of things that are wrong with our system. I do agree, I think that we need to dedicate more resources when it comes to education. Again I am going to restate, I have four children in the public school system, two of them in high school, one in junior high and one in elementary school. I believe that we need to give our teachers more. But I want to give them 100 percent. I do not want to filter it through Washington, D.C. and send through a pittance of it back to the teachers and back to the classroom to help my children. We want to sit down at the table. We want to fix these problems. If the President were here in Washington, D.C. instead of off campaigning and raising money from special interest groups, if he were here, we could solve these problems. We would

like to do that. Because there is so much at stake, so much more at stake than these elections that are going to happen in the next 3½ weeks. But you would think that Armageddon is about to happen, that we Republicans are back here like Simon Legree trying to figure out how to poison the water, how to fail the children, how to poison the senior citizens, kick them out of the hospitals, feed them dog food. Come on guys, you need to stop it, grow up and let us go on and solve the problems of the American people.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF TAKING SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentlewoman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN CONGRESS?

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to be here on a Sunday afternoon after watching the talking heads on television this morning. I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma who cannot understand the gentleman from Connecticut's outrage at what has happened in the medical system. I am a physician and you are a physician. I have spent time on telephones calling Omaha, Nebraska trying to get additional time for my patients in hospitals. I understand. It does take a persistent doctor. But it should not be necessary for you and I and all our colleagues in the medical profession to spend their time arguing with some bureaucrat who has never seen the patient making a decision about how long you can keep a patient in the hospital. I think the American people understand that. They understand that doctors have somebody between them and the patient. It is always an insurance company person. The failure of this Congress, even if you want to take your bill, your patient protection bill, you could not get it through the Senate. You guys did not come around here enough. The majority party cannot work with the majority party in the Senate to get something done. It is an absolute failure. There is an article here in the newspaper today. It is an analysis, it is on the editorial page of the New York Times. I will enter it in the RECORD. It is by Mr. Herbert. It is called the GOP Cover Story. He talks about the impeachment the other day. He says,

> It was, frankly, chilling. To watch Newt Gingrich presiding over the possible impeachment of a Democratic President, even one as spectacularly vulnerable as Bill Clinton, is insane.

He said,

> This is the same Newt Gingrich who several years ago told a group of young Republicans: "I think one of the great problems we have in the Republican Party is that we don't encourage you to be nasty. We encourage you to be neat, obedient, loyal, faithful and all those Boy Scout words, which would be great around the campfire but lousy in politics."

And then he says,

> The Republican Party, refashioned by Mr. Gingrich and his right-wing cronies, no longer has that problem. Since winning control of Congress in 1994, it has consistently pursued a mean-spirited extremist agenda and is now determined to turn the self-inflicted wounds of the President into an even larger majority.

Now, he says and this is what the American people should be thinking about:

> Try to imagine the implications of a bigger, more powerful, more aggressive, more right-wing regime of Republicans in Congress. This is a party that is not content with trying to roll back abortion rights. It is fighting on several fronts against contraception. Just last week the Republican leadership in the House, under pressure from the right, killed a measure that would have required Federal health plans that cover prescription drugs to cover the cost of contraceptives. No one seemed to think it was crazy to have abortion foes opposing a measure that would reduce the need for abortions. They could not grasp that.

He goes on to talk about the party that fought a meat inspection system designed to protect the people from the deadly E. coli. Members from my State, where we had children die, lingering deaths of E. coli infection voted against increasing meat inspections. I know we do not want big government. But there are some things the government should do. It should inspect the meat. Children should not die in fast food restaurants or in children's hospitals after a month of hospitalization of something contracted in a fast food restaurant. There is no question.

He also says,

> Of course, you can't expect much from the Republicans because their whip denounced the Environmental Protection Agency as the Gestapo of the government.

The Gestapo of the government. This is the kind of talk we get.

He goes on to talk about the leadership's ethics and talks about a whole bunch of things, including one of the leadership who comes out on the floor and delivers tobacco checks on the floor to Members of Congress. I mean, this is right here on the floor. We talk about why we need campaign finance reform. We got Members and the leadership of the majority party walking around handing out checks right here on the floor, while we are fighting about whether we should do something about tobacco. There is lots more but the people ought to be worried about what is going on in this Congress.

G.O.P. COVER STORY

Throughout Thursday's impeachment debate in the House you could hear the uncharacteristally low-keyed voice of the G.O.P.'s chief inquisitor.

"The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for three minutes," Newt Gingrich would say. Or he would rap his Speaker's gavel for quiet and ask, oh so formally and respectfully, "Does the gentleman move the previous question?"

Every now and then he would smile hideously, reminding us that hypocrisy is as abundant in Washington as fertilizer on the farm.

It was, frankly, chilling. Newt Gingrich presiding over the possible impeachment of a Democratic President, even one as spectacularly vulnerable as Bill Clinton, is insane.

This is the same Newt Gingrich who several years ago told a group of young Republicans: "I think one of the great problems we have in the Republican Party is that we don't encourage you to be nasty. We encourage you to be neat, obedient and loyal and faithful and all those Boy Scout words, which would be great around the campfire but are lousy in politics."

The Republican Party, refashioned by Mr. Gingrich and his right-wing cronies, no longer has that problem. Since winning control of Congress in 1994, it has consistently pursued a mean-spirited extremist agenda and is now determined to turn the self-inflicted wounds of Bill Clinton into an even larger majority.

Try to imagine the implications of a bigger, more powerful, more aggressive, more right-wing regime of Republicans in Congress.

This is a party that is not content with trying to roll back abortion rights. It is fighting on several fronts against contraception. Just last week the Republican leadership in the House, under pressure from the right, killed a measure that would have required Federal health plans that cover prescription drugs to cover the cost of contraceptives. No one seemed to think it was crazy to have abortion foes opposing a measure that would reduce the need for abortions.

This is a party that tried to eliminate Federal nutrition standards for school meals and fought hard against a meat inspection system designed to protect the public from the deadly E. coli bacteria.

It's a party that attacked Medicare and Medicaid and went out of its way to trash the environment. Clean air? Clean water? Forget about it. Representative Tom DeLay of Texas, the majority whip and a sharp critic of Mr. Clinton, denounced the Environmental Protection Agency as the "Gestapo of the Government."

You want ethics? Pull the clips on Mr. Gingrich and learn how not to behave. Or check out John Boehner of Ohio, chairman of the House Republican Conference. I wrote a column in 1996 describing how he took money from tobacco lobbyists and handed it out to certain of his colleagues on the floor of the House, while the House was in session.

These are men who couldn't find the high road if they approached it by parachute.

There is no doubt that Bill Clinton brought his problems on himself. He destroyed his own Presidency. But there are consequences

to be paid if the Republicans are allowed to feast too ravenously on the political spoils.

Democrats have already lost the opportunity to control the campaign season with discussions of such issues as the rights of patients in the era of managed care, the need to move boldly to rebuild the public school system, the concerns of working Americans in a chaotic economic environment and the outlook for Social Security.

Having been handed the gift of Monica Lewinsky, the Republicans are running with her. She conceals their real agenda. If they can parlay the Monica madness into substantially increased majorities in the House and Senate, they can renew their conservative assault on government and their submersion of the interests of ordinary working Americans and the poor.

Keep in mind that this is a party that crafted extraordinary tax breaks for billionaires while claiming the sky would fall if the minimum wage was raised to $5.25 an hour.

Bill Clinton and the Democrats fended off the most extreme aspects of the so-called Republican revolution of the mid-90s'. Now Mr. Clinton has given the right-wingers the opportunity to take care of their unfinished business. Only the voters stand in the way.

COMMENTS FROM A CONSTITUENT

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, I would just say, I put in 70, 80 hours a week and nobody has ever accused me of killing children because Republicans are withholding money from the FDA for E. coli. It is a shameful remark for the last speaker to say that. We gave the power to Secretary Glickman to use whatever resources are necessary to the Department of Agriculture to fight E. coli. To be accused of killing children. No wonder a constituent of mine Beatrice Mock wrote a letter to me, I picked it up this morning. She said:

Dear Congressman, after listening to the pros and cons of the last few weeks, I decided to call your office and voice my objection to what is happening in Washington. Somehow this quotation came to mind and seems to sum up much of what should be said. If as it seems our Congressmen, Senators and President are only interested in the power their offices gives them and not what is best for the country, only in getting reelected time after time, then we are doomed.

She went through and stated that the numerous members of her family that have fought in every war except World War I started with the Spanish-American war. She said, "So you see, I have a vested interest in seeing our leaders held accountable for their actions." She enclosed a quotation from, I think a State Senator, William Boroh, found in an old Bible that belonged to her family. Here is the quotation:

The salvation of our Republic depends on the people, the strength of might and clarity of purpose of the average voter. Democracies tend to make moral cowards of public men. Unless people rise to the task and demand high ideals and truly American standards, then there is no hope from State legislators, from spineless Congresses or listening to officials.

She concluded,

This quotation should be spoken again and again. Much of your tasks are or may be unpleasant. However, your constituents are expecting you to find your voice and to speak your conscience.

Mr. Speaker, that letter says it all. Values and character do not depend on polls. Let me quote something. Harry Truman once commented on the importance of polls to leadership, with the following insight.

□ 1545

I wonder how far Moses would have gone if he had taken a poll in Egypt. What would Jesus Christ have preached if he had taken a poll in Israel? Where would the Reformation have gone if Martin Luther had taken a poll? It is not the polls or the public opinion of the moment that counts. It is right and wrong, and leadership, men with fortitude, honesty and a belief in right that makes epics in the history of the world.

Some things are right, and some things are wrong, and these do not depend upon the philosophy of the day.

There was an article that appeared in the Washington Times about 4 years ago about Daimion Osby, Fort Worth teenager by the name of Daimion Osby. He was 18 years old, was charged with shooting and killing two other young men, Willie Brooks and Marcus Brooks. They were his cousins. Mr. Osby's lawyers came up with a pathetically cynical defense. The youth committed fratricide because he suffered from, quote, "urban survival syndrome," they argued. In other words, he blew away his unarmed cousins because he thought they were out to get him.

This is not accepting responsibility for one's actions, and irony of all ironies, as I came into the office this morning and saw this letter from my constituent, I picked up Dic DeVos' book on rediscovering American values at home, and it fell open to the chapter on accountability. It is exactly what my client was calling for in her letter when she said:

"So you see I have a vested interest in seeing our leaders held accountable for their actions."

And Dick DeVos says:

Some like to blame others for what goes wrong in their lives. Others blame God. When we hold ourselves accountable, we accept the blame for wrong choices. Accountability is part of my faith. I believe that we are all accountable to God for the choices we make. Thankfully God is forgiving, but we must acknowledge our mistakes before him. Accountability depends on honesty and humility as well as fairness and courage. This means simply recognizing and accepting responsibility and the consequences for past mistakes and for the state in which we find ourselves. Individuals can receive rewards for accomplishments and victories.

Mr. Speaker, it is accountability for one's actions for which my client has written this letter and which I am glad to share with this body today.

DEMOCRATS' APPROACH BEST SOLVES THE PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, Americans have said that they want Congress to deal with the real issues, the issues that affect their daily lives and that affect the future of their young people. Education is such an issue.

We are here this weekend debating, and some say fighting, over the question of education and America's future. We on the Democratic side have a clear proposition. We believe that we need to invest more money in public education.

As my colleagues know, recently we got a wake-up call of sorts. In a battery of international tests, American students lagged behind their foreign counterparts. Moreover, as we talk about the global economy and the 21st century, what we realize is that we need more technical training for our students in order to compete in the global economy.

That is why education has become the issue of the day. That is why the debate rages.

What I would like to do is talk about the two perspectives and two approaches to solving the problem of education in this country.

On the Republican side they have advocated basically two things:

One, a voucher program. They want to use the District of Columbia as a laboratory in which to take money out of public schools, put it in private schools and say this new competition from the private school sector will create better schools. That is clearly erroneous because they do not put enough money into a voucher program to make it work. Private schools do not have to take all types of students; public schools do. We do not need to put money into a voucher program for private schools because 9 out of 10 American students will always end up in the public school system, and we need to make an investment in the public school system.

Next, they come up with the notion that they like to call dollars to the schools, to the classroom. What I call it is dollars from the classroom because what their proposal does by creating a block grant is to cut over $2 billion from public education and then tell us we are actually putting more dollars in the classroom.

Now we have to understand their premise is that too much money is being spent on bureaucracy. That is simply not true. The fact of the matter is only 2 percent of the entire Federal budget in education for the Department of Education goes to Federal administration. The rest goes to your State, your county and your city to administer education programs. So do

not let them come up and suggest, well, there is too much bureaucracy. It is certainly not Federal bureaucracy. We do have that 2 percent, though, and that is used to monitor Federal programs to make sure the money is not wasted at the local level. So they want to take this money out of the Federal sector and take, basically cut it out, of the budget. That is what their dollars from the classroom does.

Let me tell my colleagues some of the things that they cut. They cut educational technology challenge funds. They cut the Eisenhower Teacher Training Program. They cut school to work. Why would you cut a school to work program that is helping students make the transition? They cut the After School Learning Program. Why would you cut a program that helps students after school hours when they are most likely to get in trouble? It does not seem to make a lot of sense.

Now they talk about their Dollars to the Classroom. I did a little research, and from my State of Maryland we will lose $10 million as a result of the Republican approach. So I do not call it Dollars to the Classroom; it is clearly for the State of Maryland and, for most other States, dollars from the classroom.

Now let us turn to the Democratic approach. We believe we need to do a couple of fundamental things to improve education in America. First, we need to hire a hundred thousand new teachers for the elementary school, grades 1 to 3, to reduce class size. That is what we are fighting about over the weekend, whether we need to make that investment, because more teachers mean smaller classes, and smaller classes mean a better learning environment.

Second, we want to invest in modernizing our schools. Over a third of our schools need major repairs. That is to say that they need heating systems, air-conditioning systems, that their boiler systems do not work very well. Over half of our schools have major environmental problems that we need to confront and are not prepared to adapt to the Internet. They cannot be wired to the Internet.

So what we have is a situation in which outmoded, crumbling schools cannot deliver a quality education, and again we on the Democratic side believe we need to make an investment in public education to modernize our school system.

We also have a problem of overcrowded schools. The President came to my school district, we visited a school. The school was only 5 years old, but yet it had 6 trailers outside to teach kids. The trailers do not have air-conditioning, the trailers do not have restrooms. You do not have a proper educational environment.

So here we are. We are confronting the 21st century. We know that we lag behind our international counterparts, and we know we need to modernize our schools. I think the Democratic approach best solves the problem of education in America.

THE NEED FOR HATE CRIME LEGISLATION

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the front page of virtually every newspaper in America yesterday, I saw a story that sickened me when I read it and should shock every Member of this body. Matthew Shepard, the 21-year-old student at the University of Wyoming who was described by a family member as an incredibly caring person with a big heart, mind and soul, was lured Tuesday night from campus by two young men, driven a mile outside of town, bludgeoned with a blunt instrument and tied to a fence like a dead animal. Close to death, with his head battered and burn marks on his body, he was discovered 12 hours later by two passing cyclists who at first said they mistook his unconscious body for a scarecrow. Today, as we deliberate here, young Matthew Shepard is lying in a coma, clinging to life.

Why was this young man singled out for such a barbaric act of violence? According to all accounts, he was attacked simply because he was gay. This is the latest in a series of brutally violent crimes committed against people for no other reason than the color of their skin, their sexual orientation or their religion.

For example, in southern Virginia last year, a soft-spoken black man was soaked in gasoline, burned alive, and then beheaded in the yard of his slayer. The victim was the only son of his parents, who were incredibly proud of his service in the Marines. He was targeted for this act of violence, it was discovered, simply because he was black.

Likewise in April 1994, two African American men murdered a white father of three in Lubbock, Texas. The killers later stated that they had set out to find a victim this time who was white.

Earlier this year in Illinois, a Hispanic family mourned the loss of their son who was kicked and verbally abused as he lay on the ground bleeding to death, shortly after being in a car accident with the assailant. According to the authorities, the driver of the other car was upset that his car had been damaged and went over to the victim and repeatedly kicked him in the stomach while shouting, "Mexican, go back to Mexico."

And all of us by now have heard about the recent slaying in Texas of James Byrd, a disabled black man. The Nation was horrified to hear the account of Mr. Byrd who was offered a ride by three young men in a pickup truck. After luring him into their vehicle, buying him beer and driving him to a remote location, the men beat Byrd unconscious, chained him to their truck and dragged him around until he was beheaded.

Incidents like these underscore the need for Congress to move forward and pass pending hate crime legislation sponsored by my colleague from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM). We have a responsibility as lawmakers and as human beings to do everything in our power to punish those who commit hate crimes of any kind to the fullest extent of the law. But it is equally important for us to speak out loudly against those individuals and organized groups like neo-Nazis, white supremacists, and skinhead sects which target people based on benign traits like skin color, sexual orientation or religion.

Today we should all keep Matthew Shepard and his family and his friends in our prayers as we reflect on this brutal act of violence. If we are in fact to survive as a society, we have got to come to grips with these horrible, horrible crimes that are being committed around us, and we have got to teach our children different, we have got to set examples.

The two young couples that disposed of the body of a baby in a trash can as they celebrated their evening prom continue to underscore how terribly weak we are becoming as a Nation and how careless we are becoming with facts and how we are not protecting each other from these types of acts of violence.

So, again I urge my colleagues to speak forcibly on this floor about protecting every human being on this earth. And we may have our differences, we may disagree on a lot of things, but to witness these kind of crimes being repeated and repeated and repeated, and allow them to go unchallenged, and allow it to be, well, because he was different, or that just happened because he was hanging out around the wrong types of people. Even the characterization of a legislator several years ago when he said, homosexuals are like gay bulls; they are worthless and should be sent to the packing plant. When legislators and people of authority start talking about other people like that, you wonder what impact it may have on average Americans who are sitting, listening.

□ 1600

DOING THE PEOPLE'S BUSINESS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Spreaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for his thought-provoking remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to many different perspectives on this floor and in this chamber on this Sunday afternoon when we remain in session intent on doing the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, I was especially astounded to hear a lecture in ethics from the other side, particularly from one Member who finds himself ethically-challenged and, indeed, involved in civil litigation concerning what many would define as an ethical problem, and yet that is the level of absurdity we have reached in Washington, when those who are suspected of doing wrong often stand to claim their endeavors to be right.

So it is sadly, Mr. Speaker, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, where this morning our President met with leaders of the minority party, but failed to meet with the leadership of this House from the conservative majority. Indeed, in discussing with the leadership of the majority party the phenomenon, apparently this President has not met with the majority leadership throughout this two years of the 105th Congress.

Yet tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States will leave our Federal capital, intent on raising funds for electioneering. First he will go to Palm Beach, Florida, and then tomorrow night he will go to New York City. New York City? Yes, New York City. He will be there to raise money for a Member of this House who sits on the Committee on the Judiciary and who has aspirations of joining the other body here on the hill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand how hard bitten and cynical Washington, D.C. has become. Indeed, in stark contrast to my usual weekend activities when I am back home in position to listen and learn from the constituents of the 6th District of Arizona, I had the opportunity this morning to watch the various Sunday news programs, and came away from those just a bit chagrined by the ferocity of the spin cycle, and the seeming hunger on the part of the media elite to cast aside the Constitution and find some unconstitutional or extra-constitutional remedies for the plight in which our President finds himself.

Mr. Speaker, we should all remember, we stood here as a body 435 strong in January of 1997, raised our right hands and swore to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. Those in the Executive Branch take a similar oath. And for anyone in any office to suggest that we cast aside the Constitution and constitutional principles to embrace some remedies of convenience, do our constitutional republic a grave disservice.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would call upon the President of the United States to cancel his questionable fundraising activities tomorrow, to stay in Washington, D.C. and to do something unique, indeed, novel: To call the leadership of the Congress and to join with Members of this House and the other body in constructive solutions to the challenges we face. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, let us state clearly, so there will be no doubt, we are prepared to stay here as long as it takes.

COMMENTS ON CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the speaker who preceded me in the well waxed eloquent about the President of the United States leaving town for a short while tomorrow to do some fundraising for the Democrats, and he took great opprobrium to that. But I would remember twice in this Congress in the midst of the legislative session when the House went out of session, in the middle of the week, on a Wednesday at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, so the Republicans could get on corporate jets and fly up to New York for the largest fund-raiser held in the history of the United States. Their corporate buddies flew them up there. Wasn't that nice?

What is the result? The work is not done. It is not surprising. Congress has been in session 108 days working here in Washington, D.C. this year. The average American working for wages has put in 200 days so far this year, and they have gotten their job done, every day, day in and day out. Congress, having worked under the Republican leadership one-half as many days and being paid generously quite more, has not gotten its work done.

There is nothing for the President to sit down and talk to the Republican leadership about. The Republican leadership cannot even agree among themselves. On the House side they have tried to cut taxes by taking the money and stealing it from the Social Security trust fund. The Republican leadership in the Senate has wisely chosen not to go down that path.

The Republicans in the House passed a de minimis, not very helpful, but better than nothing HMO reform to give patients some little bit of rights, nowhere near what we would have done on the majority side or even some Republicans wanted to do on their side and were blocked by their own leadership. The Senate has denied that.

So there is no agreement between the Republican leaders of the House, the Flat Earth Society, and the Republican leaders of the Senate, those who are sometime in the era of Christopher Columbus and discovered the Earth is round, but not much further ahead of that in history. They cannot agree. So how can the President sit down with a bunch of turkeys who cannot agreeing among themselves within their own parts I?

Yesterday when we were talking about the failure of the Republicans to do anything for education, smaller class size, more teachers, rebuilding and building schools across America, something that would be a real benefit to the American people, when we talked about the failure to do anything for patients rights, when we talked about the attacks on the Social Security trust fund, the chairman of the Committee on Rules jumped up and said, "That is right, but we have cut taxes."

Now, I would ask those who are listening today, are your taxes really lower than they were four years ago when the Republicans took power? In fact, the answer is no. The first returns on the 1997 Taxpayer Relief Act are in. The results are striking.

Seventeen of the 80 percent, that basically figures out to about 14 percent of the people earning less than $59,000 a year, got a generous tax cut of $6. I hope you did not spend it all in one place. Maybe you put it away for retirement or the kids' college. That is great.

Now, we go after the $59,000 to $112,000 bracket. They did a little better, $81. But that is not where the money really went. Guess what? Two-thirds of the taxpayer relief under the Republican bill passed last year went to people whose incomes average $660,000 a year, and guess what? They got $7,135. Now, the families struggling on a $59,000 income got $6. The families struggling, the Republican constituency, just struggling to make ends meet on $666,000 a year, they got $7,000.

But, don't worry, they will spend that money in a way to put Americans to work. Of course, the Republicans are against any increases in the minimum wage and they are following a trade policy which is driving down wages in America.

But they have done great things for the American people, great things, but they cannot get their work done here in Washington, D.C. They have raised a pile of money, and they want to go home and spend it to change the subject from what they have not done in Washington, D.C. or what they have done in killing HMO reform, in killing tobacco legislation, in attacking the Social Security trust fund, and what they have not done for education and what they have not done for average working families.

Shame on the Republican Party.

FOREIGN POLLUTION AT AMERICAN BEACHES

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague as somebody

who owns a tax business in a working class neighborhood where not one client makes over $100,000, I think it is fair to know that tax reductions for the working class people in this country are coming in the next few years, mostly because bipartisan negotiation put off a lot of those reductions. So I do not want to get into that. I am just meaning to address the fact that the partisan bickering has gone so far that people that would normally be outraged and would obviously never vote certain ways are voting ways totally contrary to what their personal belief is. It is either that, or they are just so busy fighting that they are not reading what is being proposed and what they are voting on. It is too easy to vote "no" against a Republican because he is a Republican, or vote "yes" for a Republican because he is a Republican, or vote "no" because he is a Democrat.

The point I am talking about is this summer, as a father, I was taking my children to our beaches in Imperial Beach, Southern California, and this is what we were greeted with, pollution signs that were closing our beaches and saying to children, you are not allowed to go in this water.

I want you to notice that the sign is a bilingual language sign. That is for a good reason. I will explain it later.

The point being, was this a corporation that polluted our beaches? Why was Washington not doing something about it? In fact, this pollution problem has gone on for 20 years. The fact is the reason why it was not taken care of is not because it was a corporation, and I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would say they would be outraged if an American business was polluting the beaches so badly that children could not go in the water.

The real outrage about this issue was it was not an American business or citizens polluting these waters, it was a foreign government desecrating U.S. territory with sewage in such large magnitudes that it not only affects the environment so you cannot get in the water, but it is also destroying the largest estuary and sanctuary in the Pacific coast.

You can say wait a minute, Mr. BILBRAY, how could a foreign government actually be polluting and desecrating American soil? Let me just give you a little geography lesson here.

The San Diego-Tijuana Tijuana border happens to be cut by the Tijuana River. But, unlike a lot of rivers, the Tijuana River flows north into the United States.

Now, that normally would not be a problem, except for the problem that Tijuana has been growing so fast, a lot of it by economic development, that the sewage lines are broken and are flowing into the Tijuana River, flowing through the Tijuana estuary and preserve, and going up into the surf zone for the United States.

Now, you understand, these beaches have been impacted for 20 years. Well, the Federal Government has told us, and I will tell you this as a young mayor of 27 years old, I was told by the Carter administration, that is how far this problem has gone, that, Mr. Mayor, we don't want to do anything that may be embarrassing to Mexico, because we are trying to close a deal on oil.

I would just ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider the fact that someone said we do not want to confront a major corporation with polluting our water because it might embarrass them.

I do not think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would ever stand for their neighborhoods being polluted, and in fact would not support allowing $200 million of taxpayer funds to be wasted or not put to appropriate use. $200 million is going to be spent by the taxpayers of the United States to address this problem, and the problem is continuing.

Now, what was the resolution voted against by all but 28 Members of the Democratic Caucus? The resolution said if Mexico does not stop polluting U.S. waters, Congress will take a look at our treaties that relate to Mexico. Can you imagine that being so outrageous, that if the pollution keeps going, we are going to continue to shut it down? That we are just going to ignore it, because we do not want to even look at our treaty obligations?

I do not believe my colleagues who voted against this bill read the bill or understood the bill, and I do not believe that all but 28 Members of the Democratic Caucus believes that they should vote no to clean up the sewage problems and the pollution problems along our border.

□ 1615

I do believe they got wrapped up in this partisan bickering this week that says if a Republican proposes it, let us vote against it. They voted against it, even though it was against the environment.

I would ask every one of them to go back to their constituents and say, citizens, I believe that our treaties with Mexico are more important than the environment; that Washington should continue not to address this issue comprehensively, that Washington should find excuses for Mexico polluting our waters.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this House has worked longer and harder at working with Mexico, at taking care of this problem. But we do not solve problems by ignoring them or walking around them. I have dear colleagues on this side that come from my State that I will continue to work on pollution problems with, but because we got so wrapped up in the partisan bickering, we had votes that were totally contrary to the historical facts, and desecrated our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, put the partisanship away. Let us vote for our children, our environment, and quit finding excuses to vote no on everything that comes before this floor.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN FUNDING FOR EDUCATION

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody has heard that great and wonderful quotation about "We are from the Federal Government and we are here to help you."

I don't know how many are old enough to remember the good old days before the Federal Government got into funding the education program that we all have throughout our country. I think, unless I am mistaken, since they got in there and we were taking test scores and things like that, the grades have gone down.

The Federal Government's assistance has been fabulous. They come up and say, we are going to give you 6 percent of all your funding. That is what they have done so far. Six percent is all the Federal Government gives us in funding education at the local level, but they give us 100 percent of the rules and regulations by which we have to operate.

I know at this particular time, back in the 1960s, I kept trying to tell people, do not accept Federal money because it will come with strings, and you will not have the slightest idea what they are going to tell you to do the next day. But they did.

It was not too long ago, I think about 6 or 8 months ago, or maybe when we first came in and got control of Congress, we decided that somebody, somewhere, ought to come up with the idea of preventing unfunded mandates.

Let me give Members an idea of unfunded mandates. Unfunded mandates are what the Federal Government says you have to do if you accept their money. So here we are, accepting 6 percent of the money from the Federal Government, and they come up with new ideas. One of the ones they came up with, and I am not saying that this particular idea was terribly wrong, it is called IDEA. It is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Basically, what it was is children with disabilities were not getting a proper education, so the Federal Government, being thoughtful and thinking of what was right and what was wrong, decided we are going to mandate to you folks back home in your school system, we are going to mandate that you take this special education pot and take care of these children.

So they did. They mandated that we do it, and guaranteed, let me just tell the Members, they guaranteed that they would fund up to 40 percent of this total amount of money that was going to be given to run this special education program.

So far, and I have been here in Congress 12 years now, under the Democrats they never raised anything. They got up to 7 percent and that is where they stopped. They never got any higher. They were supposed to come up with 40, and promised us in blood, we will give you 40 percent of the costs, but they never did. They never got up over 7 percent. Really, we took control 4 years ago, and we have increased it to 11 percent. But stop and talk about a mandate, this program is underfunded by $10 billion.

The President has come along with a great and wonderful idea, 100,000 new teachers. Can Members imagine how they are going to fund these teachers? Why in the world, if they are coming up with all these brilliant ideas, do we not fund programs that we have already brought up?

The fact of unfunded mandates is one of the major things. I was a county commissioner for 8 years. We spent time after time trying to figure out, if we took the Federal money, what were the strings they were going to put on it and make us do? If we wanted money for a sewer but we had to apply for water, we could not use it for whatever is necessary. At one time under President Nixon, they decided to open it up and let them take Federal money and do with it what they thought they really needed, but that is not the way it operates still.

We passed that program several years ago, just a couple years ago, about unfunded mandates. Let me say, they are coming along now and telling us how much they are going to help us with construction of schools. The Federal Government is going to step into this and help get school construction started.

I do not know if Members have ever heard of a thing called the Davis-Bacon Act. The Davis-Bacon Act says if there is a dollar's worth of Federal money in any construction, they must pay what is a little higher than union wages. In an area like mine in the South, and we are a right-to-work State, if we accepted a dollar's worth of Federal money to construct schools in our State, it would cost us 30 percent more.

In other words, if we wanted to build a $1 million school and we accepted the Federal money, because of the additional labor costs, it would cost us $1,300,000, a complete loss of $300,000 worth of local money because we accepted something from the Federal Government.

All of these great and wonderful things about the 100,000 teachers, and helping us with schools, all of this is going to cost money from somewhere, yet the Democrats and the President have promised, they have guaranteed the elderly, and I happen to be one that collects Social Security, they guaranteed us that they are going to protect Social Security come hell or high water. They are going to take care and make sure that it is untouched. Yet, just in the education programs alone, they have to be spending billions and billions of dollars that we do not have.

So where do they get the money? The money obviously has to come from the surplus. There is, everybody knows, no surplus. It belongs to Social Security, so anything we do is basically Social Security money being used by the Democrats to fund their favorite dream.

PARTISAN DIALOGUE ON EDUCATION NO LONGER HOLDS THE TRUTH

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware this is a Sunday afternoon. As one of my colleagues noted earlier, we would rather be somewhere other than here. I, for one, would like to be home with my family, and with my children. I would have liked to have been there last night, when he played goalie for his soccer team for 2 games in a row, because the other goalie was out sick or had an obligation. But instead, we are in Washington, D.C. working on the Nation's business.

I noted with interest the President's speech yesterday. The Nation's business at this point is finalizing our budget process and coming to agreement. Yesterday we held a little press conference out on the steps of the Capitol. We called on the President to join us, to join us in resolving our differences in getting the Federal Government funded for the next year and to move on with the Nation's business. Unfortunately, we have not been able to achieve that because there is disagreement.

We should not set aside our principles. We disagree legitimately on the scope and role of the Federal Government. We believe that we need a smaller Federal Government. The other side believes we need a larger Federal Government. We believe we need more local control. The other side believes we should federalize almost all of the issues.

We have reached a point, though, where we must find a common middle ground. The President has decided that we cannot reach that middle ground because, he says, the Republicans are failing to pass his education initiative.

It really is sad that the dialogue in this country becomes partisan and no longer holds the truth. In this case, the Republican record on education is one that the Nation should be proud of, and one that the President actually, I believe, supports and has supported.

In the 105th Congress, in this Congress, this Congress has sent the President seven different measures which he has enacted and signed into law: The Higher Education Act, the Special Education Fund, the WorkForce Investment Act, the Loan Forgiveness for New Teachers Act, the Quality Teaching Grants Act, The Emergency Student Loans Act, and The Prohibition on Federal Tests Act.

We also have seven additional bills waiting for the President's signature: school nutrition, charter schools, quality Head Start, vocational education, Community Service Block Grants, $500 million plus for special education, and the Reading Excellence Act. This is a record of which every single American should be proud, a record of the Congress doing its job to fund education.

Yet, I was saddened to hear in the President's radio address yesterday this issue made partisan. The President, it seems, wants his ideas imposed on education. What does he want specifically? Number one, he wants national testing. Number two, he wants new teachers, 100,000 new teachers, but he does not want them hired under Title I, the existing Federal program that funds the hiring of teachers.

He wants them in a new program, the Bill Clinton new teachers program, and he wants 5,000 new classrooms. He wants those in the Bill Clinton New Federal Teacher Construction Classroom Act, so that he can have his name on it. That is what this issue is about.

Yet, let us look at the record, because the record is one in which Republicans have an excellent record on education, and in which the history of education is actually quite sad for the Federal Government in total and for the Democrat Congress in particular.

Let me talk specifically about the issue of special education. We all understand special education. We understand the IDEA Act. We have talked about it. I recall very distinctly standing on this floor last year and fighting for more funds for IDEA, for funding for children with special education needs.

Let us talk about why I was fighting for that, where this Congress stands and where this country is, and why what the President says he wants is not what this Congress did under Democrat leadership, and is not what this Congress is even doing now when we are trying to get funds into special education.

Let me make this very clear. Current Federal law, passed under a Democrat Congress, says that 40 percent of the cost of educating, that is, the increased cost of educating a special education child, a child with special needs, 40 percent of that cost is supposed to be

borne by the Federal Government. The remaining 60 percent is supposed to be picked up by the State and local governments; 40 percent Federal, 60 percent State and local.

That is what the law says, in theory, passed by the Democrat Congress and Congresses before the 104th Congress. But what is the reality? The reality is that when the Republicans took control of this Congress, only 6 percent was being funded by the Federal Government. Now we have moved that up to 12 percent, but we are falling millions of dollars short. This list shows how many millions. We are falling short in Los Angeles Unified District by $60 million every single year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, if we will fund IDEA, the districts can take care of their own education needs without passing the President's Federalization initiative.

CONGRESS ACHIEVES LITTLE, WHILE EDUCATION NEEDS IN AMERICA ARE GREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let me just make one comment, to start off with. First of all, let me just thank my colleagues who are here this late afternoon on a Sunday. There has been a lot said on the other side of the aisle about wanting to be home with family, and that we are here working. We all would love to be home with our families today and yesterday, and for a holiday tomorrow, but let us put this in the context of what we are talking about, the reason that we are not home.

The reason is very simple, that this is a Republican-controlled Congress that in fact has failed to get done the very basics in terms of legislation and process that our Federal Government relies on. Do not take my word for it. The statistics are all there. This is a Congress that has worked the least number of days in decades, 108. It has been said that regular people, real people, over 250 days they have worked, hard work every single day.

They have enacted the least number of bills in decades. They have not even passed a budget, and that is the first time. I do not keep the records. They have not passed the budget, and that is the first time since the budget process in the United States was created. Think about that, Mr. Speaker. They have failed to pass even routine spending bills on time.

I want to make one more comment before I yield to my colleagues who are here. It has also been said on the other side of the aisle that the President has not been engaged in the process. I want to send to my Republican colleagues a very simple book that is called "How Bills Become Law" in this country. Every child in our school understands the process. That is that the House and the Senate must determine what gets done in a piece of legislation before the President signs that piece of legislation.

□ 1630

I will tell my colleagues that this Republican-controlled Congress has not brought the bills together so that, in fact, the President could act on it. So he is waiting for this crowd to get its act together.

One more point, I will say that there are Democrats and Republicans in this body. What we need to know and understand is that, in fact, yes, the majority party controls. When there is that control, that means that they have charge of the calendar; that is what bills come up, what bills do not come up. They are in charge of the schedule of when we do what we do. The long and the short of it, they are in charge. They are responsible for legislation that gets accomplished or not accomplished in this body.

Do not let them get away with saying that it is other people's fault.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for the points that she has made.

It might seem unusual to our visitors in the gallery that, on a Sunday afternoon, they would see Members of Congress on the floor of the House, or to people who are watching C–SPAN, it would be unusual for live C–SPAN covering the House on a Sunday afternoon.

But the fact of the matter is is that Congress is stuck in Washington, D.C. because the Republican Congress has failed to finish its work for the year. They have failed in the grossest fashion possible.

They were supposed to have a budget on October 1. There is no budget. They were supposed to have finished the appropriations bills to run the government of the United States and conduct our obligations. Only six of the appropriations bills have been passed. The major ones have not. They have, so far, been unable to get them to the President of the United States.

As the gentlewoman Connecticut has pointed out, this is a Congress that has only worked 108 days so far this year. The average American have worked somewhere around 250 days to this day. Many people in my district and others working, out of the 283 days, sometimes working almost the full 283 days as so many people work Saturdays and Sundays along with the 5-day week.

But this Congress decided that it could come in on Tuesday at 5 o'clock most weeks, Monday at 5 o'clock, and it can leave on Thursday. It can leave on Wednesday. It would not come in at the end of the August break. It would stay out an extra week. The result is they simply have not done their work.

They have not done their work for another reason also, and that is pointed out in the Washington post this morning in their lead editorial where they simply say that the Republicans had no agenda for this year.

The Republicans were coming to town just to manage the Congress to try to keep the numbers that they have so that they can retain the power in the Congress, but they really had no agenda for the American public.

The tragedy is that the American public had an agenda for this Congress. The American public had an agenda of improving public education, of asking the Congress to help local school districts rebuild crumbling schools to make them technologically competent, to deal with the education of our children, to make them safe for our children, to go and to repair the falling ceilings and repair the roofs, to try to help out the local communities.

Local communities are doing this. But many communities need additional help. They are just simply too poor to do that. The American public had an agenda to try to help get HMO reform, to get a Patients' Bill of Rights so that patients and doctors would once again be in control of their health care so that, when the doctor says you need an MRI or the doctor says you need a prescription of a certain drug, you get that because your doctor who has been trained in medicine knows best for you. He knows your care. He has watched you as a patient. He understands your problems.

What do we have today? We have doctors getting on the phone and calling bureaucracies, calling 800 numbers, pleading so that they can have their parents have an MRI so that they can diagnose whether or not they might have a tumor or not have a tumor or so that they can do surgery or not do surgery.

They are constantly told by the HMO bureaucracies, wait 30 days, let us see if it cures itself. Rarely, ladies and gentlemen, do tumors cure themselves. Rarely do these kinds of things happen. But the HMO is trying to save money.

So the American public was asking the Congress, help us put doctors and patients back in the control of health care. That was not done.

Campaign finance reform. The American public was astonished 2 years ago at the campaign finance scandals, the amount of special interest money coming into our campaigns. The Congress refused to act on that agenda.

Tobacco legislation to try to stop teenage smoking to try to recover health care costs that we spent with people who received cancer from smoking. The Republican Congress failed on that to protect the environment.

Again, as the Washington Post said, that no serious problems were addressed, and no serious environmental problems either. In fact, they said the great success of this Congress was doing damage control against the Republican agenda to eviscerate the environmental laws of this country.

So that is why my colleagues and myself are on the floor here on a Sunday afternoon, because the Congress, the Republican Congress, I should say, we have had this agenda. We have proposed legislation. The Democrats have proposed all this legislation. The Republicans have refused to enact it. They refuse to the work.

So now we find ourselves here on a Sunday afternoon, we find ourselves with no budget the first time since 1974, and with many of the important appropriations bills not passed and an important agenda dealing with problems in this country not addressed by this Congress.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) very much. She has really brought us together.

It is interesting today. We have the Congress Member, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE). Congress Members from the West coast, obviously we could not get home this weekend, those of us from California, Oregon and Washington.

We are here to talk about that this year is the 105th session of Congress. We should have been home, adjourned sine die, all the business done. If this were a school year or business year, we would be over, and everything would be done.

Here we are on a Sunday afternoon talking about the failures of this Congress and particularly the failures in education. If the story is going to be written about education and the GOP leadership on education, I think the headlines would say "Republicans: Underachievers and proud of it," because they have never been able to put together a substantive program for education to really address the needs that have been unmet: the unmet needs of school buildings that need money for construction and repair, the unmet needs for new teachers, the unmet needs for educational opportunities, zones to provide in those hardest of areas sort of an involvement to really deal with the root causes of people unable to get a good education, expanding the access to after-school learning, and expanding access to educational technology.

They have all been the bills that the President asked us. As the gentlewoman pointed out, the President comes here and addresses the Nation every year and, in that speech, outlines what the goals for this Nation should be. He proposes to this Congress.

We are supposed to dispose. The only way we can dispose is to put our cards in that slot right there and around this room and get the majority vote of 218 votes.

Here today we hear the Republicans attacking the President of the United States for traveling, traveling on international business. I mean, he has had incredible successes in China, incredible successes in Europe, incredible successes in Latin America, and he is being criticized for it. He does not have to be here in this room to get his business done.

Members of Congress have to be here. Where are they? They are not getting the business done. So the leadership of this House, the Republican leadership of this House should be ashamed of the fact that we are here overtime without a budget, underbudgeted for education, and not meeting the felt needs, the desires of the men and women who have sent us here to provide what is essentially the only thing that the Federal Government can do, and that is that safety net for education.

We hear the debate here on the floor that we do not want safety nets anymore. We want to just privatize education. When the schools of the District of Columbia came up for funding, Congress did not approve that funding and turned around and said we want to privatize this education.

What my colleagues are saying is this voucher system. It did not work in California. It was rejected there. They want to ram it down our throats and say, "Californians, you were wrong. We are going to give you vouchers whether you like it or not."

It is time that we, the United States Congress, go back to the basics of this country, go back to what supports the domestic tranquility. We cannot have peace around the world until we have peace at home. We cannot have peace at home until every father and mother, every parent of every child in this country has satisfaction that the schools they are sending their children to are safe, sound, and excellent centers for learning. We get there from here unless we adopt what the President of the United States asked this Congress to do.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman for allowing us to have this time to discuss that.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is still in Washington, and we are here on a Sunday because the Republican leadership has simply failed to do their job. It is quite simple. For the first time in a quarter of a century, since the adoption of the Budget Act, Congress has failed to adopt even a first budget resolution.

The leaders of the House, otherwise known as the flatterer society, and the leaders of the Senate, perhaps a slightly more progressive group recognizing the shape of the earth, have failed to agree on the basics of a budget.

The leaders of the House want to have a huge tax cut raided from the Social Security trust funds. The leaders from the Senate somewhat prudently have not decided to do that.

But, then again, the leaders in the House, when confronted with anger across America from people being denied essential care for themselves and their loved ones, and physicians even rising in anger when they are being denied tests and care that they know that their patients want, with all that pressure, the insurance industry, which pretty much sponsors the other side of the aisle at election time, could not be fully protected.

So they passed, better than not, but not much of a patient and providers bill here in the House, an HMO bill. But even that was too much for the leaders in the Senate because it might jeopardize their fund-raising with the insurance industry in a year when they hope to make big gains in the Senate.

Of course tobacco, well, that did not go anywhere on either side with the Republican leaders, despite the fact that the American people are appalled to see the rise in teenage smoking and what that will yield 10 and 15 and 20 years down the road.

So here the Congress has no budget, many major bills denied. But at least we could salvage something. We could salvage the President's education initiative, something that all Members of Congress, no matter what side of the aisle they come from should be able to agree upon.

They should be able to go home to their own districts and see the fact that the schools are crumbling and overcrowded, and there are trailers parked on what used to be the playground because there are too many kids to fit in the school.

If they went inside the school, the public schools, they would find that the classes were about twice what they were when they were kids when they went to public school. A lot of people on the other side of the aisle did not. They would see that the teachers are carrying more classes and working harder. There is no counselors anymore in most of the schools. They would support the President's initiative to help add teachers to the schools, reduce class size, and rebuild our crumbling schools and make them safe for our kids.

But they tell us there is no money to do that. There is no money to do that.

Wait a minute. Was it not the same leadership here on the House side just a couple of weeks ago who jammed through tax cuts that were paid for by raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, otherwise known as the budget surplus?

□ 1645

They could find money to do that. They could find money to cut taxes in an election year favoring the usual suspects. But no, there is no money for the schools and the kids and the teachers. They say there is no money.

Look at the Department of Defense appropriation this year. It adds $4.1 billion, not million, billion dollars of pork projects that were not requested by the Pentagon. This is the same Pentagon that has now come up to the hill and said, we need more money, we need gas for the tanks, the soldiers do not have ammunition, the housing is crumbling for the enlisted ranks. I want to take care of those things, but guess what, the Republican majority already spent that money. They spent it on pork projects that the Pentagon did not ask for. But they tell us there is no money for the kids and the schools and the teachers.

Now, somehow they can find money for the mythical space station that we are building with the former Soviet Union. This thing is only about 2,000, 3,000 percent over budget, 10 years behind schedule. We keep pretending that they are going to build parts of it over there. Now we have to pay them to build parts of it over there, in addition to building the parts over here, but pretending they are building them over there. It has no mission. There is $40 billion over the next 10 years. But there is no money for the schools and the kids and the teachers. What is wrong with these people? What is wrong with them? Where are their priorities?

Well, they do have some priorities when it comes to education. Eliminate the Department of Education, priority number one. Divert billions of dollars from public school funding to private school vouchers. That is their answer to the crumbling public schools. And the large class sizes and the lack of public funding, take that money and give it to the private schools. Cut school lunches for poor kids and end equal opportunity for higher education. Cut student loans, give higher subsidies to the banks so they will give some student loans.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I just think that it is interesting where the priorities are, as the gentleman points out. I am sorry I offended the gentleman earlier today about the intensity of my statement. Frankly, when I find friends and relatives and constituents losing their health care, dying because of bad health care, it does bring out an emotional response. It is infuriating and frustrating. But then when you look where they are putting their efforts, instead of trying to deal with HMO reform, trying to make sure that seniors do not get bumped out of their managed care health care, they are trying to get oil companies extra breaks in the royalties they owe the taxpayers of this country.

They came to this Congress saying they wanted to run it like a business. You tell me what business takes the family assets, the family owned oil reserves and says, let Exxon walk away with a little more of it. They spent time here, when they could not get any of the education product done, they got a $50 billion tax break for the tobacco companies, snuck it in a bill, lo and behold, when we found out even they were unable to keep it there so we repealed that tax break. They gave, again, a $50 billion tax break to tobacco companies.

On health care, they spent more time trying to make sure that unmarried couples in San Francisco could not get health care provided by their community than they did in trying to protect the health care of the rest of us. And if you go to education, the President seems to be able to figure things out in a way that works and a way the American people understand.

In the area of crime, the President said one of the things we need is more people on the street. That is how we all grew up. There was a cop on the corner. You got to know them. They knew what was going on. The President says, we want 100,000 cops. They say, that is terrible. They were against the 100,000 cops. It took them 3 years. The public was on board. Every first selectman and mayor was on board. The police chiefs knew it worked. The Republicans were still swinging around with guys who were against the crime bill. Then they figured that one out.

I do not know when they are going to figure out the education one. Let me tell you something, the United States is in a very competitive international market. It is in chaos now. We will now compete with countries that instead of paying 15 cents for every dollar an American makes, we will be competing with countries that make 2 and 3 and 4 cents for every dollar an American makes. Our workers have to be better trained and better educated. And if we do not invest in education, we are not going to have the kind of future that we want for all of our children.

We need to make sure that we are here working on things for the people.

The Speaker has a new club. He got in enough trouble with his last set of clubs. This new club is the Speaker's people call you up and they tell you you have just been appointed to a panel. You are on an advisory panel for the Speaker of the House. Then they want you to send in, $1000, $2000, $3000.

They talk about the President fundraising. What they do not tell anybody is they have a several hundred million dollar advantage in almost every account.

At the end of the day, the people know what this fight is about. They are trying to make sure we do not focus on health care, on education, and retirement security. They would rather have us talk about anything than the things that affect the people. Time enough to give big tobacco a tax break. Time enough to give oil companies some of their royalties that they should have paid us. Not enough time for average citizens. That is what is wrong with this Republican Congress.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman forgot a couple highlights of things they did propose. They did propose elimination of the School to Work program for high school students. I suppose somehow in their world that is going to better prepare our students for employment after school and to compete in the world economy. Beyond me. I wish they would come down here and explain that. I thought it was a pretty good thing to have school to work opportunities for high school kids. In fact, my State has embarked statewide on a program to bring that about.

They have also eliminated in school interest subsidy for student loans. I borrowed a bunch of money to go to college. I thought it was a lot of money when I graduated. I owed about $12,000 when I got out. I am talking to kids now getting out with bachelor's degrees from higher education with $25- and $30,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman raised the point of student loans. The President just signed the higher, reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The tragedy of that bill is that the Republicans fought us for the last 2 years at every turn where we had the ability to make it less expensive for students who graduated from college to consolidate their loans, to save hundreds and hundreds of dollars in interest costs, to refinance those loans at lower rates. They fought that effort even when the administration tried to do it again this year, the Republicans came down on them like a ton of bricks.

Then when we tried to lower the cost of student loans, the Republicans fought us the whole way, finally agreed to lower the cost of student loans just a little bit so that they could say they lowered the cost. The fact of the matter is, this whole year, I serve on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, this whole year they have fought on behalf of the banks to retain the ability of the banks to suck money out of the student loan program, to take it out in fees, to take it out in higher interest rates. And what does that do? That just means for more students they have to work more hours or they cannot go to college or they have

to defer it or take fewer units, costing their families more and more money.

So it is just incredible that they would spend 2 years, at a time when we had a chance to dramatically lower the cost of student loans, they fought us at every turn. They fought us at every effort we made either to consolidate loans or to reduce the interest rates on loans. They just fought for the banks. It is what they have spent their time doing in this session, as you pointed out. They have fought in this session for every special interest.

But they missed a really very simple agenda for the American public. Take care of our health care. Make sure our doctor can prescribe what we need, provide a minimum wage so that families can support themselves, get rid of the teen smoking and recover the money that tobacco companies have taken from this country because of cancer and tobacco. Give our children a chance to get a world class education in a safe school by reducing class sizes, by repairing the buildings, by having high standards for our teachers, high standards for our students and accountability for the school districts back to the parents.

I had a provision in one of the bills and they fought me on it. I said, parents ought to know the qualifications of the teachers that teach their students. Is this teacher qualified to teach your student history or mathematics or biology? They fought that effort.

This is not a complicated agenda that the President brought to this Congress, that the Democrats have brought to this Congress, but more importantly, that the American people have brought to this Congress. Because the gentleman from Oregon points out, most of their time has been spent here on these efforts on behalf of special interests trying to protect little nuances and tax breaks and special deals that allow them to go around the public interest. I appreciate the gentleman raising those points.

Mr. DEFAZIO. To go back to the student loans for a moment, because that is something that I am pretty exercised about, there was an absolutely Titanic struggle here on behalf of the banks to say, the bankers actually came in to me and I said, I always thought the theory of interest was that there was risk. With these student loans, the government guarantees that you get 100 percent back no matter what happens, plus your interest, no matter what happens. The student dies, goes bankrupt, leaves the country, you will get it back. So why are the interest rates so high?

Their eyes got big and they looked at me and said, well, very profitable. Yes. Guess what? We can charge the students 8, 9 percent interest for loans that are guaranteed by the Federal Government. So after much pressure from our side and from the parents and the families and the kids, the Republicans had to lower the interest rate just a little bit for the kids, but they gave an additional subsidy to the banks. So the banks are still going to get a guaranty of 100 percent repayment. They are still getting obscenely high interest rates. Interest rates are falling through the floor and the banks are getting an increase in the interest rates and the kids are not getting the loans.

Direct student loans, take out the middlemen. What do we need the banks in the middle for? Why should we guarantee the loans and give them a subsidy and give them those high interest rates and take the money out of the kids' pockets? If we had direct student loans through the institutions, through the kids, like I got when I was in college, another 600,000 kids could get student loans of $4000 or $5000 this year, if we just took out the banks' profits.

They say, that is too complicated. They said we tried to do an experiment. It did not work. Ross Perot was running the program.

But it can work, and that can be a much better way of doing this. And you can give more kids a higher education.

I just want to make one other point before I have to leave. The gentleman touched on this. From what they have not done, by not reforming HMOs and the insurance industry, from what they have not done in terms of dealing with teenage smoking, from what they have not done in terms of raising the minimum wage or protecting the environment, they have gotten some very rich and powerful friends. And those rich and powerful friends are rewarding them handsomely. That is why they are in a hurry to get out of Washington, D.C. now, not because they want to do a good job or get the job done or leave with the job done. They want to get home and start spending the obscene amounts of campaign cash that they have piled up.

I would just ask the people that are watching television today, when they watch those ads come piling out in October and up in the first few days of November, when they see them four and five to one, as a Democrat, I would like them to think, where did all that money come from? Where did all that money come from? It came from the HMOs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The Chair would remind Members that it is improper to address the television audience. Members should address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I said the people watching. I did not say you, the people watching. I did not attempt to garner their attention directly.

In any case, the point is made.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon, and I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut, who is doing a real public service in coming out here and organizing this effort to talk about education.

As I listen to this education business about loans, I think about my own circumstance, my own family. My sister told me that she will be 54 years old when she gets through paying off her loans. These are loans that were for a PhD at the University of Chicago in the 1970s. She is going to be paying until another 6 or 7 years.

When interest rates have fallen, all of us who have a house, we go out and we refinance our loan. We drop our interest rate. I bought a house at 8 percent. I am now down at 6 percent. And I save myself all kinds of money.

A student cannot do that. You cannot refinance a student loan. If they really cared about children in the middle class, they would make it possible for you to refinance the loan. You can do it if you have a house. You go in and you get a home improvement loan and you use that home improvement money to pay off your college loan. Then you pay at 6 percent and you get tax deductibility. That is how they make people work around the law and put the students out there and let the banks squeeze them endlessly.

As I was sitting here thinking about this whole education thing, I was thinking about what is a democracy based on? A democracy is based on an educated electorate. If you do not have people who are educated and can understand and participate, you lose the democracy. And we have done some things here in this last couple weeks which are, if you think about them in that context, are very destructive.

We had a big debate out here about how many H–1B visas we are going to give. Now, most people do not what an H–1B visa is because our grandparents or our great grandparents came and they just kind of walked in here. But now if you come to the United States, you have to have some kind of a visa, and it either has to be a work visa or you are coming here because your family has been here and you are unifying the family or maybe there is so many could come in from each country.

□ 1700

But we have a special category. It is called an H–1B visa. This is a visa that we give to people who have a special skill somewhere in the world. We say, we need that skill in the United States, so we will give you one of those visas, come on in and work here. You can't stay, but we will use you, we can pay you as little as possible, give you no benefit, but if you are willing to come here, we will take you in on that basis.

Last year we passed the bill and we said we need 60,000 of those people in

the United States next year. Lo and behold, industry in this country was so desperate for trained people that we had used those 60,000 visas by the 1st of July. So in come the Republicans and say, we need 150,000 more. We have to go out into Poland and Czechoslovakia and Germany and India and Cambodia and we have got to find these 150,000 people and let them come in here.

If you think about that, what that says is we are not training enough people in this country to fill the jobs that are available. These are not $5 an hour jobs flipping hamburgers in some fast food joint. These are in my district at Microsoft where we pay 30, 40, 50, $60,000 to these people, and they cannot find an American who qualifies for that job, so they have to go to India, or the Ukraine, or Uganda or somewhere and find them.

So when the President says that the focus of this country and this Congress ought to be developing an educational system that prepares our kids for the jobs of the 21st century, he is talking about making Americans available for those H–1B visas. The problem in politics is that a lot of times we always think in 2-year terms or maybe 4. We do not think about the fact that we are really sewing the seeds for 20 years from now if we don't educate our kids, if in those first 3 years we do not learn to read. Then they are not going to know how to read a computer, ma'am, when they get an opportunity to work as a computer operator, or as a programmer.

If they do not learn basic math—my daughter teaches in the Seattle schools. She teaches sophomore remedial math. She said to me, dad, you can't believe how many kids don't know how to use a ruler. She has to take them out in the parking lot and say, all right, now here is what a ruler is about. How big a parking space, so they measure out the parking space. Then she says to them, why is that parking space this size. The kids finally say oh, so the car will fit in. So they measure the car. Lo and behold, a parking space is a little bit larger than an automobile, a standard automobile.

Now when you are taking 15 and 16-year-old kids who come through our system and they do not have the capacity to make the logical connections between a ruler and a parking space, you have got serious difficulties in our educational system. So when the President says we need 100,000 new teachers to get those kids in the first 3 years where they learn to add and subtract and do fractions and they learn to read and write. That is what that is all about. It is not about somehow the Federal Government taking over education. It is supplementing those school districts in this country, and Seattle has not got a bad school system. But we still have kids who are not making it, who are not getting it, because the schools are too big or too whatever, and we need to add this kind of thing.

Now, the other thing is this whole business about school buildings. My daughter is in a school building that was built before the Second World War. When they try and wire for computers, God help you. You have to have Rube Goldberg come in to put together the wiring to work inside a building that was built 50 years ago. That is not the oldest building in Seattle. There are a lot of buildings, and all over this country, and we say to our kids, well, we want to get you ready for a job. But we do not give them the opportunity to deal with the very things that they are going to have to do when they go out into the world. To me, it is a tragedy.

There was an editorial in this morning's newspaper which I think is the one that just stops me sort of sometimes. When we look at what we have spent our time and energy in here, Bob Herbert in the New York Times said, having been handed the gift of Monica Lewinsky, the Republicans are running with her. She conceals their real agenda. If they can parlay the Monica madness into substantial increased majorities in the House and Senate, they can renew their conservative assault on government and on their subversion of the interests of ordinary working people and the poor.

You cannot say it any clearer. If the poor, if the lower classes in our country, in the middle class in our country, if we do not come up with ways to give them an education, this democracy will lead to fascism. You will have to have the government with a soldier on every corner like they do in half the countries of the world. The reason we have a democracy is because people are educated. If we do not educate them, we will have turmoil in this country that we are not prepared for. That is why what the President is saying is that this is a long-term plan in the best interests of all Americans.

I congratulate the two of you for putting this together.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I would like to have a little dialogue with the gentleman about workers and H1–B visas, because something else that is totally missing is some incentive, an encouragement for businesses to retrain their current workforce. Technology is growing so fast and beyond the workforce. Employers are hesitating or refusing to train their existing workers. That must be something we do. That is why we need H–1B visas. One, we do not teach our young people, and, two, we do not retrain our existing workforce.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Some of us are really worried that the H–1B visa is a way around taking your existing workforce and raising them up to the level that you need them, rather, go get somebody somewhere else who you can hire for $10,000, $20,000 less, do not have to pay for a pension, do not have to pay for health care or anything else and put them in the job rather than taking an existing worker. There is a lot of concern among many people who look at the workforce and say that the issue of retraining is one of the most fundamental issues to labor peace in this country. You cannot go and get somebody from somewhere else and stick them in a job when there is somebody standing there that could be trained to do that.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That is right. The other connect there is that person is being laid off because they are not trained, quite often is a very senior worker, needing Social Security. And what are we saying? We are raising the age of Social Security. That is the threat. In order to save it, privatize it, raise the age, give less. But certainly do not train workers so they can stay on the job. They need that Social Security at the time they will be laid off and it will not be available to them.

Ms. DELAURO. Let me just make a comment before I recognize the gentlewoman from California. The theme that both of our colleagues were talking about, education in this country has been the great equalizer. I think it is true to talk about the fundamental part of our democracy. What I mean by education being the great equalizer is that youngsters have the opportunity to succeed despite their gender, their religion, their socioeconomic status, political party affiliation. It says that your God-given talent is what is in fact that which allows for your success in our society. That has truly been the premise of public education.

I will just take myself for example. I am the daughter of a garment worker. My mom worked in the sweatshops. My dad sold insurance. They killed themselves literally to make sure that I had a good education, so that in fact that I could have opportunities that they never had. That is the same with probably the majority of people who serve in this body.

Ms. WOOLSEY. If you will yield, I will tell you my story.

Ms. DELAURO. Which is so frightening in terms of what is at stake when we are talking about public education and what this institution and the majority party in this institution has refused to recognize.

Just one more point. I got the finest education in the same way that any corporate executive or any scientist or any academic could get and was allowed to be able to have the honor and the privilege of serving in this body. So it is a precious, precious gift, if you will, that we need to preserve this ability. It is values. It is what we prize and what we value in our society is this ability for education.

Ms. WOOLSEY. If the gentlewoman will yield on this thought, then later I have more words. Thirty years ago my children and I were abandoned by their

father. My children were 1, 3 and 5 years old. I went to work immediately. I had good job skills fortunately. I was a very healthy young woman. My children were healthy. We were really fortunate. But the most fortunate part of that horrible situation was that I had a good education. I had 2 years of college. I quit college so that I could help my children's father finish school. But I had enough education to get job opportunities and make those job opportunities work for my family and myself while I continued to finish my college education. Without that education, I do not know where we would be today, because it made all the difference in the world in my self-esteem, and in my ability to go forward.

Mr. PALLONE. If the gentlewoman will yield, I am going to join in by pointing out my background as well. My father, who probably is listening because today is Columbus Day and he told me he might listen to us.

Ms. DELAURO. We were supposed to be marching in parades today, in the heart of the Italian-American community.

Mr. PALLONE. In New Jersey. That is right. My father was a policeman for about 25, 30 years and is retired now from the police force. The same is true. We grew up, we never had to worry about anything, but we were middle class, went to public school and basically the quality of the education in the public school was, I think, as good as it gets. That is all we are saying. But if I have to go back to that same school or other schools in my district today, you will find that many of them do not have the money to keep up with the plant, as I would say.

When we talk about this money that we are looking to see for modernization of the schools, which really is sort of the main object, if you will, of what we are asking the Republicans to do before we get out of here, is that we would like to get this modernization fund available for the local communities. It is not so much that a lot of communities need additional schools or need to build additions to their schools, which is true. A lot of them are overcrowded now and they need new schools and this money that we are asking for that be appropriated could be used for that purpose. But I find that many of the school districts just cannot afford to keep up with technology anymore. In other words, they need to be rewired for computers, they need to have things done so that they can keep up with the high tech age, so to speak. It is very different today than it might have been 20, 30 years ago, or even 10 years ago, where the local community of course never had an easy time raising the funds to build the school or renovate the school but they did not have all the problems that are associated now with all the changes that occur in technology every day. I have found that when I go back and I talk to some of the school districts, they are just looking for some additional help just to make the changeover, if you will, to the high technology age. Now, of course there are others that have crumbling roofs. I have some in my own district that are in pretty bad shape where I have been in the auditoriums and I have seen the water leak through. So there are some that are very decrepit. But you will not find a single school district in this country now, I do not think, that does not need some kind of assistance because of all the demands that exist now on the physical plant of the school building.

Again, I know I hear my Republican colleagues say, well, you know, schools should be local, everything should be done locally. We are not arguing that the curriculum should not be decided by the local school board, that the local school board should not decide who to hire or what to do on a daily basis. We are just talking about the money that they need, because local property taxes are so high, it is very difficult for them to get along. So all we are saying is give us a little down payment here. Do not rush out of this place immediately without having done your job. Address the education needs, address the need to modernize the schools. If they would just do that, I will be honest with you, all the other things that I would like to see done here, but if they would just do that, I would be happy.

Ms. WOOLSEY. The gentleman is right on target. If the school needs upgrading and wiring, that is what they need.

□ 1715

If a school needs roofs, paint, that is what they need, and, if we do not invest in those children, in their schools, what are we saying to them? We are telling those children you do not matter. We want you to get an education, but we do not want it to be the best it could be. And we are not saying, take our Federal tax dollars and wire that plug or that particular room; we are just saying, use those tax dollars to benefit our children because we know they all need a good education. And public education makes that possible, and we want to invest in them.

Ms. DELAURO. Well, interestingly enough, you know, to further talk about this a bit, is that 90 percent of our youngsters are in public schools.

Now, we do have problems with the public school system. No one is suggesting that we cannot make improvements, which is what precisely we are talking about, and in terms of the modernizing, again the piece that is, it is not just about the bricks and the mortar. It is in fact about providing that opportunity for youngsters to be able to have a learning environment which is a secure one and at the same time have a learning environment which, in fact, plugs them into an Internet to utilize advanced technology.

I did a survey, a modernization survey, in my district. I visited the Orange Avenue School for a tour. We had a round table discussion with superintendents about school modernization needs. There were 71 schools who responded, and this is what I found in my own district.

The average age of the elementary school buildings is 50 years old. More than half of the elementary schools regularly hold classes in areas not designed to be classrooms, including cafeterias, hallways, mobile or temporary rooms and storage areas, literally closets being turned into classrooms. The average class size was still 23 students, even with the makeshift facilities, which is why we have been talking about reducing classroom size to 18 in the grades from 1 to 3.

All of the schools that responded said that they had some computers for students to use. More than 50 percent of the schools have no computer lab or a room where there are computers. The majority of the schools have no computers designated for teachers' use, nor is there programing to teach teachers as to how to teach our kids to use computers, and many schools do not have computers in every classroom. I would venture to say that today computers are becoming like textbooks; where you have a text book for every child, you have to have computers for every child.

Let me just make one more point about modernization because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say the Federal Government wants to get involved in construction of schools. Not true. Very simply what we are talking about here is that what the President's initiative, what the Democratic initiative is, and what we like to have accomplished before we leave here, it is to help with Federal tax credits to pay interest on $22 billion in bonds to build or to modernize public schools. That helps the local community float the bonds that they need to construct the school. We do not want to be building schools and have the Federal Government pay for the building of these schools, but we want to try to provide that local government with the opportunity of getting some relief on their taxes with regard to the bonds.

What does that do for the local community? You know what it does for the local community? It lowers their tax obligation. That is what we are talking about. And it is very simple, it can be done, and we truly do have the obligation to make sure that we do this. That is what we are calling for: Do this before we get out of Washington, D.C.

Ms. WOOLSEY. You know in California, our very conservative Republican Governor put into place the decrease in class sizes for grades K

through 3. Well, guess what we found out? We did not have enough certified teachers, we did not have classrooms, and good that the idea was, yes, reduce the class size. We did not have the infrastructure or the trained teachers to support even what this very conservative Republican Governor wanted.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. As I said, I think that the school modernization is probably the most important aspect of this education agenda that we have been trying to push, but I also think that this proposal, which originally came from President Clinton to hire a hundred thousand additional teachers, is equally important. And again it is modeled in many ways on the COPS grant program where the President has basically instituted a program, and we approved it in Congress, to hire a hundred thousand additional policemen. Let me say that that COPS grant program, because I heard some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle criticize it earlier, and I was shocked to hear some of the Republicans criticize that program because I know how effective it has been in my district. We have had, almost every community has been able to hire additional police because of that COPS grant, and it is a community program. In other words, the policemen have to be put on the beat in the community, in many cases tied into recreation and other programs that they work on during the evening or during off hours. It has been terribly successful. I have had so many people in my hometown, in Long Branch, where I was supposed to be at the Columbus Day parade today, tell me how it has made a difference in terms of the crime rate has gone down significantly as a result of this.

Now we are saying we want to model that in the same way. We want to give those towns money so that they can hire additional teachers and bring class size down. I think it is either 1 to 3 or K to 3 in the lower grades.

Now we know that anybody who has been involved in education, I know both of my colleagues who are here with me today have been, have talked about this in the past, know in the last few years all kinds of research has come out to point out that early childhood development is so crucial, even down to like 6 months or a few months, zero. And so what we are saying is that we want to make sure at that early level, and I mean it is not even that early because we are talking kindergarten or first grade, but whatever, that when these kids start in the public schools that they have those small class sizes.

And again, you know, you could talk to people who say, well, I went to a one-room schoolhouse and there were 30 kids in the class. Well, again, things are different today. In many ways I wish that they were like they used to be, but they are not. A lot of these kids come to school already with some major problems, and they cannot have a class that has 30 kids in it because they are not going to learn anything. So, if you combine the fact that we are trying to reach these kids at a young age, that we have a lot of problems that need to be addressed today at that young age, you have to bring classes down. I think this would actually bring it down to 18 or so, the average in the classroom and the country. And I cannot stress how important that is, and do not let anybody on the other side tell you that the COPS grant program was a failure. If we can build on that, we will have another very successful program, and, I will say, for not a lot of money.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just say that, you know, when we talk about reduced class size, again like modernization is not bricks and mortar, lower class size says the following: I am a teacher, I can give more individual attention to each of the youngsters I have in a classroom. Better learning, better standards, more accountability. And you know what else? More discipline in the classroom. Parents today want to make sure that their youngsters are in schools that are safe, in a learning environment with a teacher who has time to devote attention to them.

And you are absolutely right about we have a very successful model on which to base this program, and it is one that universally school officials and administrators and parents and teachers are clamoring for.

I think it is important to note, because we are going to be out of time in a few minutes here, that our colleagues will talk about their accomplishments in education, but I do not think that we ought to be fooled by their commentary.

Child literacy program, America Reads, zero funding. Summer jobs, zero funding. Out of school youth, zero funding. School modernization, zero funding. Class size reduction, zero. New teachers, zero. Shortchanging Head Start programs, Goals 2000. When they talk about taking the money, Dollars to the Classroom, that eliminates Goals 2000, the Eisenhower training program that trains our teachers, several other critical programs that provide for basic skills for our young people.

We have an obligation. We serve here because the people who we represent trust us, and they trust us with their children.

Let us take the remaining days of this session and do something to improve public education in this country. We can do it. There is support for doing it. We need to do it. That is what we should be about.

I yield to either of my colleagues for any final comments.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, I have a comment. When our colleague, Mr. PALLONE, talked about small one-room school houses, those schools were homogeneous. Everybody in that class looked the same, came from the same kind of background and environment. Now we are talking about classrooms with as many as 17 different languages in one classroom. Tell me that these young children do not need one-on-one attention from their instructor.

Mr. PALLONE. If the gentlewoman will yield, I would just say that again, one of the things that really has been bothering me about this Republican Congress is that, you know, they will pay lip service to education, but they wasted so much time trying to take money away from public education by instituting voucher programs that basically take public dollars and give it to private schools, and we had to go on for weeks and months fighting those proposals. If they had just not wasted that time, we would not be in the situation we are in today.

You know some of our colleagues have said, well, you know, it is time to go home, we got to get out of here quickly. They wasted so much time trying to attack the public school system. We heard talk again about abolishing the Department of Education. You know, again, how can we have any kind of standards or have any kind of supervision of what goes on out there if we do not have a Department of Education?

So, you know, I honestly believe that in many ways what the Republican leadership has been trying to do here is to basically break down or even destroy in some ways public education. I mean, if they are going to spend all their time and say we are going to take these dollars from public education and give it to private schools, we are never going to get to the initiatives that we are talking about.

That is why I get very annoyed when I hear them say, well, we care about education because we know that their whole history for the last 2 years and even for the 4 years that they have been in the majority is to try to break down the system and not allow dollars to go to public education.

Ms. DELAURO. The one thing they want to do is to return education to the limited few and the rich instead of using education as that great equalizer that allowed us our success to be able to come here.

MOST OF OUR PROBLEMS CAME FROM WHEN THE DEMOCRATS CONTROLLED THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Arizona, sitting in the chair, for his endurance on a Sunday afternoon in listening to what has just gone on.

I listened to the discussion all this day, and I find it rather fascinating. The shrillness of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle I think reflects their sense of denial. Most of what they have said is that they are trying to continue the policies so that they can continue to support their philosophy of government that has failed. We have tried their way for well over 50 years, and most of the problems that they describe, the problems with our public school system, with our government, with health care, most of that came from when they controlled this Congress.

□ 1730

They have controlled most of the local governments, the state governments, this Congress, for the last 30 to 40 years, and the result are the problems that they have described.

The problem is that their solutions are more of the same, more money, more big government. "We know better." You heard just 15 minutes ago, the gentleman from New Jersey, talking about the fact that "I know what my local school boards need more than they do." Well, he ought to run for the school board, because that is where the decisions ought to be made, not here on this floor and not by the President of the United States.

For my colleagues and others, let me try to kind of put in perspective where we are today. I find it fascinating that the President of the United States showed up for the first time to talk to his budget people the day before the targeted date of adjournment, last Thursday. That is the first time that I have heard or read about that the President has met with his budget people about the spending and appropriations bills that we are trying to pass. That is the first time I have heard that this President has been engaged this year on anything that is going on in the Congress of the United States.

The day of adjournment, on Friday, the President announces that he is not going to accept the work of this House or the Senate unless he gets his education package. That is the first time since his State of the Union message that I have heard that he has been engaged in the process.

This President has been totally disengaged this whole year. In fact, I can contend that this year is nothing more than a reflection of what we have been going through for the last four years. This President's normal method of operation is he does not get engaged at all until the end, and then he comes in and demands more spending and bigger government and more programs. And, because he is President, he could shut down the government like he did in 1995. We have to deal with this President to get him to sign the legislation. Yet during the whole process, he is not engaged.

The American people need to really understand what is going on here. The President himself today in a meeting with Democrat leadership, I find it very strange, he has not this entire year, in fact I think if we go back two years, has not called on the Republicans, the majority leadership, to meet with him at all. But today he meets with the Democrat leadership, and he announces that he has been engaged in this educational program all along. All he could cite was he talked about it in his State of the Union message and he sent it up in his budget.

I defy anyone to bring to me one bill written that was initiated by this President this year. One bill. Just show me the bill. Show me the bill. This President has not initiated one thing.

Now, he has taken credit for the economy, but I also challenge you to show me one thing he has initiated in this Congress and followed through on and got passed that was good for the economy. I deny anyone. The only thing I could think of was that he wanted Fast Track authority, negotiating authority for Fast Track. A little less than a year ago we tried to pass that. He could only deliver 32 of his Democrats to vote for fast track. I found out, because I am the Whip and working the votes, that many Democrats that wanted to vote for fast track did not trust this President, so they voted against it.

But this year he has not lifted a finger for education, not a finger for education, yet on the targeted adjournment date, Friday, he stands up and says, "I want my education bill," and he makes veiled inferences that he will shut down the government unless he gets what he wants.

This is the same President that has not even met with his cabinet but twice this year. He has only met with his cabinet twice in this whole year. The first time he met with them was to explain to them that he had no sexual relations, and the second time he met with them was to apologize to them for having sexual relations. That is the only time he has met with his cabinet. Now, during these meetings he did not meet on the world economic problems with Secretary Rubin. In the cabinet meeting he did not talk with the Secretary of Education.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The Chair would remind the gentleman that he should not refer to personal charges against the President.

Mr. DELAY. I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

In cabinet meetings also he did not discuss his foreign policy, his failed foreign policy with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. He has only met with his cabinet twice this year.

Now, he has been out on the campaign trail. He has been to 97 fund-raisers this year. He has been away from his office attending to other things rather than work 152 days out of the 280 days so far in this year. This President is not engaged in what is going on.

I want to talk a little bit about what he is holding us up about.

Mr. Speaker, I will talk about that in a minute. I am also going to try to put this in a little more perspective. Being in leadership, we have had to deal with this administration at the end of every year on these same things that we have always done, and it is just fascinating to watch.

I remember in 1995 when the President of the United States vetoed the continuing resolution and shut down the government. The government shut down for a few days. I will never forget, I think it was November 19, anyway, it was a Sunday night, an agreement was made with this President to reopen the government, and the agreement was that he would work with us to balance the budget, to save Medicare from bankruptcy and some other issues.

Within 15 minutes after opening the government, the President and his staff walked out, held a press conference, and reneged, reneged, on everything in that agreement.

Now, we have had to deal with that for the last 4 years. In fact, just this weekend they sent staff over here to make an agreement on drug policy, and there has been a lot of work by the chief deputy whip, Dennis Hastert, and others in this House, to put together a very comprehensive antidrug policy, but the administration or the staff of the administration has fought us every step of the way.

So they have been negotiating over last week, and finally came to some sort of an agreement. Of course, the President sent staff to make the agreement. And then after they had an agreement, the staff went back to the White House, we were informed that the staff that was negotiating with the majority leadership could not negotiate for the White House, and, therefore, reneged on the agreement.

Well, how in the world are we going to do business when you have a President of the United States that you cannot trust his word to hold an agreement for longer than an hour? That is what we are going through right now.

The other thing too, some of the sticky points with this administration is this President is fighting to the death for foreign aid to North Korea. That gives me an opportunity to talk about this administration's foreign policy.

It is amazing to me that some people in this House commend the President for being such a great and effective

President, but when you analyze his foreign policy, it is a complete disaster.

He wants more foreign aid for North Korea. Now, this is the President that was concerned, as we all were, with North Korea building nuclear weapons and threatening that part of the world. So he went and made an agreement with North Korea to stop doing that, and if they would do that, then what we would do would be we would give them more foreign aid and we would build them electric power plants.

Well, we have been giving them foreign aid. We find out that most of that foreign aid has gone to the military, not to the people of North Korea, and we are building their reactors for electricity, but the North Koreans are continuing with their building of nuclear weapons, and just this last summer shot a missile over the top of Japan.

You look at the President's policies in Iraq. Now, the President of the United States sent aircraft carriers in January and February to stand up to Saddam Hussein. He told the American people he was going to be tough on Saddam Hussein. Yet this summer we find out that he has surrendered to Saddam Hussein.

The President of the United States moved his trip from November to June to China, from November to June, and he goes to China and kow-tows with the communist leaders of China. He is accepted in Tiananmen Square where freedom fighters were gunned down, and he honored the troops that gunned down the freedom fighters in Tiananmen Square. And as he was leaving China, by the way, the trip costs about $50 million, while he was leaving China, he undermined the democracy on Taiwan and has never since then stood up and tried to support the democracy on Taiwan.

In the Middle East, they now are having photo ops with Arafat and Netanyahu in the last few days and weeks, and they are about to have a summit on Israel. Well, he has not lifted a finger to enforce the Oslo Accords and make Arafat comply with the agreements. That is where the problem is.

Now, all of a sudden, we find out we are going to pull everybody together, have a few more photo ops, but undermine what the people of Israel are trying to do. In fact, the President's own wife back in May said it might be a pretty good idea to have a Palestinian state in Israel, which would completely explode that part of the world. Yet the President of the United States has not emphatically stood up and said no, we will continue with our policy of opposing a unilateral move to create a Palestinian state in Israel.

I could go on and on. Russia was a complete fiasco. Nothing came out of Russia. This President, who wants to be treated different than any other American in this country and undermine the rule of law, went to Russia and demanded that they institute the rule of law. He was laughed at by the world because of that.

So part of the hangup and the reason we are here on Sunday afternoon negotiating with staff, not with the President, negotiating with staff, is that the President is holding us up. He could have come to us weeks ago and told us exactly what he needed and we could have been negotiating and probably would have met our targeted adjournment date.

Another hangup is he wants us, us being the American people, to take our hard-earned taxpayer money and give it to the International Monetary Fund, a failed agency, an agency that has undermined the economies of Russia and Indonesia, now is trying to undermine the economies of Brazil, a failed agency, they want to continue their failed programs by funding the IMF, and they do not want any reforms. They want the American people to give up their hard-earned taxpayer money and give it to the International Monetary Fund with no reforms so they can make secret loans at below market rates to failing economies of countries that ought to be moving towards a free market system, and what they want to do is prop up the kinds of political systems that have failed, and that is part of the problem of the economy in the world.

The other thing too that really grates on me a little bit, when we are trying to get our work done, you have the President sending out his attack dogs. Again, you know, we saw these attack dogs for eight months out defending this President, trying to destroy their enemies and misleading the American people for eight months. Now they are back out. I saw one on CNN late edition this morning, Paul Begala. And the misleading statements that Mr. Begala made were unbelievable. He said that we did not need a vote of inquiry in this House. He obviously does not know how the House operates. In order to proceed with impeachment proceedings you absolutely have to have a vote of inquiry to give the committee the right to proceed.

He said that Ken Starr was undermining the process by sending a letter right before we voted on the inquiry inferring that there would be more referrals coming from Ken Starr and just berated Ken Starr and tried to once again destroy the Independent Counsel because of this letter.

That letter was in answer to a bipartisan request coming from HENRY HYDE, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the ranking member JOHN CONYERS, asking Ken Starr if there might be some referrals.

□ 1745

Maybe this is a good time to talk about the 100,000 police officers that the gentleman from New Jersey was saying was such a successful program, because Paul Begala said that they had hired 100,000 police officers.

Mr. Speaker, that is not true. It has been about 4 or 5 years now that the program, another failed program passed by the Democrat Congress, was signed by the Democrat president, creating 100,000 police officers. The person, Ken Avery, we checked with, who is spokesman for the COPS program in the Justice Department, says that the vast majority of our jurisdictions have plans in place to retain officers beyond the lines of their grant.

This is a requirement of the grant program, that they agree, upon acceptance of the grant, and what that means is if they accept this money, it is only money for 3 years. Then the money is shut off and they have to keep that police officer on the payroll. In other words, they need to raise taxes locally, and that is the Federal Government causing local governments to raise taxes for a Federal program.

Avery himself says that the COPS program has only placed around 58,000. In 4 years, they have placed 58,000 cops, of this great 100,000 cop program on the streets of more than 10,000 cities and towns.

It is absolutely amazing to me that Members can stand here in this well and praise a program that not only has failed, because they do not, most of the police or law enforcement agencies around the country do not want the Federal Government, with their big sticky hands, in their business, and they think it is a poorly-designed program in the first place, and they do not want any part of it. Now the President is holding up the entire process of this Congress in order to put 100,000 teachers in.

Do Members really believe a program designed by this president would actually put 100,000 teachers in the classroom? They could not, over 4 years, put 100,000 cops on the street. This whole notion of these little things in this education proposal by the President, that these will change the educational system and save our schools.

It was brought up by my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) much earlier in the day, he was talking about the outlandish problems that he is seeing in East Texas about the school system. I need to remind the gentleman that part of the problem with the public schools in my great State of Texas is because the Democrats ruined them. I was there in 1984, and I will never forget it, I was in the State legislature, in the Texas House, when the Democrat Governor, Mark White, petitioned Ross Perot to design education reform in Texas.

Take what I am about to say and extrapolate it to the Federal Government. Before Mark White and Ross Perot ruined education in Texas,

Texas's local school districts controlled the education of their children. Texas, thank goodness, had set up funding for local schools way back when Texas was a Republic, and continued it when it became a State, so we had good, honest funds coming to our local school districts. But the school districts were in control of their local schools.

What did the Democrat, Mark White, do? He took away local control and centralized it in Austin, Texas. He created the Texas Education Board. All decisions are made in Austin, Texas, for all the local school boards. The local school boards now are nothing more than administrators for State mandates.

I submit that my friends on the other side of the aisle and the President of United States want to do the same thing. They constantly are trying to take away local control. They are trying to take away decisions made by parents, elected school boards, and teachers, and put them right here in Washington. They do it systematically, one little program after another over the years.

I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, they not only took away local control and put it in Austin, Texas, but in order so that they could not get to that board, they laid in another layer of bureaucracy called the Regional Educational Centers, so that local control, the local school districts had to go through one layer of bureaucracy before they could ever get to the State Board of Education.

I just think that we have a very sad situation going on outside this Chamber. I think what the basic problem here is that we have two very different philosophies of government.

I think the best example of their philosophy is in the school system right here in Washington, D.C. They have piled money on the school system of Washington, D.C. so high that it has collapsed under the weight. The school system here is bankrupt in ideas, bankrupt in substance. The children here, a little over 50 percent of them do not even finish high school. The teenage pregnancy rate is at an all-time high.

If we talk about not being able to fix buildings, they have more money than any other school district in America, and they have crumbling schools in Washington, in our national capital. Why? Because the bureaucrats have the money, that is why. The teachers do not have the money. The students do not have the money. The bureaucrats have the money. They believe it is the government's money. I believe it is the American family's money.

They have created a government so big that over 50 percent of the income of American families goes to government. If we add up State, local, and Federal taxes and the cost of regulations, 50 cents out of every hard-earned dollar that the American family makes today goes to the government.

Would it not be incredible if we could do what we want to do and get a president to sign our bills to shrink the size of government, eliminate wasteful Washington programs, eliminate some wasteful Washington bureaucrats; not create more, eliminate them, so that the American family could have more money in their pocket, so that if they want better schools to be built, they will have the money to pay the taxes in their local school districts, empowered by them, to raise the taxes to pay for the schools that they need?

No, we are going to keep the government growing bigger and bigger. We are going to keep it growing, and get more and more bureaucrats. We are going to get more and more of the Federal Government sticking their sticky fingers into our school districts, because that is what the President of the United States demands. But it is not their money.

It boggles my mind all the time. It is the same pocket that all the money comes from, the American family's pocket. That is where this money comes from. But why would we take the money out of the families in Sugarland, Texas, send it up to Bill Clinton, so that he can send it back to Sugarland, Texas, to hire more teachers and build more schools? It does not make sense. And it fails, because it is a failed philosophy. It is a failed notion.

We are trying to, to the best of our ability, trying to stop this president and we cannot, because he is president. If we are going to do the people's business, we have to negotiate with this president.

I hope he stays home tomorrow. He is going on another one of those fundraising trips. I challenge the President to stay here and work on these issues. He is going down to Palm Beach, Florida, to have another fundraiser and pina colada with Greg Norman. Then after that he is going to New York City, and he is going to raise some more money in New York City for a person, by the way, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CHARLES SCHUMER) who happens to be on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President stays here. We are going to stay here. Many of my colleagues have said we are trying to get out of town and we are trying to rush this, and we want the President to give us what we want so we can get out of town and go home and campaign.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. We know what we are about. We know what we are locked into. We will stay here all the way through the election. I will say it again, we will stay here gladly all the way through the election to get the people's business done.

It is amazing to me that people are complaining about a Congress that is not getting its work done, that we are the do-nothing Congress. They are partially right, we are the do-nothing-that-the-liberals-like Congress. We are in the majority, and we do not buy into the minority's philosophy. All their bills that they want us to pass, we are not going to pass them, because we do not believe in their philosophy.

The majority of this House does not believe in paying trial lawyers for health care. That is their Patient Bill of Rights. The President has not written a patient's bill of rights. We have not seen a bill from the President, but that is their Patient Bill of Rights. We have not seen a bill from the President on his education policies, but they say they have one.

Mr. Speaker, what we are here to do is what the American people have sent us to do. I get a little weary of people speaking for the American people. The American people believe this, the American people believe that, the American people whispered in my ear this afternoon and told me this.

I watch the American people, and the American people have rejected their philosophy. It is not by some poll, it is not by someone whispering in my ear, it is by election. The American people have rejected their philosophy all across this country.

The Republican Party has gained over 500 State legislative seats since Bill Clinton has been president. It has gained 14 governorships. We now have 75 percent of the American people living under a Republican Governor. We have taken the United States Senate, we have taken the United States House for the first time in 40 years, and held onto it for the first time, back-to-back Republican Houses, in 68 years. We have even had over 370 Democrats switch to the Republican Party all across this Nation. That is the real American people speaking.

Mr. Speaker, Members can say whatever they want to on this floor about who is at fault, back and forth, but we have tried it their way. We have tried it Bill Clinton's way.

Let me just finish with this. It is amazing to me that the President of the United States would hold up spending that amounts to about $1.7 trillion over his little, small education program. The American people ought to think about that just a minute, because we know what this is about.

This is another sham. This is another attempt to mislead the American people. This is another rhetorical outtake to try to win the election in November and take back the House, or give the President some sort of credibility and legitimacy. The American people have not bought it in the last 2 elections, and they are not going to buy it in this election.

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the distinguished majority whip, for yielding to me. Mr. Speaker, as I have had the honor and privilege of serving in this House, I am struck by what our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, tells us tonight, because we have seen example after example, sadly, of this President and this administration saying one thing and then doing another.

In fact, I think about the historic budget agreement that was reached last year by this allegedly do-nothing Congress to balance the budget for the first time in a generation, to set up budget caps, ceilings that were to remain inviolate.

Now, as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, points out, in the last nanosecond of the 11th hour, perhaps based on focus groups and extensive polling, suddenly, education becomes the watchword; sadly, not in an effort to improve education, which we believe is too important to be left up to Washington bureaucrats, but because of the endless posturing and preening and electioneering that continues, regardless of the dates on the calendar, but now has grown more frenetic and frantic, given the constitutional questions that confront us, and also our constitutional heritage of an election that approaches the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November. It is very insightful.

Mr. DELAY. I would just remind the gentleman it did not take the President 6 months to break this agreement. In his budget, and the only thing he has actually submitted to Congress was his budget, in his budget he broke the caps, he expanded government, he raised taxes, and created an incredible tax increase.

What is worse, as the President, who is claiming to be the education president, in his own budget he cut the IDEA program. That is the program that has been discussed earlier, the mandate from the Federal Government on local schools to provide education for our disabled students through special education programs.

□ 1800

Yet they promised they would provide 40 percent of that expense for IDEA. In the President's own budget, he cut IDEA.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, indeed, as I stand here from this unique vantage point in the House, I note that just behind the gentleman is a rostrum. On an annual basis, we invite the President of the United States here to offer a State of the Union message.

I remember this year the President's insistence when he said, about moving from the politics of deficit to the policies of surplus, not one penny out of the surplus unless it goes to save Social Security. Save Social Security first.

Yet, almost within the twinkling of an eye, there was the administration petitioning the Congress for close to $3 billion for spending in Bosnia. How profound. How prophetic the words of the columnist from the Arkansas Democrat Gazette, Paul Greenberg, who instructed all of us years ago, Mr. Speaker, in the case of President Clinton, listen not so much to what he says, instead, watch what he does.

And it has been trying, challenging, and ultimately tragic that we are beset by a chief executive who so often, in so many different circumstances, says one thing and then does another.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on that just a moment, saying one thing and doing another. The President evidently wants to become the education President in the last week of the 105th Congress.

He said on the day that was designated as the targeted adjournment day, the day that he started this effort, on the day that we had targeted to adjourn, "Members of Congress should not go home until they pass a budget that will strengthen our public schools for the 21st century."

The President, what he does, his record is, he has vetoed a D.C. scholarship bill to provide 2,000 of this capital's poorest children a chance to escape one of the worst school districts in this Nation. I described this school district earlier.

He vetoed the education savings accounts this year to provide middle income families with tax relief for elementary and secondary education expenses. He vetoed a back to basics common sense literacy program. He vetoed lowering costs for school construction bonds. He vetoed incentives for teacher testing and merit pay.

He vetoed safe schools, a safe school antigun provision. He vetoed a tax relief for employer provided education assistance and qualified State tuition programs. He vetoed seven pro-education bills.

He was so sinister in paying homage to the National Education Association that he would take away 2,000 scholarships from the poorest of the poor in the Nation's capital and give those scholarships to the parents of those poor children so that they could take those kids and put them in a school and hopefully get them an education.

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, since this White House is so poll driven, that is the one time this administration ignored the polling in this Federal capital district.

In the District of Columbia, where over 70 percent, well nigh close to 80 percent of parents, when given the choice, said, yes, we want to have an option and educational scholarships for our children. That should come as no surprise, Mr. Speaker.

Imagine the dilemma of parents whose heads hit the pillow every night knowing that they are sending their children into unsafe, unproductive schools, where their safety is threatened, where sadly they are not learning.

Yet, to have that wiped away in a show of allegiance to factions and groups who insist they want to improve education but instead seem to want to expand the educational bureaucracy is yet another reason why we find ourselves in this dilemma of the factually challenged White House and a factually challenged President.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from a Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our majority whip. He has been a leader in pointing out a lot of the inconsistencies and problems of this administration as well as being a strong voice for conservative principles. It is an honor to be associated with the gentleman in this special order.

I think the gentleman has made the basic point here that, and I wanted to elaborate on it and get into it a little bit in detail, because I chose when I got elected to Congress in 1994 to pick to go onto the Committee on Education and the Workforce and to choose that as my first choice, not something that many Republicans do.

Because I wanted to come in and do battle. My background, besides being in the private sector business, I had been a staffer for 10 years for first Congressman and then Senator COATS and was Republican staff director with the Children, Youth, and Families Committee in the House for 4 years, and then worked as legislative director and deputy chief of staff for Senator COATS in the Senate where, predominantly, I worked with a lot of the difficult social issues.

I do not think there is anybody that is going to deny the importance of education or how we need to deal with education. We may have some differences of local, State, and Federal, and we even have differences within our party, and the other party has differences.

We are not really going to question, I do not believe, that the President is committed to education. I was over at the White House for the higher ed markup the other day, and I think he is very committed to certain parts of that education.

But we do have a fundamental question of what is happening right now and why we are here this weekend. The President was up here for the State of

the Union Address. We saw what is coming now. He said, we are going to use all the surplus for Social Security. Then, for about 15 or 20 pages, for about 45 minutes went on with spending program after spending program that would have bankrupted this government for the next 10 years.

Just in child care alone, he had, I am forgetting, it was like $20 billion. It was a phenomenal kind of the twofer approach that we are starting to see now.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is called the Clinton pivot.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes. Mr. Speaker, he is moving so fast, it is hard to tell when it is an actual pivot.

Mr. Speaker, then what happened this year, he sent down a series of proposals, as he does regularly, to try to nationalize education. Because his philosophy of education is that, unless he does something, nothing is happening in education, unless it comes out of the President. When he was governor, it had to come out of the governor. But now that he is President, it has to come out of the President.

As they propose these different things, the Democrats did not even pick them up. We heard very little about it in the Committee on Education and the Workforce; occasionally a whine here or there, occasionally a whine on the floor. But basically his policies just lay in state almost.

We went through several major pieces of legislation, the higher education bill, where we worked and wound up with a bipartisan bill that has many important parts to it that was signed last week. We just completed and passed through a bill to reauthorize Head Start, community services block grant, and other things.

We have been working for 4 years trying to get compromises on vocational education and job training legislation. We did Dollars to the Classroom through here. We have been moving education bills, as has been pointed out today numerous times, 25 different bills in this 2-year term.

We have been moving education bills, and the President basically signs them. In fact, the day after he blasted us for not having an education policy, he invited us over to the White House to sign the higher ed bill.

Then yesterday, he blasted us on education. Probably in the next day or two, we will have a signing of the Head Start bill. There is a disconnect here of what is going on. The gentleman very well prepared, I think, the general public for what is going on here.

In the last couple of days, he has refound these education bills. There can only really be two explanations. One is that he realized, contrary to all the grandstanding that we hear, because the process that we hear is, just give us a clean appropriations bill and put nothing on it, and that the Republicans, I heard this on some news broadcast yesterday, again the Republicans want to put additional things on the spending bills.

Why would we want to do that? Maybe because he vetoes everything else that has substantive reform. The only way to do it is to put it on an appropriations bill. But he is doing the same thing. He wants to put unauthorized, which is basically not allowed by House rules, new programs on appropriations bills.

Whatever he is saying about Republicans on pro-life principles and other things, he is doing on education principles. That is point one.

Point two is, as I have pointed out several times today, this looks very much like the "Wag The Dog" movie. I personally do not believe that the movie was very realistic. I do not believe a President of the United States, including in the terrorism incident, would put American lives at stake just for his own political gain.

But I do believe a President would put something like this to try to make us look like we are the bad guys in Congress. I mean, with all due respect to our majority whip, and I do not mean this personal to him because he is a strong conservative, but some of us believe we have already negotiated too much away in this budget, that sometimes our negotiators, probably when they were growing up on Halloween, when they went to the door and said trick or treat, they gave the people the candy rather than the people giving them the candy.

We seem more than willing to surrender in these appropriations bills, yet the President still does not want to deal. Why does he not want to deal? Maybe because today's Washington Post and other papers have "Are the Republicans Going to Shut Down the Government" on the front page, instead of whether or not what problems he has with impeachment, with Monica Lewinsky, with Chinese contributors, and so on.

If I can take one more minute before we engage. One of the issues is national testing, that national testing is something that neither his base likes; teachers do not like it. The blacks and Hispanics are worried they are going to discriminate against them.

Conservatives do not like it because, if you have a national test, potentially every home school or every Christian school, everybody who has concerns about a national test could all of a sudden have a standard that they cannot get into college, they cannot get Federal employment, they cannot get into the military. It could become the standard around the country. We do not know what are going to be in these national tests.

The President every year wants to fight over this national testing.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the national tests, therefore, leads to involvement of the Federal Government in designing curriculum. The gentleman just before us, in the special order before us, was talking about, we do not want to get into the curriculum. Yet, the national testing is the back doorway of the Federal Government designing curriculum for our local schools.

Mr. SOUDER. Absolutely. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, how could you have a national test? Every teacher with a right mind and every principal would say teach to the test. That means, to teach to the test, they have to have courses that have the subject matter that is in the test. It is not even logical. I mean, anybody with basically about a first grade or a Head Start or preschool education ought to be able to figure that is curriculum.

But I wanted to give a couple reasons this afternoon why the President should actually oppose national testing to see if we can move him in the direction. Because this is the report card for President Clinton the first semester.

If the subject is math, he clearly would get a D minus because he misses basic arithmetic. For example, he sent over ag. appropriations that were less than what he vetoed the other day. I mean, wait a second here. Let us look at the math. This is like blaming us for school lunches when his bill was actually less than we funded in school lunches but then said we tried to cut it.

His math does not work. He can't be for a balanced budget and say our tax cuts are taking away from the surplus. But he can propose surplus. His math is D minus, is a little generous.

In history, we have an incomplete, because, clearly, he is following the Nixon parallel well. He has read up on Nixon. He has got all the things, yell at the special prosecutor, stonewall them, all that down. But he does not understand other parts of history too well. So we gave him an incomplete there.

In citizenship, he gets an F. He fails to grasp the basic concept of a respect for the legal process. The perjury, what you tell your staff to do, that is a clear F.

Health. He fails there with an F. He fails to master the dangers of illegal drugs. In fact, just the other day, apparently we thought we had an agreement on the two drug bills. Senator LOTT now says that, since General McCaffrey agreed with this, the President apparently said General McCaffrey did not speak for this administration, and they want to go through the drug bill piece by piece.

He continues the lack of I did not inhale, all that kind of thing. Plus he relies on lawyers instead of doctors. Basic health, he thinks the way that we get health care reform in this country is to put it in the hands of the lawyers.

In foreign languages, we did give him an A. He interacts well with the Chinese unable to speak English. He has clearly done really well in a lot of the fund-raising from overseas. Nonnationals contributed to his campaign. So he gets a good A in foreign languages.

We should have given him an A in English, too, because he really is precise. He tries to sort out exactly what "is" means. He tries to go through the preciseness of the English language to make sure that he is avoiding saying anything he did not mean.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, in fact, he is very good. He is trying to rewrite the dictionary.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes. Mr. Speaker, that is a good point.

In science, we gave him a D. He misimplies census statistics. Clearly he does not know how to count and what the Constitution means regarding counting and what math means there. Sampling is one thing, but when we come down to actually getting a count, sampling does not really work.

Furthermore, he fails on missile defense. Clearly, Moscow is 80 percent protected. We do not have anything protected. He does not understand some basic science there. We could also throw in environmental science in here where he has no real understanding of the fundamentals of the environmental science.

□ 1815

In government, he would get a D. He lacks knowledge of the role of Congress. He was elected, he keeps reminding people he was elected President. We were elected to control the House and the Senate. At some point here, somebody has got to make a deal. We are are all adults. We get upset that we cannot see pro basketball right now. We say, why cannot adults, knowing they have the differences, sit down. It is not like there are any surprises. It is not like they have not been been talking and warning each other for two years. Unless one side has a posturing point here, we ought to be able to sit down and do that. Economics, we give him a C minus. He does not understand tax incentive very well. He does understand what a balanced budget is but, then he wants to spend the surplus. He signed the agreement. Gave him a C minus there.

Mr. DELAY. I might also add, you cannot spend the surplus on tax cuts for the American family, but it is okay to spend the surplus for all his government programs.

Mr. SOUDER. He clearly does not deserve more than a C minus.

Mr. DELAY. You are being magnanimous.

Mr. SOUDER. I try to be generous to the President when possible. In physical education he got an A. He is an excellent golfer and a jogger. No comment beyond that.

In attendance, we have had an attendance problem. We have a serious attendance problem. He spent 153 days this year traveling, 32 for vacation, 57 for fund-raisers and other extraneous events. He has only held two cabinet meetings so clearly we have a focus and attention problem. Just out of the kindness of my heart, we did not put a conduct rating up. In fact, the question is what exactly would you write in a conduct. It would be very hard if you were his teacher to give him a conduct rating.

But given all this, you would think that this would persuade him that he should be against national testing, because with a national test he himself would not be able to pass.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman and his comments. I think he puts it so succinctly and directly that the American people can understand what is really going on here.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again, Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect to this ongoing saga that we would be remiss if we did not point out. Because as my colleague from Indiana just briefly touched on, there seems to be a tendency in this town for members of the fourth estate, that is to say, the press, to view things with a prism that always and forever supplies a benefit of the doubt to the executive branch and to the administration.

You mentioned that in terms of the alleged government shutdown that may be formulated at this time.

I think it is also important, again, to review the itinerary that we understand the President will follow tomorrow. Tomorrow the President will not be involved in negotiations to end this stalemate. The President will instead first go to Palm Beach, Florida and then follow up that trip with a trip tomorrow night to New York City to fund raise for his political party and for candidates including in New York City a gentleman who serves in this House, who also serves on the Committee on the Judiciary and who entertains ambitions of moving across this Capitol into the other body.

Now, again, I should point out that we certainly know why Washington fancies itself a sophisticated place, sometimes sophisticatedly cynical. But even with the collective mindset of journalists and the punditocracy in Washington, D.C., certainly, Mr. Speaker, we can detect some conflict of interest. Indeed, my colleague from Indiana, in his other position in oversight on the yet another committee, we understand that given campaign finance difficulties of the minority party in this Chamber, apparently in excess of $1 million, some $1.7 million has yet to be refunded that the minority party in this Chamber claimed they would do given the status of those contributions and the apparent illegalities involved. Does the gentleman from Indiana have a comment on that?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes. Hopefully later today we will be talking further about that. In fact, this is interesting, the board that I chose to put the national testing on is one I had earlier of 94 witnesses who have fled the country or pled the fifth.

The problem is that you have to change this part up here a lot. It is now 116 or 118 people. We know that a number of these witnesses, they have had to refund the money, but others are still pending. If they would talk to us, we probably would have a lot more money that has been illegal. As Chairman HOEKSTRA'S oversight investigation of the Teamsters, he sees the same money laundering pattern there. As these things move up, you start to see the same names pop up in different places. They have some real problems. They would like to make this whole discussion of what Congress has been focusing on just about the legal questions or about personal affairs of the President or people in the White House, but the truth is that it is a lot more complicated. It would be nice if some people helped come forward to clean up the process that this government has sunk into.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Again, I am somewhat amazed and chagrined that now over 100 people, almost 120 people have either taken the fifth amendment or fled the country with regard to this investigation. It only compounds the difficulty that sadly we see in this city within this government, within the executive branch.

As I was looking at the report card offered the President by my colleague from Indiana, Mr. Speaker, I thought about my own children, their educational experience and the fact that our youngest, John Micah, not to be confused with the gentleman in the chair from Florida tonight, but John Micah with an "h" at the end of his middle name, is fond of a new endeavor at school, being a year out of kindergarten and being 4½, something called connect the dots. And it is a metaphor for what is transpiring within the executive branch of this government, to the point where we have moved past connecting the dots in some areas of conduct and, to mix metaphors, we have moved from that endeavor of connecting the dots to Hans Christian Andersen's fairy tale of the emperor's new clothes or the lack thereof.

It is amazing, again, to see the willingness of people to turn away, to actually try, through the punditocracy to distract us, to suggest that constitutional procedures should not be followed, that it really would be better to try and find an unconstitutional or extra constitutional third way that is just as devoid of reality as any fanciful tale you could find in children's literature.

Mr. DELAY. The gentleman is right. I think he has expounded on his

premise of where he quoted Paul Greenberg, do not watch what the President says, watch what he does. The gentleman from Indiana, as he says, is on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

My question is, who is in charge? We do not know who to deal with anymore. We have been here all weekend. We are going into more negotiations tomorrow, and who knows how long we will be here. And again, I tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we will stay here until we get it done. But this whole notion of who is in charge and what he says and how he backs up what he says, we have already talked about the fact that having 100,000 teachers being paid for by the Federal Government would be as successful as the 100,000 cops that they have not funded yet. There are only 58,000 that have actually been put on the streets because nobody, most people do not want to participate.

The gentleman is on the Education Committee. I seem to remember that along with that, the President wants to improve the technology, put computers in every classroom, those kinds of things. In fact, I think his quote was, the budget should also bring cutting edge technology to the classroom, the library.

Does not the Department of Education have a trust fund and they have had a trust fund to bring technology to the classroom and it has been in place for over 2 years. And not one dime has been spent on improving technology in the classroom. So they have this bunch of money sitting out there. That was not good enough.

The President of the United States got the phone companies to raise taxes on phone calls, we call it the Gore tax on long distance, to help fund this effort, and that was not even part of the agreement, when the bill was actually passed a couple of years ago. Another almost shutdown where the President demanded new programs and things like that. But there is money there. There is a trust fund set up, and they cannot even spend it. So they propose a program for rhetorical reasons. They get what they want by negotiating out the final outcome of spending, yet when they are given it, they cannot even implement it. They are so incompetent they cannot even implement those programs.

Mr. SOUDER. I think it is important for those who may not be real C-SPAN junkies who may be watching today, you did not say the President is trying to provide Gortex to people. It is a Gore tax. The vice president has proposed a tax on all American consumers to pay for one of their pet programs. A lot of times when we say it real fast, it sounds like Gortex.

I think you have hit the fundamental point. There is a difference. In my heart of hearts, I believe that the President and the First Lady have a sincere commitment to education. I believe, however, they want to nationalize it. Furthermore, the way they do that is they poll test. I had the unusual experience, when I was working with Senator COATS for 2 years, to work with Dick Morris, who is a very brilliant pollster, but he tests different things to see, and these things get the highest response, even down to the words with the little things on your arm where you try to see which words get the response.

My daughter is an elementary ed and her secondary emphasis in education is preschool education. And as I mentioned, I am on the committee. I also am more of a neoconservative than a particular libertarian. We may have some differences on this, but there is a framework for the Federal Government within to work. That is, if certain school districts, say, in inner city Chicago or New York do not get covered or do not have the property tax base and they do not get covered at their State, we have developed programs at the Federal level, chapter 1, TRIO accounts and so on, to say for the very poor there is a Federal role. We also, because a lot of States and local governments ignore the handicap, have developed a program called IDEA. We developed Head Start. It is not that the Federal Government is not in education.

Quite frankly, almost everybody in this body votes for those particular programs every year. The question is that that was a very particular need. These, I believe, as you stated, are poll driven. Even when the money is there, they do not use it. There is no reason that every school district has to surrender their sovereignty on computers and that type of thing, that there can be, there are plenty of targeted funds that can be better used.

We did far better for this country by balancing the budget, getting interest rates down, getting taxes down in local communities and giving families more money to work with so they can try to make the decisions at the local schools. If we are going to fund Federal programs, it takes a lot of gall for the President of the United States to propose new programs when he has not funded the programs for the handicapped children in this country. If he is going to spend money, he ought to give it to those who are hurting and where we have a consensus, not come up with new gimmicks.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentlemen from Arizona and Indiana participating in this special order. The insight was very valuable.

□ 1830

MANAGED CARE REFORM AND OTHER TOPICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to start out this evening by pointing out that the problem that I as a Democrat and I think most of the Democrats have with what has been happening here the last 2 years is not necessarily that we are not willing to debate with the Republicans on these issues because in many ways I think that what happened today in the discussion that we have had today on both sides of the aisle has been rather interesting. The problem is that on most of the Democratic initiatives which I think are the initiatives that the average citizen is concerned about, we have not had the opportunity to bring them up. We have talked as Democrats about how we want to bring up before the Congress adjourns education concerns, money to modernize our schools, to hire additional teachers, 100,000 new teachers. We are going to talk this evening in the next hour quite a bit about HMO reform. We have talked about the need to address Social Security because we know that eventually down the road there is not going to be enough money in the Social Security trust fund. But what we have found is that the Republican leadership does not allow these things to come up. They do not even allow, and the very debate that we have had tonight in the context of these special orders is not a debate that we are allowed to have on legislative issues because the legislation that deals with these education or HMO, health care concerns or Social Security concerns, we do not get an opportunity to deal with it. The Republicans control the House. The Republicans decide what comes to the floor. And they have basically stalled and not allowed most of these concerns that the American public has to even be considered. That is why we are here tonight on Sunday to debate this, why we are demanding that these issues be addressed before we go home, and all we keep hearing from the other side of the aisle is that they want to get out of here quickly, they think they have completed their business. Well, they have not completed their business. We would like to point that out.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut who started the special orders earlier this afternoon and who has been our leader on so many of these issues.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I just wanted to make a couple of points before we start our hour's time here. The gentleman who led the previous discussion here this evening is the third-ranking leader in the House of Representatives, the majority whip. I think it was interesting to note that he commented about the government shutdown 2 years ago. What is quite extraordinary to note is that the government was

shut down twice, unheard of in the history of the United States, by the Republican majority because, as my colleague from New Jersey has rightly said, and sometimes people do not understand this, when the party is in power and they have the majority, they control what happens here. You can say anything that you want about the Democrats were in the majority and you could agree or disagree on what they have, but the fact of the matter is that the Republicans control both the House and the Senate. But an interesting point, because he talked about how terrible a government shutdown would be and that is not what they were looking for and that it was the President looking for a government shutdown. Well, I was so stunned by a comment that the majority whip made when the government was shut down 2 years ago that quite honestly I had it blown up and I have it in my office because I could not believe anyone who held such an honor and held a position in this body would say such a thing. It was in a Texas newspaper and I am happy to provide it to anyone who would like to see it. I am not making this up. He said that when he heard that the government was reopened, that it was the worst moment, and I am paraphrasing, the worst moment of his life. He was grilling steaks on his balcony with some other Republican members, and he said, "We should have kept the government closed for as long as it was necessary."

Now, he has the luxury of saying that because he was earning a salary while the government was closed and people who were furloughed or laid off had no idea whether or not they were going to get their salaries, and the hundreds and hundreds of services that are supplied by this United States Government were shut down. So that he truly is someone who, in fact, was pleased that the government was shut down in the past, and I hasten to view that he would not mind if that happened again. That is where they are going.

I might also make just one more point. We are talking about how this Republican majority, how they legislate and the reasons for what they do and how that is tied in to special interest money. There is a big argument, if you will, a feud, GOP Feuding About Lobbyists. The point here, and it is in the papers here, again the majority whip is locked in a feud with the chairman of the Republican Conference because what they want to do is to dump the choice of president of something called the Electronic Industries Alliance. The long and the short of it, the person that is scheduled to become the president of this organization is a former Member of the House, Representative Dave McCurdy, who is a Democrat from Oklahoma. Essentially what they want to do, and this is by their own admission here, this is a quote, they want to send a message to this EIA that Republicans will not deal with trade associations and lobbying groups run by Democrats. Now, this is a quote by John Linder who is the head of their Republican Congressional Campaign Committee who says, quote, we think they, "they" being the trade associations, et cetera, ought to look back and see who won the last couple of elections. And Mr. Linder confirmed that Republican leaders held intellectual property legislation, that means that our patents, all of our inventions, that laws restricting foreign governments, speaking of foreign governments, Chinese, everywhere where they are stealing our intellectual property around the world. What he is saying is that they held the legislation hostage that would have restricted foreign governments from stealing our intellectual property. He confirmed, "Republican leaders held intellectual property legislation favored by these EIA members hostage, quote, to send a message, that if you don't play by the Republican rules and don't do business with the Democrats, we are not going to pass legislation and you are not going to be able to get anything done up here." That is the way this Republican majority is dealing, fast and loose, fast and loose with the lives of the people in this country. It is on intellectual properties, it is on tobacco, 3,000 of our kids start to smoke every single day, a thousand of whom die. And they refused to pass tobacco legislation in this body. They are the single biggest recipients of tobacco dollars in the country. So who are they kidding when they talk about what they want to do for the American public? It was Mr. DELAY, it was Mr. GINGRICH who said, "There isn't enough money in our system. That's why we cannot pass campaign finance reform." And it was the Republican leadership of this House who said take Social Security dollars and squander them away.

Mr. PALLONE. "And let Medicare wither on the vine."

Ms. DELAURO. That is right.

Mr. PALLONE. That was Speaker NEWT GINGRICH's quote.

Ms. DELAURO. I believe it was Mr. ARMEY, the second-ranking member, who said Social Security is not a system that ought to be in existence or that we ought to have a part of. We need to remember some of those things.

In terms of public education, what we were talking about before, they would just as soon see public education come crumbling down and take public education and take those dollars and put them in the hands of the very few and the very rich and take away our birthright to education in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to introduce the gentlewoman from California, but I just wanted to follow up on one of the things that the gentlewoman from Connecticut said. I am glad that she brought up this issue of Mr. DELAY, his remarks that he made when the government had been shut down by the Republicans and he regretted the fact that it was not shut down longer. There is a basic difference of philosophy here, or ideology, and, that is, that this Republican leadership does not believe in the government essentially, and they believe that it is better if the government does nothing. I have had many Republicans on the other side of the aisle the last couple of days say, "Well, it doesn't matter if we're labeled as the do-nothing Congress because a do-nothing Congress is better." Many of them actually believe that. They do not look at the concerns that we have for the health and the safety and the protection of the average American as something that is actually positive. Remember that the issues that we feel that they should be raising, managed care reform, as far as many of them are concerned, there is no need for managed care reform because they do not have a problem with the insurance industry basically running roughshod over the American people and not providing medically necessary procedures and operations and length of stay in the hospital that a person needs to provide for adequate health care.

As far as education issues, I think the gentlewoman is right when she says that for many of them they would just as soon not have public education. So when we talk about modernizing school or class size, that is not their concern. They want more students to go to private schools. They are not concerned about public education. When we talk about Social Security, we have heard some of these same leaders say that Social Security was a bad thing from the beginning, so they are not concerned about whether or not we bring up efforts to try to shore up Social Security. She mentioned teen smoking. The same thing. Let the tobacco interests sell whatever they want to whomever. That is laissez faire. They believe that. They are not going to have us play some role in trying to protect young people or teenagers from smoking. And on down the line. Minimum wage. They do not want to raise the minimum wage. We have had to fight that so many times. Every time it has been raised here, it has been a battle by the Democrats to try to raise minimum wage. As far as they are concerned, there is no need to deal with that. For them to talk about how they really care about these issues, they do not care about these issues, they want to go home and they are proud of the fact, many of them, not all, but many of them that this is a do-nothing Congress. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and I thank

the gentlewoman from Connecticut for this day of standing up for the rights of the minority party. I was listening to the majority whip yammer along about the fact that blaming everybody else for this being a do-nothing Congress. Of course if he had anything to say about what they had achieved, they would have stood there and told us what they had done. Instead, they talked and talked and talked about why nothing had happened and pointed fingers and blamed others. If they had managed this Congress any better than the Soviets managed Chernobyl, they would have something to say. If they had been working on the American public's needs instead of trying to raid Social Security, trying to cut taxes so the wealthy could benefit, trying to give education tax breaks for private schools, cheating the public education funding and threatening our national resources with anti-environmental riders, maybe they would have achieved enough that they could have stood up there earlier and said, "But this is what we did." But instead they had to say, "Oh, it's everybody else's fault, not ours." I will quote the Vice President in his saying, "The right hand does not know what the far right hand is doing," if they had their ranks together. They are the majority. And at what cost have they left this country without really anything except renaming National Airport to the Ronald Reagan Airport. They have not produced a managed care bill. There has been no bill to train and hire more teachers so we can reduce class size. They have no bill to modernize our schools, no safeguards for our Social Security, nothing to reduce teen smoking, no increase in minimum wage for working families, and the campaign finance bill that passed the House over their dead bodies, if Members can remember what Majority Whip DeLay said and what the Speaker said about campaign finance reform. And then when we did pass it, it could not get through the Republicans in the other body. They forget. They forget that children, 25 percent of our population are 100 percent of our future. Because of that, they are setting a record, a record that has not been broken for generations, for the least amount of days worked, the least number of bills enacted and the first time since the budget process was created, they have failed to pass a budget. This is not management. This is disaster. That is why they are complaining over there and trying to blame somebody else. But our families deserve better. It is time for a change.

Let me tell you how this has affected our children. 71,682,000 of our population in the United States are children. 10,000,743 more American children have no health insurance, that is up over 10 million from the start of this Congress. This number has continued to rise during the 105th Congress. It continues. Five thousand schools in the United States are in desperate need of repair and many are unfit learning environments.

□ 1945

Zero, none, of the 100,000 teachers needed to reduce class size and improve education quality have been approved; 14,113,000 children are living in poverty. This is in the richest Nation in the world. Despite a very strong economy, children continue to represent 40 percent of the impoverished while compromising only 20 percent of the Nation's population, and yet we have to remember 100 percent of the Nation's future. Seventy-three percent more children have taken up a daily smoking habit. Each day 3,000 kids become habitual smokers. Of these 1,000 will die of smoking-related illnesses.

It is time that we turn the debate to the needs of our children, our seniors, our environment. Enough about politically inspired investigations, and excessive partisanship and wasteful spending on duplicative and wasteful Republican committee investigations that have ended in dead ends, costing millions of American dollars. Instead, we have to do something about managed care reform. We have to have campaign finance reform. We have to have bills that will reduce teen smoking. We have to have bills that will enhance environmental protections. And we must raise the minimum wage. Then our children will be considered our number one priority. But most of all, making them our number one priority, we must invest in their education. We cannot leave here without an agreement for 100,000 more teachers and new and improved classrooms.

Twenty-five percent of our population are our children. One hundred percent of our future are those same children.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman, and I wanted to point out tonight, if we could just spend a little time on the issue of HMO reform, because all three of us went over to the Senate; I believe it was a couple days ago now when the democratic majority leader Mr. DASCHLE tried for the last time, and he has tried many times, to bring up the issue of HMO reform or the Democratic, really bipartisan, proposal that we call the Patients Bill of Rights. And many of us in the House, the three of us included, went over to the Senate and basically stood in the back of the room to show our support for the effort to bring up HMO reform, and, as you know, it was a defeated. We had a couple of Republicans that joined all the Democrats, but not enough because we do not have the majority to bring it up and to discuss it.

Again, we were only asking that the Senate take up the issue on the floor. The issue of whether they passed something, the Patients' Bill of Rights or any kind of managed care reform, never came up. Again, we are just asking that they consider these things as part of the debate, and that was denied, and that unfortunately probably means the death knell of that issue in the Congress for this year.

What I wanted to point out very emphatically, if I could, is that what the Democrats and some Republicans, this is not just a Democratic issue, but it is something opposed by the Republican leadership; what the Democrats are asking for are very simple common sense protections.

Most people, when I discuss this with them, unless they have had a problem with their HMO, you know, because maybe they have been healthy and have not had to deal with this, they think that these things are already there. They are surprised to learn that these protections do not already exist, and just to give you an idea, I just listed some of the main ones here that we would like to have provided for all patients, all Americans, is guaranteed access to needed health care specialists; if you need a specialist, that you should be able to get one; access to emergency room services. Many people go to the emergency room and are either turned away or find out later that their health insurance will not cover the emergency room care. Continuity of care protections, access to timely internal and external appeal; if the HMO or insurance company denies you a particular procedure, then you should be able to appeal that and have it overturned. Limits on financial incentives to doctors. Unfortunately, and many people are surprised to learn, that doctors in many managed care organizations are actually encouraged and given extra money if they limit the number of people that are provided care, assuring doctors and patients can openly discuss treatment options. Can you imagine? I do not think there is anybody probably who thinks that there is anything out there that would deny doctors and patients the right to openly discuss treatment options. We live in a free society, we value the first amendment, and yet many of the HMOs tell their physicians that they cannot talk about treatment options that are not covered by the health insurance. It is called the gag rule, which is un-American. Assuring that women have direct access to OB/GYN; I know that Congresswoman DeLauro has been very much involved with that and some of the other issues that women have been denied by their insurance companies, various types of care, and lastly an enforcement mechanism that insures recourse for patients who are maimed or die because of health plan actions. Many people do not know that if their HMO denies them a particular type of care and they are seriously insured or

die from it, that they cannot sue the HMO. Well, they should be able to.

We are just pointing these things out because we think that every American should be guaranteed these basic protections. But if we do not enact them into law, if we just proceed with this do-nothing Congress that says that the government does not have to do anything, you know laissez-faire, or whatever the term is, then we have a situation where these insurance companies simply deny care, decide what is medically necessary, and you have no recourse, and that is what we are trying to prevent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman again.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, you said that maybe some of our colleagues have never experienced the shortcomings of managed care because they are healthy. Well, oops, maybe it is because they can afford other coverage. It might have something to do with people being wealthy, and I think we have to remember that, and we have to continually remember that if an appeal process does not have real teeth, it is not an appeal process.

There is some very good managed care providers in my district, the Sixth Congressional District in California. I mean they are models for the Nation. But I tell you we can be assured that even these good managed care providers are going to have to give up some of their quality, some of their standards if we do not have real reform because they will have to compete, and they will be competing against providers that do not do as well, do not do as much, do not have protections, and everybody is going to lose because we will be slipping sliding to the lowest rung of the ladder; there is no question about it.

We have to have real managed care reform, and the doctors in my district want it. They want to be part of making the decision about health care with their patient. They do not want to have to be listening to what a clerk in an insurance company is telling them that they can to or not do for their patient. The patient and the doctor want to make those decisions, and the insurance company is responsible for paying for it.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman and yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I think that this is such an appropriate discussion, and it is such an issue that is on the minds of the American people, and that is what is being flaunted here. It is not us. It is about what the American people have talked about in terms of the whole managed care system which they find is out of control.

There was a recent Times CNN poll that found that 76 percent of Americans support managed care reform. Only 41 percent said that they were very confident that their health care plan would pay for their treatment if they really got sick. And now you have another, and most people, and I think everybody saw it, As Good As It Gets, the movie where there is the great applause line when Helen Hunt expresses her frustration with the HMOs and managed care because people feel that that is out of control, that they, in fact, have no way of being able to handle this system.

More recently we have found that the HMOs are pulling out of Medicare and leaving seniors on their own. It has happened in my State of Connecticut where we have 12,000 people now who are, you know, trying to scramble around for what they are going to do for their health care. Now, it is not only happening in Connecticut, it is happening all over the country. So, the fact is that the public truly knows that the managed care system is out of control.

Now we tried to address that, as both my colleagues have pointed out, with a very simple set of guidelines, if you will, in which my colleague from New Jersey mentioned about emergency room care, and speciality care and continuity of care if your employer changes plans, and employers change plans every year now.

Just interesting to note that that was a bipartisan piece of legislation. There are lots of folks said if we can put the bickering aside and do something on behalf of the American public, let us set the record straight. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. Dingell, Ganske, a number of other folks including the gentleman from New Jersey who worked very hard on this issue that could have passed this House in a heartbeat. But go back to the notion that who was in charge? Who has the jurisdiction to bring up the legislation? Who has the jurisdiction to hold hearings?

Three days of hearings on the issue of managed care reform; contrast, 63 days of hearings on politically-motivated investigations. More to the point: 2 days of hearings on renaming National Airport the Ronald Reagan Airport.

Now for 3 days, only 3 days for our health care system, they finally passed; they brought up after months and months, they passed this sham bill, sham bill, and I just want to mention it because they will come up and claim that they passed a HMO bill, but let me just say that it makes things worse, the bill that they passed. It does not guarantee coverage of emergency care, it does not guarantee privacy of medical records. That is your medical records which today is such a problem with regard to employment or with regard to insurance coverage can be given away to anyone without your knowledge. It would not guarantee access to specialists, it does not guarantee the continuity of care if your doctor is arbitrarily dropped from the plan, does not hold health plans accountable for their decisions when things go wrong. And above all, above all, it will not give the power to decide what is medically necessary to your doctor.

That is the fundamental reason people want to see health, managed care reform because of they want doctors to make the decisions along with them, with themselves.

Again, this is thwarting the will of the public, it is thwarting the will of the majority in both the House and in the Senate, and they recently, just 2 days ago, defeated managed care. That is not the way that this place should be operating. We are here to represent people's interests. We are not for political reasons to thwart the will of the people particularly on their health care and their health and their safety.

Mr. PALLONE. The gentlewoman points out, makes a very good point I should say, with regard to the HMO reform, and that is that, as we know, back in August, there was so much heat, if you will, on the Republicans to deal with the issue of managed care reform, so many constituents who were clamoring that they take up the issue that they finally did just on one day with a very brief debate on the House floor allow the issue to come up. But what they did as a result of that was to pass a bill that was actually worse than the status quo.

I have not been dwelling that much on that, although I think we should talk about it a little bit because when it went over to the Senate, they would not even take that sham bill up. So we are faced in a situation now where they will not even bring it up again because they think that, you know, circumstances have changed and the public is not paying as much attention to that, which I think is garbage. There is no question that the public is still very much concerned about it.

But if we can just take a minute to elaborate a little more on this sham bill that they brought up, and I think you pointed out this issue of medical necessity which is really the heart of this debate because when we say that a person is not getting care, it is usually because they are not allowed to have a certain operation or they are told they cannot stay in the hospital more than 2 days for a certain procedure, and so the decision about what is medically necessary in that case, just to have the operation or to stay the extra few days, is essentially made by the insurance company.

□ 1900

What the Democratic or bipartisan, if you will, Patients' Bill of Rights says is that medical necessity will be based on generally accepted principles of professional medical practice.

So it goes back to what the physicians and the physician groups say is

necessary, as opposed to what the insurance companies say. They do not change that in their bill. They simply say it is up to the insurance company to decide what is medically necessary.

This kind of trickery goes on for just about everything in their bill. Emergency room care is another example. You can theoretically go to any emergency room under the Republican bill, but there is no guarantee that the insurance company is going to pay for it.

We use this example of severe pain, because under the Democratic bill, we use a lay person's standard, a prudent layperson. Obviously the prudent or typical citizen, if you will, if they get severe pain in their chest, figures they had better go to the emergency room because they may be having a heart attack.

Under the Republican bill there is no guarantee that severe pain is a basis for your getting emergency room care. You could go to the emergency room with what you think is a heart attack because you have severe pain, and, if it turns out you do not have a heart attack, they do not pay the emergency room.

Ms. DELAURO. If you survive, they do not pay. Only if you die.

Mr. PALLONE. I just want to mention one more example. We laugh, but it is not funny; but it is ridiculous when you think about it. I talked about the gag rule before where they do not allow or many of the HMOs do not allow the physicians to talk about procedures that are not covered by the insurance plan. In the GOP bill, a health plan would still be allowed to restrict communications between doctors and patients, because their bill only prohibits gagging doctors who contract directly with the HMO plan. What they do not tell you is that most doctors subcontract with health plans and their bill does not prohibit plans from gagging doctors who subcontract with plans.

So here again we have got all these little quirks in their legislation, little exceptions and things that turn out to be big exceptions that still impact the majority of the people.

There are similar things with the financial incentives, where most insurance companies can still create financial incentives for doctors who do not provide care.

So, again, I have not stressed this too much, because I would have at least appreciated if the Senate would bring up any managed care reform bill and let us debate the issue the way we have tonight in this special order. But we did not even get that. So there is almost no point in talking about what should or should not be in the bill, because they will not let us bring the bill up.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. We should not be surprised, because a year ago, November 1997, let me read to you from the New York Times.

> Business and insurance lobbyists who helped kill President Clinton's health plan in 1994 are mobilizing a new campaign to block more modest proposals that would set Federal standards for quality of care. Republican leaders of Congress are urging the lobbyists to step up their activities against an array of managed care reform bills, backed by consumer advocates as a way to protect patients in a turbulent medical market.

That was the first. Then the times reported on October 22, 1997 that Melody Harnad, a Federal Affairs Counsel at the Health Insurance Association of America, summarized the situation in a confidential memo to her supervisor, the vice president of the association, and she said,

> The message we are getting from the House and Senate GOP leadership is that we are in a war and need to start fighting like we are in a war. Republican leadership is now engaged on this issue and is issuing strong directives to all players in the insurance and employer community to get activated.

Well, I would like to say that there was a lot of fear in 1993 when I was first sworn into the House of Representatives, a fear of a single payer national health care system.

Well, I think we are going to get there sooner than we ever thought, because, with attitudes like this, the public has to be fearful that they will have health care in their future, a national health care system could protect them and will.

Ms. DELAURO. If the gentlewoman will yield for one second, because I think it is interesting, and this is a quote, because we started talking earlier about how special interest money plays into this effort. It happened, as we pointed out, with tobacco, and there was a $40 million ad campaign by the tobacco companies to defeat tobacco legislation, and they succeeded. They succeeded.

Now, this is what Senator LOTT said, that the Senate Republicans need a lot of help from their friends on the outside. "Get off your butts; get off your wallets."

Then we see another $40 million ad campaign by the group of votes here.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must not make personal references to members of the Senate.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, then the leader of the other body, that was his quote, so that in fact what you understand here is that they wanted their folks to get up, get their money out there, and defeat managed care reform. Another $40 million ad campaign to defeat managed care reform, one of the single biggest issues that the American public is trying to grapple with today. It just reinforces the point of how this Republican-controlled Congress is dealing with legislation that faces people.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Taking my time back, it worked. Did it not work? We do not have managed care health reform in this Congress.

Now we have to change it. The people of this country have to know what is happening, and I thank both of you for making this possible so we can speak to the issues and the people who are listening can hear the issues, and we can be moving forward. We need a Congress that cares about health care, our seniors, our children and our environment, and this Congress and its majority does not.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman. Let me talk a little bit more about health care, if I can, and then maybe we could also bring up this whole debate over Social Security, if you would like, because I think that is another one of the major points that I feel needs to be addressed and that the Republicans have gone on off on a totally different course.

I was so glad when you mentioned about the President's health care plan a few years ago, because, if we remember, at the time the President brought up his proposal for universal health care, it was a different proposal. It was not a single payer system, it was a different approach. But, nonetheless, he was responding to the fact that so many Americans, and more Americans every day, did not have health insurance.

Many of the issues that we have brought up are sort of aspects of that. We talk about managed care reform, we talk about portability, we talk about preexisting conditions, about people being denied care. But, most important, the President was addressing the fact that more and more Americans do not have health insurance.

What we have found since the President's plan was defeated by the special interest lobbyists and their multimillion dollar campaign was the number of people that have no health insurance has gone up. There was a report that came out just a few weeks ago that had an all-time high, it was over 40 million Americans, 42 or 43 million Americans have no health insurance. So we know the concern he had then was a legitimate concern, and, in fact, the situation is getting much worse.

Now, we have tried sort of dragging and kicking to get this Republican Congress over the last few years to address some of these concerns. We did manage to get a kids health initiative passed last year. But what we found, in fact, we had a hearing just a couple of weeks ago in the Committee on Commerce on the kids health initiative, because that initiative came out of the Committee on Commerce and was also another focus of our Democratic Health Care Task Force, is that although we were now on the way to ensuring about 5 million more young children, that the number of uninsured children is rising at a much more dramatic rate than it was when we were

trying to address this kids health initiative. So as fast as we are with this new program trying to ensure more kids, the number of children uninsured is growing even larger.

The main reason for that is because so many people who are working, and we are not talking about people who are on welfare or eligible for Medicaid, we are talking about families that are working, who cannot get health insurance for their kids because more and more employers are not providing for health insurance, are not given the opportunity for health insurance on the job.

I have always felt what we needed to do was somehow encourage more employers to provide health insurance. I do not know how you do that, whether it is a mandate or through some tax incentives or whatever, but the HMO reform, as important as it is, only helps those who already have insurance. The numbers who do not have insurance continues to grow.

This Republican Congress, it just ignores this whole health insurance debate, and essentially, as Ms. DELAURO said, is basically just in the pockets of the insurance industry, and they do not want any of these reforms to take place. They just do not want to hear it, every aspect of this health insurance debate.

We are at the end of this session. We are not going to be able to address most of these things. But we cannot let them go home, we cannot let them go home without addressing some of these concerns, whether it is HMO reform or the education initiatives or some of the other concerns that we have brought up here.

As I said before, with all the things I think should have been done in this Congress, if I was able to say that I only stayed here a few more days and was at least able to get the school modernization program passed, I would be happy and say okay, "let's go home." But, right now, they are not willing to address any of these things, and we just have to keep pointing it out over and over again.

Ms. DELAURO. I think the gentleman is right. Also, just because of what they will say on the other side of the aisle, I would just say this: There are reasonable people, as I said, because the managed care reform bill was a bipartisan piece of legislation. It was the leadership who will not bring it to the floor. I think that is critical, because this is not bickering back and forth. We could have done this. We had enough votes.

Mr. PALLONE. If I could just take my time back a second, you remember that we have our Democratic Health Care Task Force, but the Republicans had set one up also, and they had come forward at some point in the summer, early in the summer, with a patient protection bill that was very similar to the Patients' Bill of Rights. Some of the people on there had actually endorsed the concept of our Patients' Bill of rights. But when Speaker GINGRICH got a copy of that thing, he immediately said, "No way. We are not going ahead with this." He obviously showed it to the insurance industry and they said, "No way, this is much too protective of the interests of the patients," and he told them literally, "Go back to the drawing board."

They went back, two or three more weeks, and they came out with this awful bill that they eventually brought up in one day.

Ms. DELAURO. That is precisely the point. Let us listen to the public. We reflect their interests here. We put a piece of legislation together. Let us get it passed.

The other thing they would say is that this was going to drive the cost of health insurance sky high and make it unable for people to pay for.

Wrong. The CBO analysis, Congressional Budget Office analysis of the Patients' Bill of Rights of 1998, was it would have only a minimal effect on premiums, with most individuals paying only about $2 more per month for all of the protections that have been cited in the past. So they should not have said that.

Mr. PALLONE. If you remember, we had many of the Members of the Texas delegation, and these are not ideological liberals by any means, Democrats, many of them of conservative ideology, who had the experience in Texas where Texas passed a Patient Protection Act, and it was very similar to what we want at the Federal level. The results are already in and show that the cost is practically nothing. I think it was like 34 cents a month or something like that.

One of the reasons that the cost was so minimal, and this was brought out by one of our task force hearings where we had someone testify from some of the Texas organizations that were involved, was because it led to prevention. In other words, it was sort of like what Congresswoman WOOLSEY was saying: Once the HMOs have this sort of floor that they have to provide these basic protections, they are very careful to make sure that the level of health care that is provided is of good quality, and you have preventative measures taking place so that you do not get lawsuits, you do not get all these problems that result from the current system, because they know they are being watched, and it actually cuts the costs down considerably.

Ms. WOOLSEY. One thing I would like to call to everybody's attention is that these 10 million children that are not covered, more than 80 percent of them live in families with at least one working parent.

□ 1915

That is a huge number. We are not talking about welfare recipients, we are talking about the working poor who work every day as hard as everybody else, or harder, at maybe more than one job, and they cannot afford health care for their children. One of the reasons that businesses do not provide it is that health care costs are going up again.

One of the reasons we supported HMOs in the first place, and HMOs were going to be the savior for health care, is because the cost of health care leveled as the number of HMOs grew in this Nation. Now we have passed that nexus. Health care costs are going up in rapid, rapid numbers, and the quality of the HMO is going down, so we have to put that floor. That is what HMO reform would do, managed care reform. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I know we only have about 10 or 15 minutes left, but if we could just spend a little time talking about the Social Security issue and what the Republicans tried to do a few weeks ago with regard to these tax breaks for the wealthy versus Social Security, because this was very disturbing to me.

We passed the Balanced Budget Act last year. For the first time in a long time, this year there was a bit of a surplus in the budget. However, when we look at the budget, we realize very clearly that that surplus is totally the result of money that has been set aside in the Social Security trust fund, because at some time down the road that trust fund money is going to be needed to pay out benefits to senior citizens. We know that at some point, even more money is going to have to be available than what is set aside in the trust fund years down the road.

But they had the audacity a few weeks ago to suggest and to actually pass on the House floor a bill that would take money from the surplus for tax breaks, a lot of which, from what I can see, would just help wealthy corporations. But regardless of who it helps, they would be taking this money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. They actually had to change the House rules or get around the House rules because the money was coming directly from the Social Security Trust Fund.

When I talk to the senior citizens in my district, I do not even have to explain this to them. They know it right off the bat. They understand. They become very upset, because if we start skimming this trust fund, we are going to aggravate the problem that we already have in not having enough money to pay out benefits in the future.

Then what is going to happen is the pressure is going to be on to reduce benefits, either by raising the age or eliminating the COLA or somehow changing the Social Security program. That gets back to what the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) was saying again; this Republican leadership does not care about

Social Security anyway, so that probably fits into their scheme.

I am thankful at least, in this case, that the Senate did not take up this terrible bill. It just goes again to show the kinds of things we have had to deal with and the kinds of things we have wasted our time with in this Republican Congress.

Ms. DELAURO. When we voted, I know the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) did and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and I did, we voted for tax cuts. We all support tax cuts. We voted for the tax cuts, and we said that they would go into effect when there was a law in place that would make sure that the Social Security system was solvent. Because in fact with this opportunity for a surplus, the Social Security Trust Fund surplus allows us to have the surplus, so in fact you are using the surplus and then shortchanging Social Security.

We vetoed four tax cuts. I support tax cuts. Men and women are working hard today. Families are literally throwing every hour that they have into the workplace, and they are barely staying even. We need to do that.

However, the point was, let the tax cuts go into effect when we are sure that Social Security is solvent, so the beneficiaries today will keep getting their benefits, and, if you will, my generation, the gentleman's kids' generation, will have the opportunity.

I want to just tell the gentleman why, because this is critical. Social Security is 60 years old. It has been one of the major success stories of this country. We have men and women who are working hard all their lives, and now for their financial security and their retirement years they rely on Social Security. Today two-thirds of America's seniors rely on Social Security for over one-half of their income.

That is staggering, and is why we cannot be political with Social Security. Social Security, we cannot play fast and loose with it. It has to be a thoughtful and reflective process. We have the opportunity immediately to take a look at this potential surplus in order to be able to make it solvent over the next 75 years. This is going to be the critical issue in the next session of the Congress.

There are going to be a number of issues that are going to come up, such as privatizing Social Security, which is something that I lean against, because the other piece, which is important to note, Social Security provides for a guaranteed annual income for these two-thirds of seniors who rely on Social Security for over half of their income. There is a guaranteed annual income.

The privatizing solutions remove that guaranteed annual income, so we need to be very, very careful with it. That is what we were saying by that vote a couple of weeks ago in this body: Let us not raid Social Security, let us make sure it is safe for the next 75 years. Then, yes, let us move to tax cuts, targeted tax cuts for working families today in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. Again, the biggest concern I have is that so much time was wasted on this debate. The Republicans basically knew this was going nowhere, so what happens? We are back here again today. They have not accomplished anything in terms of trying to achieve any of these goals relative to education, HMOs, or Social Security.

The issue is how to deal with Social Security in the long run and try to shore up Social Security for the future. Instead, they waste all this time again, forcing us into a situation where we are going to be back in session here tomorrow. There is no budget, there is so little time, and basically they are saying, look, do not worry about it. Go home. A do-nothing Congress is fine with us. We take pride in it.

It is just very upsetting. I think the only thing we can do is keep doing what we are doing now, keep demanding something be done. Mainly, I think the education initiative is something we can try to achieve over the next few years.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am embarrassed at how little this Congress has produced. I would think the leadership of this Congress, of this House, would be red in the face when they look at themselves in the mirror.

I, too, voted for Social Security first and tax cuts afterward. But I want to tell the Members, I represent if not the, one of the best-educated districts in the Nation. They know about this stuff. They have been saying to me since the day I was elected in 1992, when is the Congress going to pay back what this country owes our Social Security Trust Fund? I have said, it is going to be paid back. We are on our way to a surplus. It will happen then.

I am telling the Members, it had better happen, because if we do not, not only are we putting the Generation Xers and the baby boomers at risk, we are putting our national debt at risk, because a great percentage of that national debt is what we owe back to the Social Security trust.

It is a win-win. It is a two-fer, if we take care of Social Security. We need to get Social Security off-budget. Social Security deserves to stand on its own. It must be secure. I will not fool around with privatizing Social Security, but I certainly would encourage people to have a base, and we have to find a way to encourage people to invest more. We cannot just depend on Social Security for our retirement, because that is not enough. It is not intended for that. It is intended for a safety net. So, Social Security first; tax cuts, yes, particularly for middle-income working families, next.

Mr. PALLONE. My fear is that in the same way, and I do not know when it was, I think it was in the seventies or maybe eighties before any of us were here in Congress, that the Congress actually passed a law raising the payroll tax on Social Security to make sure that there were enough benefits. That is my fear.

In other words, what is going to happen here is if this money from this trust fund keeps getting siphoned off for these tax breaks or whatever it happens to be, then 10 or 20 years from now, the next Congress or future Congresses will be faced with actually having to raise taxes in order to pay for the benefits.

What we are doing now, or what the Republicans are doing now, is taking that money away, or they are not succeeding, but they are trying to take it away for tax breaks, and they are going to make future generations possibly pay more taxes to make sure that money is there. That is the possibility we could have down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, and it kind of sums it up for me about this Congress, it is really the political equivalent of the Maytag repairman. The Maytag repairman's phone never rang because nobody ever needed his help.

Our phones are ringing off the hook here, but we have a Republican Congress that refuses to pick up the line. All the Democrats are saying on these issues is, let us answer the call from the American public.

First and foremost, we have talked about HMO reform, we have talked about saving Social Security, but what we are asking for in these next several days while we are here is education reform. Let us reduce the size of classrooms, 100,000 teachers in grades 1 through 3, and let us in fact modernize our classrooms, provide those tax credits to local government, so that they can float the bonds to build the schools, and it will bring down their own property taxes, if you will. Let us do that for the good of our children. That is what we are claiming to want to do in the next several days.

We can talk all we want about what has not been done. We have a few more days. This we can get done. I think we have an obligation to go for it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentlewoman. I regret to say that HMO reform is dead, and that there is no opportunity here to really deal with the Social Security issue anymore, because they have run the clock.

But at least over the next few days if we can get the budget to include these two education initiatives, the modernization of the schools and the 100,000

additional teachers, then at least we can say that we have accomplished something before this do-nothing Congress goes home. We are just going to be out there every day saying that. We are not leaving. We are not leaving this place until we get some response from the other side of the aisle on these two issues.

Again, I started off today by saying that when I was back in New Jersey in my district and I was at an event, this is what the people were talking about. I had a lot of educators there, I had a lot of elected officials on the local level, and as the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) was saying, they were saying they need to modernize their schools, and they cannot do it. They cannot get the bonding. The cost of the interest rate on the bonding is so excessive that they either cannot do it, or the taxpayers are upset because of the amount of money that is involved.

We need to address these issues. I know the gentlewoman has the dozen education initiatives that they failed to do. I wish the gentlewoman would go over that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to. This is the dirty dozen that the Congressional Republicans wanted to do to our public schools: eliminate the Department of Education; divert billions of dollars in public school funds for private school vouchers; cut school lunches for poor children; block-granting critical education programs, and when we block-grant those programs, we eliminate programs, and there is no accountability by the Governors as to where that money is being spent; ending equal opportunity in higher education; tax cuts for wealthy taxpayers who send their children to private schools; eliminating summer jobs; eliminating school-to-work; ending school interest subsidies for student loans; eliminating safe and drug free schools. That is the litany, that is the legacy of this Republican Congress.

Mr. PALLONE. Hopefully, we can get something done before we adjourn.

□ 1930

PRIDE IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, before I begin and respond to a lot of things we have heard, and there is an awful lot to respond to, I want to say a couple of words about two people that were in the news today that all America needs to remember.

First of all is Clark Clifford, who was a wise man to many Presidents. He helped Harry Truman in dealing with the union crisis also certainly helped LBJ in Vietnam. He was a good public servant. He was a wise man. Any clouds that may have come over his life in his waning years certainly are insignificant compared to his public service.

Also we need to be thinking about Matthew Shepherd. He was a young college student who was brutally beaten a few days ago. I find it kind of ironic that Amnesty International this past week issued a report talking about human rights in America the same week that this happened.

While it certainly was not sanctioned by this government, I believe all of us who are public officials must do all we can to publicly condemn these type of actions. Certainly all of America's prayers need to be with Mr. Shepherd today.

There is also obviously strife in the District of Columbia as we have heard. It has always been that way, I guess, from the time that our President Adams, our second President openly loathed our third president Thomas Jefferson. This is a bit of tradition in Washington, but those two gentlemen learned how to disagree without being disagreeable.

Unfortunately, as we have heard today, that has just not been the case. We need this honest debate. There are differences. But I am continually disappointed by the tone of the rhetoric from the other side.

This is what I heard just about 15 minutes ago, quote, "the Republican majority does not care at all about America's health care, about our children's education, or about the environment." This is not quite as bad as the last session when I think I was called a Nazi because I was a Republican probably about 5 or 10 times by the minority because they disagreed with our efforts to balance the budget. This shrill rhetoric does nobody any good.

I have a question to ask. Who says I do not care about our children's educational system, when I have got two boys in public schools back in Pensacola, Florida, just because I do not believe that bureaucracies in Washington, D.C. should have more money, more power, and more authority, and just because I believe that the teachers that I meet when I take my children to student night, to open house night at Cordova Park Elementary School, just because I have faith in the principal that oversees my children every day, just because I have more faith in local school boards than bureaucracies in Washington, D.C., does that really mean that I hate public education? Of course it does not.

But we are 3 weeks away from the election, and this shrillness. It is offensive. We also hear that we hate the environment because we do not agree with their form of regulatory burdens that they have thrown on America for over 40 years while they were in the majority.

Listen, I have got a stream in my backyard. I have got blue skies overhead. My children drink from the water supplies that Democratic parents' children drink from. Who says we do not care about the environment? Again, it is the shrillness.

They have lowered the level of public discourse, and I think it is shameful. We do not need to disparage Democrats just because they believe in a centralized bloated bureaucracy. I can disagree with them without being disagreeable.

I am not going to say that they hate their children just because their policies failed in education from 1954 to 1994. I am not going to say that they hate their grandparents because, over the past 40 years while they were in control, they did not put aside one cent for Social Security.

But after four years, we have already put a plan together to save $1.6 trillion to save for senior citizens and keep Social Security solvent. I am not going to say that they hate senior citizens. I am just going to say that they are misidentified, that their way was the way of LBJ and FDR and generations past.

But we are going into a new era, and we need to go into that era with a bit higher public discourse. They say that we take pride in doing nothing in Washington, D.C. in this do-nothing Congress. Well, I do not want to get into this partisan wrangling, but facts are stubborn things, and the American people have been misled.

I think the American people need to hear the facts. Four years ago, when we got here, Americans had a $250 billion deficit that was strapping them down and strapping the economy down. We had Alan Greenspan, Fed chairman, say, if we balance the budget like the Republicans are proposing in 1995, we will see unprecedented growth in America.

Four years later, we have a $70 billion surplus the way that Washington calculates the surplus. And true to the Fed chairman's prediction, we have unprecedented growth in America. Interest rates did come down. America's economy has been stronger over the past 4 years than ever before.

Am I proud of that? Yes, I am proud of that. I am proud of the fact that we also did something about welfare reform. We promised we would do something about welfare reform. The President promised in 1992 that we would do something about welfare reform. But when the Democrats were in control, he did not do it. When we got into control, he had to do it.

In the first 6 months, the welfare rolls of America dropped by almost 8 percent. We have a long way to go. But

am I proud of the first step we took in welfare reform? Yes, I am proud, and America is proud.

Tax relief, I hear them say that they agree that we need tax relief. But I have never heard of a single tax relief bill that the Democrats have supported since we have been here, not a single one. But we gave Americans the first tax cut in 18 years and tax cuts that will help them educate their children, tax cuts that will help grow the economy, that will keep interest rates down, and have if put student loan rates at their lowest of percentage point. That helps all of Americans. Am I proud of that? Yes, I am proud of that.

Despite all of the wrangling and all of the screaming and all of the moaning about how horrible this Congress has been, the public opinion polls show that more Americans are pleased with the performance of this Congress, over 60 percent. The newspapers say it has been a historical high more than it have ever been.

So am I proud of our accomplishments, yes, I am. Am I discouraged by their rhetoric? Certainly I am. They talk about health care, about how we do not want our families to have good health care. That is insulting.

My father underwent open heart surgery a year ago. He would not have been able to afford it himself. Obviously, we have a health care system that is the best in the world. We have to improve on that and get more Americans in to have access to health care. We have to curb some of the abuses, and that is what we did when we tried to pass a health care reform bill earlier this year.

But it has never been enough. We actually heard 20 minutes ago a Member from the minority party dream wistfully, and I could not believe it, but they cannot help showing their hand sometimes, dreaming wistfully of the day when America will once again recognize that we need a single payer health care system, that we need to socialize medicine in America.

I am sorry. I thought that is what the President tried to do in 1993 and 1994. Have Americans decided in the past 3 years that they were wrong when they elected us to Congress in part because he tried to socialize one-seventh of the economy with the health of the Democrats? No.

Americans still do not want socialized health care. Even if that is what the liberal extreme left wants, we have to chart a moderate course for health care reform.

I also hear them talking about tobacco, the evils of tobacco, and how the Republican Party is fueled by greed, lust, and tobacco money. I cannot help but remember the articles that came out after the 1996 campaign that showed that, no, the Democratic National Committee did not take money from tobacco companies. Instead, they let their State parties take money from tobacco companies, and then they funneled the money to President Clinton's campaign, to the Democratic House Members' campaign, to the Democratic Senate Members' campaigns. The same campaigns where they were shaking their fist on television talking about how they hated big tobacco. They hated it so much they did not take the money directly, they had to take it under the table.

I am saying this as somebody who has not been a friend for big tobacco. I voted against tobacco subsidies before. I will do it again. I think it is bad policy for America. I think it is bad policy for the health of our children. But I also think it is bad to have this level of disingenuousness coming from the other side. Do not attack tobacco if you are taking their money under the table.

Again, we hear about Social Security; last time, we wanted to cut taxes to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. Well, I do not hear them saying anything about the $17.1 billion that President Clinton and the Democrats want to use today to take from the Social Security Trust Fund to fund more government spending in Washington, D.C., more employment of bureaucracies, and more regulations.

The moral of the story today, it appears on October 11, 1998, is that the Democratic Party thinks it is bad to give Americans a tax cut if that takes a dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund. But if we are talking about feeding bureaucracies, making the Federal Government even fatter and bigger and more obtrusive, then that type of gutting of the Social Security surplus is okay.

Again we have inconsistencies. They just cannot seem to get their story straight. They cannot get their story straight on education either. We are the do-nothing Congress on education? I do not think so. I think we proposed one of the most dramatic bills for education reform that has been proposed here in 40 years.

We had a very radical message, a very dangerous message. The message was this, it was a message of Jefferson and Madison, it was that we are a Nation of communities, not a Nation of bureaucracies.

We had the Dollars to the Classroom Act. We said we were going to give 95 percent of the money in Washington, D.C. in education to the classrooms. That is radical in Washington, D.C. in 1998. But we are actually going to spend education money in the classrooms.

I can tell my colleagues, I have been around the classrooms in, not only my children's classrooms, but also across my district, across this country, and then in Washington, D.C., and I can tell my colleagues the classrooms are in dire need of more money, better books, better facilities, better computers, more teachers, and smaller classroom sizes.

But we are not going to get that by keeping the money in Washington, D.C. and growing the education bureaucracy. They are very fearful that power may actually slip out of the hands of Washington bureaucracies and their allies and instead go to teachers and parents and principals.

I am fearful that that will not happen. Because, while they were in control from 1954 to 1994, we saw the educational standards and the system in this country skid at an unprecedented alarming rate.

We have got to do better. My two boys deserve it. Our children deserve it. Their children deserve it. We are not going to do that as long as we continue to fight to protect the status quo.

Let us get all the money we can get into the classrooms. We are not a do-nothing Congress. I really do not want to tread too much into this area, but I think it is necessary, because we have been attacked as being a do-nothing Congress.

I think it is important to set the record straight, that the same party that is attacking us as being a do-nothing Congress, even after we passed this historic balanced budget agreement, the economy is booming. Welfare rolls are down. The Social Security trust fund is solidified.

What we found is that we have a Democratic Party whose leader has held only two cabinet meetings in 1998. Think about that for a second. Here we are being attacked for not doing enough. The President, their President, our President has only held two cabinet meetings this entire year.

We know during the first cabinet meeting, he used it to mislead his cabinet officers. The second cabinet meeting was to apologize for misleading his cabinet officers.

I think we deserve better. I think we deserve more honesty from our leaders when they attack us for doing nothing to actually put that mirror up and see what they have done.

Instead of vetoing every single education proposal that we have sent to the White House, seven education proposals, every single one of them vetoed, I think they need to turn around and start being constructive.

□ 1945

They are saying they are going to keep us in town. That is fine. We will stay in town. We will debate the issue of education. We will debate who has done better on saving the Social Security trust fund. We will debate on who has done better by balancing the budget for the first time in a generation. We will debate about who has done a better job cutting taxes for the American people. We will do that as long as they want to do it.

The American people are on our side. They are the ones that need to worry about getting back to their district and justifying what has been going on with the Democratic Party over the past 7, 8, 9 months.

In a free and open debate, in what Thomas Jefferson called the free marketplace of ideas, we are going to win every time, because in the end we believe like Jefferson, Madison, Washington and our Founding Fathers, that the genius of America does not lie in Congress or in the Senate or the White House or in bureaucracies across Washington, D.C. but, instead, the genius of America rests in communities.

We are a Nation of communities. We are a Nation of individuals. We are a Nation of people that actually know pretty well how to govern ourselves and how to educate our children and how to take care of our parents and grandparents.

What is at the bottom of their argument? Regrettably, it is the paternalistic belief that they know how to educate my children better than I do, they know how to take care of my children and my parents' and my grandparents' health better than local governments and State governments. And they know how to spend our checks that we get from working better than we know how to spend our money. It is total arrogance. It is the arrogance that drove them out of power in 1994, and it is the arrogance that is going to haunt them again three weeks from now.

I think we can do better. I think we can continue fighting to do the things that we have been doing. I think we need to ask the President to become engaged in this process, to stop calling out focus groups and pollsters and saying, how can I save myself from this political crisis that I find myself in? We need the President of the United States to come back to Washington, to sit across the table, to negotiate instead of doing what he continues to do.

I told you that he held two cabinet meetings all year for not the best of reasons. Well, he has held over 96 fundraisers this year. In fact, tomorrow he is going to be holding a fund-raiser in Palm Beach, Florida, would we all not like to be there, and New York City. So he is going to be holding as many fundraisers tomorrow as he held cabinet meetings all year.

Is this really a President that is serious about doing the Nation's business, about reforming education and health care and Social Security and balancing the budget and cutting taxes, or is it a President who is desperately doing everything he can in his political power to hold on to his office for at least three more weeks until the midterm elections?

There are some disturbing questions to be asked that we are not going to go into. I want to talk about policy. I want to talk about education because they talked about education. I want to talk about our great record on Social Security and keeping Social Security solvent. We want to talk about taxes. We want to talk about balancing the budget for the first time in a generation. We want to talk about doing all the things that we have done.

We will let the Committee on the Judiciary talk about the impeachment proceedings, but if they want to talk issues, we will talk issues. The American people, I get people calling up saying, you people need to do the people's business. Well, all of this that we are talking about, education, Social Security, health care, that is the people's business. That affects government. But what also affects the American people is whether they have an honest and trustworthy President and honest and trustworthy Members of Congress. And those are tough questions that have to be asked.

At the end of the process, we certainly hope that America will be stronger because of it, but it will be stronger, we know already, because of the great policy objectives that we have put forward over the past four years that have been such a success.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) who has done a fantastic job with me on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to make a brief comment associating myself with your earlier remarks. One thing, I was a little concerned that you were going to discourage them from advocating socialized medicine when, in fact, you and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and I owe a lot of our presence here, as you point out, to the fact that they advocated socialized medicine in 1993 and 1994. And I hope they continue to advocate that because it goes contrary to the American will.

I want to associate myself with two other things that you said. I think it is very important for the Speaker and anybody watching this discussion to understand. When the venom comes out of the other side's mouth and they talk about the radicals and the people who are extremely conservative, the truth is that they are talking about, if anybody else, you and me and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Do you know what? I do not take tobacco money. I sent tobacco money back. I do not even take the affiliates of tobacco money. I, too, like you am concerned about the impact of tobacco on my kids. Yet we are the class of 1994. We are supposed to be these conservatives. Who are they talking about exactly? Furthermore, they talk about education and beating on it, saying we are not doing anything. In the higher education bill, there was bill developed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) that he worked with the President on called High Hopes. Not a lot of Members in on our side advocated that. I was a cosponsor. In committee we talked together and you cast the deciding vote.

The fact is, the number one priority of the President in education would not be there if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) had not voted in committee giving them their margin of one to get it through.

We are supposed to be the terrible people. We are the people they are constantly fingering. We have reached over and tried to work together. We have tried to give them tobacco. We have tried to pass bills through here. We have tried to move the Patients' Bill of Rights and different health legislation through. What we do not see is any accommodation from the other side except venom.

I thought you did a good job of pointing that out.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I have to tell you, it has been very discouraging to see for the past four years Republicans sitting on the floor, talking on the floor and balancing the budget, cutting taxes, saving over a trillion dollars for Social Security. And from the first day that we got here, all I have seen is venomous attacks.

I remember the first day we got here, it was the Speaker's book deal, that this was somehow a horrible affront to western civilization. Then they dredged up that story about the Nazi historian and it went down hill from there. Now I am told that I do not care about my children's public education. I care very much about my children's public education, just as I care as deeply about the education of children who are south of the Anacostia River, who will not be getting to go to the schools that the President and the Vice President's children were able to go to when they were here, because the President vetoed a bill that would have given children south of the Anacostia River the same opportunity that his children had.

Now, listen, this is a tough business. I certainly am not saying that the President and the Vice President's children should not have had that opportunity, but I am saying, why do you not give the children in Anacostia and inner city Washington, D.C. the same opportunity that your children and our children have? It only seems fair.

One other thing on the radical remark. If we are radical, then so, too, are the 65 percent of Americans who agree with what we are doing. I guess the only people that are rational are those in the 35 percent minority, because they are basically saying that 65 percent of Americans are backward and dangerous and radical.

Mr. SOUDER. I, too, want to point out that I have two children in college. Both of them went through public schools, through elementary, junior

high and high school. My youngest is going through public schools. I went through public schools. I get tired of people lecturing me, whose kids are in private schools, about public schools. I thought that was a very good point.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. As a public figure, I have seen that time and time again. You have, I do not want to put a label on them but for lack of a better use of a label, liberals telling me how much I hate public schools while their children are going to private schools. I do not know about the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) but I know you and I are not country club Republicans. I know he is not either. We are not Rockefeller Republicans by any stretch. We have an awful lot more in common than a lot of those Members claiming that we hate public education. Our children are going to public schools, and I have got to tell you, I am glad every day that they are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. I want to identify with a few of your remarks. Being from Oklahoma, I went to all the public schools, all of my kids went to public school. I have, my third daughter, my youngest daughter is now a senior at Oklahoma State University. Public schools is something that we need to enhance, and nobody here is saying we should not. The question is, how many of the dollars are spent on the children and how many of the dollars are spent in the classroom and how many of the dollars are sent there for a merit raise for an outstanding teacher versus how many of the dollars are spent above that school all the way back to Washington?

The fact is only 60 percent of the dollars are getting to our children. Why should not our teachers be some of our highest paid professionals? Why? Because it is getting chewed up in administrative costs from Washington before it ever gets there.

It is interesting, not long ago they published a study done in Massachusetts, an 8th grade literacy test, 40 percent of the teachers in the State of Massachusetts could not pass an eighth grade literacy test. That is not an affront from me towards the teachers of Massachusetts, but it brings to bear the very real problem. We put the dollars in the wrong place.

If we want excellence, then we have to concentrate the dollars in the classroom. I hope you will yield me about 4 or 5 minutes. There is an area that, another area in Washington that I would like to address and just take a little break here for a minute, if I could.

It has to do with the Office of Inspector General. This is an office that was created to create a balance. The Inspector General in all the different departments in this country was designed to be a balance, to look at, to make sure, to both report to Congress and to the Secretaries that, under the laws, that each of those departments were running properly. It was established to promote economy, efficiency, effectiveness, to prevent fraud, waste and mismanagement in the programs that each of those agencies operate.

There is a particular inspector general, Ms. Susan Gaffney. She was nominated for the HUD Inspector General post in 1993 by President Clinton, was sworn in and confirmed by the Senate. This lady is somebody we can be proud of. She is a career lawyer who has worked to expose fraud and abuse and to expose those who perpetrate and steal the very tax dollars that people bring to the operation of this government.

She has been in the housing industry since 1970. She has had the following awards: the Presidential Meritorious Rank award, the Distinguished Honor award, the Joint Financial Management Improvement award for distinguished leadership, and because of those awards, she was appointed and placed to be the watchdog over the housing programs in this country.

She came in under Secretary Cisneros' tenure and had a great relationship, developed good input and had a wonderful course, where she helped that agency control the dollars and made sure that fraud and abuse were not present.

However, I am sad to report that at this time the situation at HUD is very much different. There is no question that Secretary Cuomo and Ms. Gaffney share the same strong commitment to HUD's mission. However, the department appears very uncomfortable with the concept of an independent Inspector General who has dual reporting responsibility to both the Secretary and to this Congress.

I believe that Inspector General Gaffney wishes to do the job to the best that she can and to bring accountability to HUD, its programs and the taxpayers who support it.

Over the past couple of years a series of events suggests that there have been efforts to tarnish her superb reputation, her record and to limit her ability to do her job. I want to share some of those for the record.

Number one, the Acting General Counsel of HUD, a key aid to the Secretary, asserted that the OIG audit reports should be issued only through the Office of the Secretary, violating the laws that we have set on the books. The OIG was not authorized to have its own office of counsel. The OIG was violating its memorandum of understanding with the HUD General Counsel. These actions contradict the concept of an independent counsel and an independent Inspector General.

□ 2000

A deputy general counsel at HUD stopped a routine investigation of an Equal Employment Opportunity complaint against the Inspector General and instead contracted with two law firms outside of the agency to do a wide-ranging investigation of the complaint. A typical EEO investigation costs $3,000. HUD is paying $100,000 to outside lawyers for the investigation that is ongoing. Number three. On two occasions, the Secretary has cut the office of Inspector General's budget request without notification, without consultation. In February of this year, the Secretary advised Ms. Gaffney to take care in reporting on his program initiative HUD 2020 in the OIG's semiannual report to Congress. The Secretary stated that he was having HUD 2020 evaluated by outside private sector program consultants and their reviews would be very positive. The Secretary said that he did not want Ms. Gaffney to be humiliated by filing a report at odds with the others, regardless of what the truth was. In fact the Secretary spent $412,000 contracting for outside reviews which the Inspector General had a parallel review going on at the same time. One of the reasons is they gave very different results. Despite authorizing language in the Inspector General Act of this government and precedent and other offices of the Inspector General throughout the government, HUD's general counsel opined that the HUD Inspector General not establish its independent personnel function without the approval of the Secretary. Congress has decisively resolved this issue by inserting language in the Senate-House conference report in the omnibus bill on the HUD's 1999 appropriation. The reason I stand here and share this with you is the apparent assault on government accountability and the apparent assault that this Inspector General is under.

When I was elected in 1994, the majority who voted for me wanted a change. They wanted sunshine, they wanted open government, they wanted less government and they wanted more efficient government. They wanted an accounting of the tax dollars that is coming out of their paycheck every day. One of the ways we achieve a goal like that is to make agencies accountable. One of the greatest assets that I have as a Congressman is the Inspector General's office. They have an expert knowledge of governmental areas and critiques of programs. I think the gentleman from Florida would agree when we have Cabinet secretaries undermining the position that was placed there to hold them accountable in the first place, that we have something very wrong ongoing. It is my charge through this House that the Secretary let the Inspector General do her job, that she would not be harassed, she would not be limited and that her exemplary record be used to make sure that our tax dollars are used in an appropriate way for those that are depending on our assistance for housing.

With that, I change the debate back. I think that is something that needs to be said. It is unfortunate that we see this many times coming out of this administration. This is not the only area where we have seen this type of coercion take place in trying to move the government in a way other than sunshine and other than light. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. Really it does fit right in with what we were talking about when we were talking about who to trust, about whether we were being misled in this debate or not and whether or not we can trust the administration officials to properly execute and faithfully execute the laws of this country.

Mr. COBURN. One key point. We heard that the Republicans had not done anything for municipal bond funding for schools. The President vetoed a tax cut for schools in terms of their ability to float bond issues. He vetoed it from his own desk. So to claim that we did not do it, we did it, we passed it, we sent it to him and he vetoed it. So the misdirection. One of the things you do when you are on offense, if things are not going real well is you misdirect. You go a different direction. That is what we see on the football field. That is what we are seeing in terms of playing with the truth.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. It is disingenuous. It is disturbing and again whether you are talking about tobacco, whether taking tobacco money under the table, shuffling the money around in a different way; whether you are talking about health care reform where they are still dreaming of socialized medicine; if you are talking about Social Security where they claim that we are raiding the trust fund, yet they want to spend $17.1 billion that they would take directly out of the surplus on new government programs; whether you talk about what we have done over the past 4 years in setting aside over $1 trillion for the Social Security trust fund. Again and again it is disingenuous.

Mr. COBURN. I have a question for the gentleman. Where did the $1.6 trillion of IOUs that are in the Social Security bank account now come from?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. The gentleman is exactly right. For 40 years the Democratic Congress borrowed, begged or stole from the general budget and got $1.6 trillion out of the Social Security trust fund. That has changed dramatically just in the past 4 years. I have got to say, I think I would have a hard time getting on this floor and saying with a straight face that after that sorry record over 40 years, I would have a hard time pointing at somebody else that has made Social Security solvent.

Mr. SOUDER. You would at least think they would come out and say they are sorry. "We're sorry that for 40 years we did this." Maybe it would take seven speechwriters to sort through this over time to get the "sorry" part down just right. But how you can come down here and not even say you are sorry and then point at us who have just gotten here, barely 4 years in control, have balanced the budget for the first time, have a surplus actually putting the money over in Social Security and then to point at us just takes an incredible amount. At the very least you should say you are sorry.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. It depends on what the definition of "sorry" is.

Mr. COBURN. I would just make one other assumption. We have tried to slow the growth of spending. We have tried to send money back to the people that are sending the money here. We have done that at the same time while we want to protect what money is coming into Social Security today. We always hear we cannot do it. We cannot do it. That is based on the assumption that the government is this wonderfully efficient operating machine, 110,000 IRS employees. How efficient are we that we need 110,000 IRS employees? How efficient are we at all these different Cabinet levels? How efficient are we at the Department of Education with our 6,000 employees that are mandating on the people that I represent what they will and will not do while at the same time for years the commitment to IDEA, education for those with disabilities, was promised by this government to be 40 percent of the cost. It has never come close. So what we have is school boards having to maintain a federally mandated budget program to meet the requirements of IDEA while we do not send them any money. It is called an unfunded mandate. If we would just pay our share, what we promised to send to the local school districts for IDEA, every school district in the country would average about a $500,000 to a $1 million increase in their budget this next year.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. That point the gentleman made, that really answers why we got elected in 1994. The question was to the American people, who do you trust? Do you trust politicians with your children's education or do you trust parents? Democrats for 40 years trusted politicians in Washington. We trusted parents. Do you trust bureaucrats at the Department of Education bureaucracy or do you trust teachers? I can tell you I know my children's two teachers. I do not know a single bureaucrat right down the street at the Department of Education. If my child is having trouble reading, or with his math, if he is having trouble in his school, I can go to the source. I do not want 60 percent of their paperwork that they have to do coming from Washington, D.C., and that is what an Ohio study said it did come from. I would rather them have that time working on lesson plans for my children. It does come back to the question of who do you trust.

If I could just say one more thing and then I will yield to the gentleman, because what he brought up at HUD reminds me of something that I found out about a year ago in this Chinese campaign finance scandal. There was an international fugitive who wanted to go to the White House and there was this pesky employee at the National Security Council that said, "No, we're not going to let an international fugitive in the White House." So the international fugitive goes to the head of the Democratic National Committee and he says, "I'm an international fugitive. They will not let me in the White House. There's this pesky woman down at NSC who won't let me in. Can you fix it?" The DNC chairman says, "Sure. I'll call my friend at the CIA, Bob." He scribbles down on notes that were later subpoenaed, "Call CIA Bob." He called CIA Bob, he went around this government employee that was trying to keep government clean, to keep this international fugitive out of the White House and, sure enough, like a lot of other things that happened in 1996, it got murky and they did not listen to the people that were put there to be watchdogs for the White House, for the administration, for this government, for this city and for America. As a result, America suffered because of it.

Mr. COBURN. I will finish up with this. As I travel around my district, every time I encounter a teacher I ask them two questions. Is it the system that is the problem or the kids? If you could discipline in the classroom and you had the time, would our kids do better? Uniformly, every time, they say, I do not have the time to fill out the paperwork and teach the kids. I do not have the ability to instill the discipline in my classroom without the support of the structure of law to make it that I am not sued every time I try to control the environment in my classroom. So what we are really asking teachers to do is to teach with both arms tied behind them. We take half their time away filling out paperwork and then another third of their time trying to control discipline in a positive way that eliminates any ability for corporal punishment or significant absence of privileges if in fact you do not participate and behave. One of the things we have to do is dollars to the classroom. The block-granting of education programs have to go directly to the school districts. And individual school districts have to spend that money on the kids, on the teachers. The only other thing we can do is we can download the paperwork burden for our teachers, and that starts right here, by eliminating programs, eliminating departments so that paperwork is not generated in the first place. If we

do that, we will see changes just like we saw in welfare reform. If we will start using a commonsense approach that is based on proper incentives and proper punishments when behaviors are not right, then we will see the kind of response in education that we all want from our public school system.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. And most importantly it will not be Washington making those decisions. It will be teachers and parents and principals who are going to be empowered for the first time in 40 years to make that decision. For the life of me, I really cannot figure out why my friends on the extreme left will not allow Washington to get out of the way and get those dollars to the classroom where they need it so desperately.

Mr. COBURN. I would just add one other thing. Somebody may think that I am one of those extreme conservative radicals. A father, a grandfather, I deliver babies on the weekend still. I love children. But I also know if they do not have guidance and if they do not have discipline, they are going to be in trouble, and they desire that guidance. Do not ever kid yourself. They want to be disciplined in a way that will give them a future. It is natural that they would desire it.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for coming and speaking with us today. He has certainly helped out. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding. It is once again really important to remind people why on a Sunday night we are here and not with our kids and families. There is nothing going on in the negotiations right now in the budget agreement that we did not know were going to be in the final conditions 12 months ago. There is no excuse that we are here. As I would like to point out again as I did earlier, the plain truth of the matter is many of us believe our leadership has negotiated too much away. In fact when they were kids, I bet they were the kind of kids who when they went trick-or-treating and they knocked on somebody's door and said trick-or-treat and the person came to the door, they probably gave the person candy out of their pumpkin. We have in effect surrendered much of what we fought for. The plain truth of the matter is that the President has a lot of leverage right now, but why would he not want to deal? Why given the fact that we have gone through these same points, we had a shutdown in 1995, we are down to the end here, we know what things we are going to debate over, human life, over the size of government, over national testing, over census, what could possibly be a motivation?

Well, one of the things that has been much talked about in this country is a movie called "Wag the Dog." The dog, the tail wagging the dog, because of an allegation in that movie that because of a personal affair of the President he decided to start through a movie thing a war. Now, in this case clearly there is no war. I am not making any allegations that the movie in fact says anything about this President regarding that type of incident. But there is a legitimate question, is there a secondary motivation? Is there in fact a tail that wags a dog in this case where the tail says, in effect, I need a second show, I need to be able to say to the general public that there is another crisis that may take precedence over this crisis. And that in this case I think that there has been a pattern.

I want to go through, rather than talk about this President, I want to talk about a different President. I want to talk about Richard Nixon. There is a new book called Abuse of Power. Stanley Cutler has gone through the tapes which he fought through courts to try to have made public.

□ 2015

We do not have such tapes with this current President and probably given what has happened with the Nixon tapes we may not in future years. But there are some dramatic things on this that come across very similar to many of the things we have been hearing over the last few months, and I want to put some of these in the RECORD.

Number, point number one: Limiting the testimony, July 20, 1972, Bob Haldeman is talking to the President, quote, so they branded slow and temporary immunity, and he is going to cover what he knows about the Watergate stuff, which is nothing, and that gets him out of the thing. Now what they had planned to do is he was going to take the fifth, but this avoids his having to take the fifth, which is much better because he has no guilt, where under the Watergate thing he has some of the other. They just opened a new line of prosecution. We have seen that in limiting the testimony today too regarding some people in this administration.

Two: Limit the scope of the investigation. In 1972, Bob Haldeman again talking to the President: Petersen, the Justice Department, is working with that knowledge, directing the investigation along the channels that will not produce the kind of answers we do not want produced.

Now he also goes on to say that Petersen also feels that the fact that there were some lines in this case that ran to the White House is very beneficial because it slowed them down in pursuing things because they are all of the view that they do not want to indict the White House, they only want to indict the, they want to tighten up the case on that criminal act, Watergate, and limit it to the degree that they can. This is in fact exactly what the FBI director and Mr. LaBella who did the Justice Department investigation said in their memos to the Justice Department which is that the Attorney General had limited the investigation to narrow parts and would not broaden the investigation. That is in that memo that they will not release.

Number 3: We need to finish this investigation, no fishing expedition. We have been hearing that for 4 years now. On August 2, 1972, Bob Haldeman said this to Nixon. The Attorney General has ordered the director of the FBI to end the investigation. He said they have got all they need to wrap up their case that is on Watergate. The President: Do you think that is correct? Haldeman: Yes. Nixon said really it is over. Otherwise it is a fishing expedition. We have had enough of those. As the gentleman from Florida knows, we have heard over and over, fishing expedition, fishing expedition.

Number 4: Overstate the potential damage. This is in September now with the President, Haldeman and Colson. Haldeman goes on saying that you know there is a perverse theory that we walk through this this morning. We might be better off with the Watergate story. It is not doing us much harm. The President says, yes, not much. What I mean is the harm that is done when the reporters are in a hurry too much. Haldeman: That is right, but the difference also is that the indictments will be less than anticipated rather than more. The indictments do not, see they said all along if the indictments or guilt reaches into the upper levels of the Committee on the White House, then there is the problem, and they did not at this time, which is what we have been seeing here, limiting. You say it might be this bad, and then it comes in this bad, and everybody goes, oh well, that is a relief.

Number 5: Complaints about spending too much money on the investigation, something we hear constantly. September 15, 1972, 5:27 p.m., Nixon, Haldeman and Dean, John Dean says quote, the resources that have been spent against this whole investigation to date are really incredible. It is truly a larger investigation than was conducted against the after inquiry of the JFK assassination.

Number 6: Build up expectations so news is less damaging. Here it is Nixon and Colson, and they are talking about leaking false information through a friend in the media, that the spread is going to be 19 points over McGovern, and Nixon then says 27 points, and Colson says it will sandbag him, it will sandbag him, and Nixon says sandbag them always, that is right.

Number 7: Complain about press obsession, avoiding real issues, October 13, 1972, 7:26 p.m., Nixon and Colson. Nixon: They have to attack the press for its double standard. Colson: Yes, I

think that is the only way. Nixon: And by making it an all-out assault on the press for their double standard and the rest and say now come on, you are going to report this campaign, let us report what is happening.

By the way, I have been going through this book, and last night I spent 3 hours because the more I heard this the more I thought this is what we hear in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight all the time.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And you are right, it is, and you talk about the press. We have heard continued complaints about how the press is on a witch-hunt and that they are absolutely enraged that over 115 or over 120 newspapers have called for the President's resignation, and these are independent newspapers. The Philadelphia Inquirer, the Atlanta Constitution are not conservative journalists by any stretch of the imagination, but they have attacked the press as being on a witch-hunt, and the question is, I guess for a conservative, is why would the New York Times, why would the Washington Post, why would other newspapers question this President in the way they have? Why would newspapers like the Chicago Tribune, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Atlanta Constitution, call for his resignation? And I think what you have to come to a conclusion is that there are some people that take their job very seriously, and they have integrity, and that is the decision, the journalistic decision that they have come to, and yet they get attacked just like Ken Starr gets attacked, just like anybody that has ever sort of been caught in the President's headlights gets savagely attacked.

I read a news article about a former Miss America in fear for her life and her family's life, and we have seen the hit squads that are out there, and it is just regrettable.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, as I went through this I found I have gone through seven parallels, and I found 21 minimum.

Number 8: Take advantage of the public's belief the Presidents act logically. November 1, 1972, Nixon and Erlichman. Erlichman: We do not mind being called crooks, but not stupid crooks. Nixon: We know we will never convince them on our morality, but do they think we are that dumb?

9: What is is. It is incredible, history repeating itself. December 11, 1972—

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And, excuse me, when you say what is is, you are referring to?

Mr. SOUDER. What the verb is.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. What the President said in his testimony, it depends on what your definition of is is?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, I am saying that there appears to be historical parallels.

Erlichman says the Watergate thing, I do not think there is anything to add what we have already said. Haldeman said you might re-say it. Erlichman: That nobody in the government did this thing. Haldeman: The White House. Nixon: What do you mean Watergate White House? Nobody currently in the government. Haldeman: Currently employed in the government, say currently employed. Nixon: Ever involved in the government. Erlichman: Now you have Liddy and Hunt who were at one time employed. Nixon: But while they were doing it even, while they were doing it? Erlichman: That is right. Then employed I can say. Nixon: No one who is an employee of the White House, who is an employee of the White House. Then he goes on. Erlichman says either at the time of the incidence or since. Nixon: Or since, that is what I mean, yes. Because in fact they were still employed but not at the White House. They were another branch of government. That is the precision of the is, that they had it down, that they were at the White House earlier, they are now in another branch of government, but if they said is in a certain way, it implied they weren't employed by the government.

Parallel Number 10: Everybody does a defense. January 2, 1973, Nixon and Colson. Nixon: Our democratic friends did a lot of things too and never got caught.

Number 11: This is just partisan politics. February 6, 1973, Haldeman says something we heard almost weekly. Haldeman: As we start into the Senate thing, which is that there is a dire threat to the two party system, because for the first time in our history we have one of the political parties using the machinery of government to investigate the other political party. He is trying to get them all stirred up. It is not going to make any difference, and he does not have any illusions that it will. He is just trying to make a case that this is a totally partisan thing.

12: Coordinate the witnesses. March 6, 1973, John Dean said, well, I think the most important thing for our handling the hearings are, one, any witnesses that go up are well prepared. You know, re-reading your speech on the Hiss case again showed how effective investigators can be if one witness does not know what the other witness or there is a dichotomy between the witnesses. I want to make a direct point here. I sat in on the deposition of Jane Sherborne, and she told us how they coordinated the White House witnesses both before and after.

Number 13: Conspiracy to commit perjury, Nixon and Haldeman. Haldeman: I said that that is a conspiracy to commit perjury even if Magruder did in fact later commit perjury or even at the time he was answering Dean's questions commit perjury. He said not if Dean advised him to tell the truth, and I said what if Dean did not advise him of anything. He said, okay, I take that back, but I will simply say to you that there was a conspiracy to commit perjury and there was a conspiracy to commit justice.

14:——

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And if this can be the gentleman's last one? And if I can ask the gentleman if he can submit all of those into the RECORD, I think that will be helpful.

Mr. SOUDER. Okay, one I want to finish on then is the loyal secretary/scheduler, Nixon and Rosemary Woods. Two points, one Woods. He said says, well, I think he is too a nice man, referring to a man, but because of that fact is it even safe for me to talk on the phone? Nixon says, no, do not talk on the phone. Woods says I will call this girl today and say as soon as he gets back into town, say I need to see him. In other words, do not do it at the White House.

Then in another amazing parallel Nixon and Rosemary Woods, June 12, 1973. Nixon: You know, Rose, you know that money you got from that fellow? I would like to find a way to get that to the campaign committee. I do not know how it could be done. Woods: I am concerned. Who can hand it to them? Who can hand it to that does not have to say he has got it? It is safe and sound already. Nixon: Third parties. You never know when it is going to be investigated. Woods: But I do not think he would need it, but if so, it is out of the safe, it is in my home.

We have seen this over and over, and it is amazing parallel, and I will submit them all for the RECORD.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And I thank the gentleman, and I thank again Dr. Coburn and everybody else that has come to the floor today to debate the issues that affect Americans, to debate health care, to debate education, our firm belief that communities and teachers and parents should form the alliance to educate our children for the next generation instead of simply bureaucrats and politicians and Washington, D.C., to debate Social Security, to take pride in the fact that in just four short years we have put aside so much more to protect the solvency of the Social Security, especially when you consider that over 40 years our friends on the left did not put aside a single cent, to debate about other issues that have an impact on Americans like tax reform and tax relief for working class Americans.

I have been very surprised that over the past few years every time we try to present a tax cut that would help Americans, that would help lighten the load for parents who want to educate their children, every time we have tried to pass an educational reform that would get dollars into the classroom, every time we have tried to pass educational reforms, every time we have tried to guarantee children in the inner city of the District of Columbia south of Anacostia River and points

north the same opportunity that so many people in this Chamber are able to give to their children, every single time it is met with a veto.

And so tonight on a Sunday night approaching 8:30 Eastern Daylight Time, we are here, we are ready to work. We would ask the President to hold his third Cabinet meeting of the year tomorrow and at that Cabinet meeting talk about education reform, talk about saving Social Security the way we have over the past several years, talk about continuing to balance the budget without spending $17.1 billion in new dollars that will be taken directly out of the Social Security Trust Fund. Let us talk about the issues that affect Americans instead of running around the country talking about fund-raising and also obsessing over a shutdown strategy that does not do my children or the President's children or America's children any good.

I again thank my friends for coming to the floor and speaking tonight, and I certainly hope that the President will stay in town, work hard and give us a process that every American can be proud of.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROEMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOYD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TURNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GORDON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LOFGREN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GOODLING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BALLENGER, for 5 minutes, today.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 10, 1998:

H.R. 3694. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3790. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the Library of Congress.

H.R. 4248. To authorize the use of receipts from the sale of the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to promote additional stamp purchases.

H.R. 4194. Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

On October 9, 1998:

H.J. Res. 133. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8:30 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, October 12, 1998, at 12:30 p.m for morning hour debates.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4805. A bill to require reports on travel of Executive branch officers and employees to international conferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.R. 4806. A bill to authorize the carrying out of a flood damage reduction and recreation project at Grand Forks, North Dakota, and East Grand Forks, Minnesota; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3710: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4065: Mr. CALVERT.