$4,800 to $6,080 a year, a 45-percent increase.

I have not heard a single Republican stand in this well and talk about what the premium growth is going to be over that same period. Not a single Republican has done what Paul Harvey does, and that is tell the rest of the story. Let us tell the rest of the story in terms of what the premium increases are going to be for that 68-year-old widow on a fixed income.

Right now, that senior is paying $46.10 per month. It comes out to $500 a year, somewhere around there. Under the plan that is being put forth by the majority, by the Republican Party, that amount is going to go to $90 to $93 a month, at least. We have not seen the figures. We do not know how much of a shortfall there is going to be, but we can be certain it is going to go from $46.10 a month to at least $90 to $93 a month.

Why have we not heard from the Republicans the rest of the story? Why have they not stood in the well to tell us that? The reason is obvious. The reason is because it is a 100-percent increase, that is, a 100-percent increase in the amount that senior citizens are going to pay for monthly premiums.

Again, it is important to note that I am using the same base year and the same outyear that the Republicans used when they brag about this 45-percent increase in the spending per recipient. That figure is correct, the Republicans are correct, the Government will spend 45 percent more per recipient. They are slowing the growth there. However, they are not slowing the growth as to what the recipients, what the beneficiaries, the widows in our communities, are going to be paying. So on the one hand, you see a 45-percent growth in what the Government is spending, but as far as that person who lives in the heartland, they are going to see a 100-percent increase under this plan.

Let us use the figures a little bit and talk about how that compares to the tax package. If we have a senior citizen who is paying $90 to $93 a month for their benefits under Medicare, that comes out to just about $1,100 a year. If you are a senior citizen who is on a fixed income of $8,000 a year, and your rent is, say, $500 a month, right there you are talking $6,000. You are going to put another $1,100 for Medicare. What are they going to live on? What are they going to live on?

Traditionally what we have done is we have allowed the States to use their Medicaid dollars to supplement that, to help them pay their premiums, but that is not something we want to do in this Congress. We are not going to require them to help pay their Medicare premiums. What is even more striking to me is that this Congress, under the bill that has not yet been introduced but that is being discussed, is going to have seniors paying $1,100 a year for Medicare premiums and at the same time it is going to tell a couple with an income of $200,000, who has two dependents, that they should get a tax credit of $1,000. So we are telling the couple with $200,000 income, ''You get a $1,000 tax credit,'' and we are telling the single widow on a fixed income, ''You are now going to pay $1,100 per year for your health care premiums under Medicare.''

The response, of course, probably from my colleagues on the other side, ''We are just letting them pay the same percentage that they are paying now. They do not mention that under current law it is supposed to drop back down to 25 percent. They are saying, ''Let us just continue and have them pay 31½ percent.''

That gets to the very essence as to why we are missing the boat in health care reform. There is absolutely no attempt being made to seriously deal with those costs. It does not matter to the people who are pushing this package that the costs are going to continue to rise. They are going to slow down what the Government plans to pay for those costs, but they are not seriously going to deal with the costs. They are going to allow that gap between what the Government pays and what the individual has to pay out of their pocket to grow and grow and grow, so the providers will not want to provide the services, hospitals will not want to provide the services, seniors will have to pay more out of their pocket, and all of this is being done so we can have a $245 billion tax cut that disproportionately benefits the wealthy in this country.

Mr. Speaker, what do the American people want to have done? It is clear. The American people want the Medicare system to be working. They want to make sure that it does not fail, they want it to be fixed if there are problems, and I think we should do that. That is why the Democrats are now moving forward with their bill that will fix the problems of Medicare at the tune of $90 billion, not $270 billion, $90 billion. The reason they can do it for $90 billion, rather than $270 billion, is that they are not shaving $180 billion off. They are not building an extra two walls, if you will, or tearing down two walls in the basement that do not need to be torn down. They are solving the problem.

The other issue we have to face is when the Republicans talk about fixing the system, they are not talking about fixing the system for the baby boomers, they are talking about plugging the hole for another 5 years so the system will be flush through the year 2006.

That is exactly what the Democratic proposal that is going to be introduced later this week is also going to do. It is going to take care of the problem through the year 2006, it is going to do so without doubling the premiums that senior citizens pay, it is going to do so in a fair way.

They can do so in a fair way because it does not have this tradeoff that on the one hand says, ''All right, senior citizens, in the year 2002 you are going to pay $1,100 for your health care premiums; a family with an income of $200, we are going to give you a $1,000 tax credit.''

I would ask the people in this body to do what the American people want us to do. They want us to fix the health care system. They want us to get rid of the deficit. Those are their two major concerns. We can do both of those, we should do both of those, and we should forget about this tax cut that disproportionately benefits the wealthiest people in this country, because if we do that we can solve this problem, and we can do so without doubling the insurance premiums that the older people in this country pay each year.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF REPUBLICANS DURING THE LAST YEAR, AND THE REPUBLICAN PLAN TO SAVE MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALMON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] will be joining us, and also the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], and we look forward to an hour of trying to give accurate information to those that might be viewing this 1 hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and we appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] getting the time this evening so we could talk among ourselves and talk to the American public this evening, first of all about what we accomplished in the last year, and then we would also like to go into considerable detail about the Republican plan to save Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is it was 1 year ago today, as a matter of fact, that all three of us and many of our colleagues came to this city from communities all over the country. My district is the First District of Ohio, most of the city of Cincinnati, and many of the western suburban areas of Cincinnati, and I came from that area, and you gentlemen came from your districts. We came here to Washington to sign what I really believe was an historic document.

I had talked to a lot of people in my community, and I asked them, ''If you were Congress, what would you do? What do you think this Congress should be about? What kind of changes would you like to see made?'' I heard the same types of things, it turns out, that you gentlemen were hearing in your districts: that people thought taxes were way too high, they were sick and tired of money being spent up here in Washington so excessively that we had such a huge debt, they wanted

us to balance the budget, they wanted us to reform welfare, they wanted regulatory reform, they wanted tort reform, and so many things.

So we signed a document, we put our name on the line, and we told the people of this Nation that if we had a Republican majority here in the House of Representatives, where we are tonight, if we had a majority of Republicans in the House within the first 100 days, the first 100 days of us being here, we would have an open debate on the floor of this room we are in right now and a vote on 10 specific items.

The interesting thing is a lot of people thought, ''Maybe that is just politicians' talk, and they never really carry out their promises,'' but we kept our promises. We did what we said we were going to do, we had an open debate and a vote on the floor of this House on all those items within the first 100 days. In fact, we did it within 93 days.

□ 2130

Most of those items, all but one, passed in the House. I think it was one of the most proud times I have had in my whole life, was actually carrying out the promises that we made to the people back home. I think probably what would be a good thing for us to do is to discuss specifically what those items were we did, first of all, since it was exactly 1 year ago today that we made that promise, and how in the first 100 days we kept those promises. So perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] might want to take over from there and discuss those promises that we kept.

Mr. JONES. I appreciate that, Mr. CHABOT, and I am delighted to take just a couple of minutes to add to what the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CHABOT, said, and I am sure that the gentleman from the State of Washington, Mr. TATE, will also join in.

I think the Contract With America set a new direction for campaigns in this country, because for the first time in memory we had a political party that said, we will put into writing what we are willing to do if you give us the privilege and the honor to become the majority in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As the gentleman said, we promised the American people that we would get 10 major items to the floor of the House for debate and a vote. I want to remind those that are watching tonight that the 10 items came from extensive polling nationally by the Republican party to find out what issues were at the foremost on the American citizen's minds, and certainly there are more concerns than just these 10. The majority felt that these 10 items must be addressed, and I will just touch on 2 or 3 and let the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] touch on a few others, and then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

Mr. Speaker, obviously, balancing the budget and a line-item veto for the President were two of the issues that the majority of the people said we must deal with; especially balancing the budget. The budget today is about $4.9 trillion in debt. That is growing by the moment. We are talking about a child born this year in our country, the first breath he or she takes as a newborn, they owe $187,000 in taxes, and that is because the Congress has not been responsible in trying to balance the budget.

So the Republican Party, the new majority promised in the Contract With America that, if elected, the majority would, by the year 2002, have a balanced budget. That means we would be the first Congress in about 23 or 24 years that would balance the budget. That does not mean we get to a zero debt. We need to balance the budget every year for the next 25 years after 2002 to get a zero debt, but that is the importance of having a balanced budget amendment.

We passed a balanced budget amendment on the floor of the House, and we did have help from conservative Democrats that joined us, meaning the Republican majority, to pass the balanced budget amendment. Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is still over on the Senate side. They seem to be one vote short, and we certainly hope that they will come up with that one vote, because I think it is absolutely necessary, as do the American people, that we have a balanced budget amendment.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, if I could just mention one thing in follow up on that, even though they still need one more vote over in the Senate to actually pass a balanced budget amendment to put it into the Constitution, nonetheless, we in this House passed the first balanced budget resolution in about 30 years. So the budget that we are acting on right now, the spending up here in Washington that goes all over the country and is spent for services here in Washington, this is a balanced budget resolution, and it will put us in balance over the next 7 years. Some of us voted to do that even quicker. I voted to do it in 5 years.

The President has come around to some degree. He is now talking at least about 10 years. So we are heading in the right direction, but even though the balanced budget amendment did not pass, unfortunately, we are still pushing to balance this budget and we are dedicated to doing that.

I would like at this time to yield to the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. TATE].

Mr. TATE. I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from North Carolina. It has been a privilege to serve with both of the gentleman, and when we were all back here together, as you stated, on September 27, 1994, when we all came back here and signed the Contract With America, we did not sign it with any particular leader. When I signed it, I signed it for the people back in my district.

These are the issues that I heard about over and over and over again, as I went door to door through my district. In Burien, which is the northern part of my district, down through Tacoma and down into Thurston County, I heard people talk over and over again about how politicians keep making promises and then something changes the day after election. They always change. That is why I thought the contract was so important, because we said, if we do not do what we say, kick us out.

Mr. Speaker, we did exactly what we said, starting on day one. We spent 14 hours, 14 hours on January 4, that seems like years ago now, because of the many issues that we have worked on, but 14 hours on the House floor in passing the kind of reforms that have reformed our own house.

I believe very strongly that if you are going to tell other people what to do, you better get your own house in order first, and we passed the law that Congress follow the same laws that apply to every other American, retroactively. That is so important. There are so many reforms that Congress passes and then says, sorry, I do not want to live by those laws. Well, no longer. We are changing that. I am hoping we can review some of those laws and maybe Congress will not be so quick to pass laws that we now have to live under.

We also passed the committee structure, eliminating some of the staff in this place, learning to do more with less. We also made changes, for example, requiring hearings now to be in public. Now, there is a novel concept. If you are going to have a hearing and you are going to raise taxes, it should be in public. It is called the sunshine law and I have been told many times that the best disinfectant is a little bit of sunshine.

I think we are getting our own house in order here in Congress, actually requiring Members to be in committee to vote, because for years, Congressmen did not have to be in committee to vote, and they did not have to live by the same laws as every other American. So those are the kinds of reforms that require us to get our own House in order.

I think we have to lead by example. There are many changes that need to occur. The thing that is exciting to me is we brought up every one of these items for a vote. Some, like term limits which were never allowed, ever, in the history of the United States on this floor to even to voted on. We can argue for and against the merits of term limits, but by gosh, they should at least have an opportunity to have a vote on the floor. That is what we did on three or four different versions, if my memory serves me well.

So we have kept our contract; promises made, promises kept, the ones we made 1 year ago on the Capitol steps,

we have kept the faith with the American people.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, relative to term limits, a couple of things I would like to point out, as the gentleman mentioned, in reforming Congress itself.

On the very first day of Congress, we passed term limits for committee chairmen, and the reason that is important, one of the main problems up here in Washington and in the Congress is we have some of these old bulls, these committee chairmen that have been in power for decades, sometimes, and their power was sometimes corrupting, and oftentimes just not healthy for the system. So we passed term limits for committee chairmen of 6 years, and after 6 years they can no longer be chairman of that committee.

Relative to term limits for all of Congress, the reason that it did not pass in the House is because it was a constitutional amendment, and therefore, we needed two-thirds, not just 50 percent of this body to vote for it, but two-thirds of this House to vote for term limits.

Now, we got 85 percent of the Republican Members of Congress to vote for term limits, 85 percent of us did. Unfortunately, 82 percent of our democratic colleagues in Congress voted against term limits, and that is why that failed in the House. The Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, has indicated the very first bill that will be introduced in the House, assuming we have a Republican majority next time and therefore we have a Republican speaker, will be term limits, once again, and if we have more folks that support term limits, hopefully we will be able to pass it next time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to something that the gentleman from Washington said about the first day that I think is unique, and really I think said to the American people, we did hear you, we heard you clearly.

In addition to what the gentleman from Washington said, that very first day, the first 12 hours, in addition to the reforms that the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] mentioned, we saved the taxpayers $72 million in the very first 12 hours. We did it, as the gentleman from Washington said, by reducing the committee staffs by one-third, saving roughly $67 million. A lot of people did not know this, but in the past, the caucuses that we have within the House of Representatives, those caucuses were being paid for by the taxpayers to the tune of about $5 million. So the first 12 hours of the first day of the new Republican Congress, we saved the taxpayers $72 million in addition to the reforms that Mr. TATE and Mr. CHABOT mentioned.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think that is an excellent point. Another thing we did, and I am sure that the gentlemen remember this very well. I remember I had my little son, who is 6 years old now, he was 5 years old at the time, sitting in a chair right over there, the day we got sworn in, and that was around noon, and we were here until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, because we had promised that we would take action on all of these items the very first day.

To give credit where it is due, many of our colleagues, many of the Democrats on the other side of the aisle, joined us in these reforms the very first day. One of the most important reforms we made the first day, I think, is the fact that we made it tougher than ever for Congress again to raise taxes on the American public, because as the gentleman from Washington mentioned, when he was going around his district, he kept hearing people saying the same thing: balance the budget and cut taxes. It has been too easy to raise taxes on people, so from now on, rather than a simple majority, 50 percent plus one to raise taxes, we have to have 60 percent of this body to ever raise taxes again. That will make it tougher to raise taxes, and that is the way it ought to be.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from North Carolina will yield, a couple of points I would like to make. One of the things that I was involved with is the Barton-Hyde-Tate constitutional amendment. We changed on day one in our own rules that we wanted to live by, regardless if we had a constitutional amendment, but we had a vote, and it came close, we still had a vast majority of the Republicans voting in favor, making it more difficult, a 60-percent majority, required to raise taxes. It should not be easy for the government to take my money. And that one failed, but it was close.

The Speaker has promised that next year on April 15, or 16, I think April 15 falls on a Sunday, but around tax day, we are going to bring that up for a vote again, and one more opportunity for that commitment, promises made, promises kept.

Another important part of the contract is we reduced the tax burden. In 1993 the Clinton administration raised taxes. We cut taxes. I guess I am not apologetic for giving people back their own money. What we are saying is, we are not going to take as much so you can spend it on your family to pay for your health care, for your clothes, for your trip to Disney Land, whatever your family needs, and that is a huge change, letting people control their own money, even before it gets to Washington, DC, and that is what excites me about the Contract With America.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Washington makes some excellent points, and relative to balancing the budget and taxes, there were many of our critics whom we remember when we were running last year, and I kept saying, I want to balance the budget, I do not want to raise taxes. I had some of the folks in the press, and my opponent, over and over again, and many of our critics said, you cannot possibly balance the budget without raising taxes. Well, we proved them wrong.

We absolutely have to balance this budget. It is immoral to continue to spend and spend and spend the people of America's money up here in Washington and turn that debt over to our children. It is immoral to continue to do that. So we are going to balance the budget, but we are not going to balance the budget by raising taxes. We are going to balance this budget by cutting spending. That was our commitment, that is what we are going to do.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I represent the third district in North Carolina, which is the coastal area of the eastern part of the State. During the campaign for Congress, and again as the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Washington said, I used the contract with every civic club I had a chance to speak to. Every time I had a chance to meet with any group or any individual, I talked about the Contract With America.

So many times I would hear from working men and women, we cannot afford more taxes. We cannot afford this government to continue to grow on our backs as we are working two jobs, in many cases. This came to me in conversation with an individual: I am working two jobs, my wife is working two jobs, we are doing the best we can, but we see that the harder we work, the further we get behind.

The reason for that, and I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio talking about the fact of balancing the budget without raising taxes. In this country today, the average working family would spend more on paying taxes than that same average working family would spend on clothing, housing or food. How can they ever realize the American dream when they work more and longer hours, they pay more in taxes? That is not what this country should be about, and again, I think that is another reason why we have the opportunity and the privilege that we have to make the changes in this country that the American people would like to see made.

□ 2145

Mr. TATE. I think the gentleman from North Carolina hits a salient point by talking about the tax burden. Because as we finished the Contract With America, May 6 was Tax Freedom Day. If you add up all the State and local and Federal taxes, you have to work now until April 6 before you start earning your own money.

If you add in all the Federal regulations and State regulations and county regulations and city regulations and all the taxes, you have to work until the middle of July before you start earning your own money. You have to work almost half a year before you get to keep some of your own money to spend on your family, to pay for your education, as I stated before.

I think that what we are doing is reducing that burden, allowing people to keep more of their own money, to make more of their own decisions at home instead of some bureaucrat that fills some building here on the Potomac telling the people in the towns in my district where these bureaucrats do not even know where they are, they cannot even pronounce it, yet they are taking their money and making their decisions for them.

I would rather keep it at home and let them make their decisions. That is the difference in this freshman class and this new Congress, is we are allowing the people to make their own decisions, letting States make the decisions, not bureaucrats, empowering people.

Mr. CHABOT. The problem and the reason that previous Congresses and the folks in control of this House for the past 40 years were unable to balance the budget is they really had it all wrong. The way they looked at things is not that the government overspent. They thought that the people of this country were just undertaxed. We think just the opposite. The problem is not that people pay too few taxes. It is just that they overspend up here in Washington.

When we talk about the tax burden, I think it is important that we look at the trend that has happened in this country. I was born in 1953. Right around that time, in the early 1950's, the average American family sent about 5 percent of what they earn up here to Washington in the form of taxes. That has increased over the past 40 years to about 25 percent, from 5 percent to 25 percent of what the average American family earns comes up here to Washington in the form of taxes.

If you add into that city taxes and county taxes and State taxes and Social Security taxes and real estate taxes and property taxes, and God knows what all the taxes we all pay every day, the average American family now pays 40 to 50 percent of what they earn in one form of taxes or another.

The folks on the other side of the aisle, the liberals in this institution, keep attacking us on a daily basis, saying, oh, well, we are just trying to give tax cuts to the rich. That could not be further from the truth. Seventy-five percent of the tax cuts that we passed this year go to people who earn under $75,000. Things like a $500 tax credit per child for families. Those are the types of taxes that we really need to encourage. Capital gains taxes, so that businesses can create more jobs, so rather than people being on welfare, people are working. Those are the types of positive changes that this Republican majority who now controls the House has been trying to enact.

Mr. JONES. I want to add to that list. The gentleman is absolutely right. When we can help working families with children, that is the right thing to do. The other side, I certainly do not criticize them, even though I do not agree with them, but certainly in my opinion, they are out of touch with the working man and woman in this country.

You listed some of the changes that we want to see as it relates to taxes. I was pleased this past couple of weeks, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], a Republican, one of the young leaders in this House of Representatives, introduced a bill to repeal the inheritance tax. I do not know about your State and your district, but I can tell you that in my district, eastern North Carolina, the people of my district think one of the most unfair taxes, maybe the most unfair tax is the inheritance tax. When a man, a women has worked all their life, paid taxes all their life, to accumulate and hopefully leave something to their child or their children and then the children have to pay taxes on it. I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and the new Republican leadership for being willing to at least get this debate started on repealing the inheritance tax. There are so many good things that we are doing.

Mr. CHABOT. That is, I think, an excellent point. What we have seen across the country is, for example, when you have had a family who has owned a farm, and wants to pass that farm on to the next generation, either their sons or their daughters, to run that farm, they have oftentimes been unable to do so because of the exorbitant inheritance taxes. In essence they have had to sell the farm in order to pay their taxes. That is not fair to that family and it is certainly not healthy to our agricultural communities across this country.

We have had the same problem with small business owners, somebody owns a business and they want to pass that business on to the next generation. Sometimes the businesses get sold down the river to pay the taxes. What happens to those people that worked there, the employees? Many, many people get hurt besides just the business owner and his family.

I agree very much with the proposal of the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] to try to reform the inheritance tax system in this country because it has been very, very unfortunate what it has done in many instances.

Mr. TATE. I agree 100 percent in what you are doing on that particular issue. Another part of our tax proposal that helps people in their retirement years, some of the things we do for senior citizens. We have heard a lot about Medicare and the so-called tax cuts for the rich. I do not know what their definition happens to be, anybody who has a job, anybody who pays taxes must be considered the rich, because we are tying to provide as much tax relief as we possibly can for working Americans.

One of the things I think gets overlooked, especially in the House proposal, is in 1993, Clinton raised taxes on senior citizens, especially under their Social Security benefits by 70 percent. Where I come from, 70 percent is a huge increase in your taxes. What we did is we are repealing that under the House proposal, allowing senior citizens under our House proposal to work longer, under our Contract With America.

Right now if you make over $11,000 a year and you are on Social Security, you start losing your Social Security benefits. That does not make any sense. If people want to work, they should be able to. They should not be punished for working. We allow them to make up to $30,000 a year. We allow them, one provision I have listed here is provides tax incentives to encourage individuals to purchase and employers to offer long-term care coverage.

These are the kind of things that seniors are concerned about. We also provide incentives for working families if they want to purchase a home or post-secondary education or medical expenses. Those were all part of the Contract With America that the Members out here voted for. Those are those so-called tax cuts for the rich we always hear about are really the working Americans that live in all our districts that we go home and see every weekend, we have town halls with, we run into at the grocery store. Those are the people we are trying to help. I think we are straight forward. There are a lot of attacks. But I wanted to get the truth out on the tax cuts we have passed on the floor of the House.

Mr. JONES. Just a couple of other points with the Contract With America. The American people want to see a real true welfare reform bill. They want to see the Congress strengthen our military defenses so that we are adequately prepared to protect this Nation. I want to touch on that just a moment because I am on National Security, and I also have 3 bases that are in my district.

For the past few years, the Congress in passing the Department of Defense budget, many times in that Department of Defense budget were allocations for nondefense items. I want to touch on that just a moment.

Between 1990 and 1993, the GAO, the General Accounting Office, said that the Department of Defense budget between 1990 and 1993, $10.4 billion in those 3 years went to nondefense spending. As the new Republican majority in our Contract With America, we have established a fire wall, so that no dollars under the Republican leadership that are going to the defenses of this Nation can be used for nondefense items. I think that is extremely important, because quite frankly over the past few years, our defenses have not gotten what they need to protect this Nation.

I think that is just one of many items in our Contract With America, to help strengthen our defenses. I just wanted to mention that.

Mr. CHABOT. I believe the gentleman makes some very important points about our defense. Another item that you mentioned was welfare reform.

This was one of the things that I saw up front and very close in my community in the city of Cincinnati. I was on the Cincinnati City Council for 5 years and I was a Hamilton County commissioner in Cincinnati for 5 years.

One of the greatest problems, one of the most frustrating things that I saw was how destructive the welfare system was in Cincinnati. I am sure that was repeated all over this country. We passed, I believe, a very positive welfare reform package in the House earlier this year. I think, and I have heard again some of the folks on the other side attacked us as being mean-spirited, not caring about the poor, because we were trying to change welfare. But I would argue that there was nothing more mean-spirited, nothing more corrupting, nothing more damaging to children in this country than the present welfare system, which basically for many years has encouraged families to break up, has encouraged fathers not to live in the home but to go away from the home, not to support their own kids. Kids all over this country grow up in homes where they never see an adult go to work. They then fall into that same pattern of behavior.

Our plan emphasizes work. It gives job training, it gives job opportunities and basically assists people into getting into work in the private sector, not some government make-work-type jobs but jobs in the private sector. We have got to get people working, supporting themselves and supporting their own families.

I would argue it is really not fair to require other families that oftentimes both the mother and the father have to work, sometimes work two jobs to support their own kids, and then they get their money taken and sent here to Washington and sent to folks on welfare who for the most part ought to be supporting themselves and supporting their own children.

I am all for helping the truly needy, but too often welfare in this country has become a permanent way of life, generation after generation after generation on welfare.

I think our plan was a step in the right direction, requiring people to work, and support their own children, and emphasizing families staying together. That is direction we should be heading.

Mr. JONES. Am I correct, and please correct me, the gentleman from Ohio as well as the gentleman from Washington, I believe I have seen or read that since the beginning of the Great Society in the mid 1960's, this Nation has spent over $5 trillion on welfare-type programs.

Mr. CHABOT. That is exactly right. It is interesting that that $5 trillion is almost the same amount as our national debt right now, of which 14 cents of every dollar that comes up here to Washington just goes to pay the interest on that debt. We have spent a tremendous amount of money on welfare. Most of that money I would argue has been counterproductive and just has not worked. Most of that money, the explosion in the spending started back in the 1960's during Lyndon Johnson's Great Society. I think the intentions were good but the results have been tragic for this country.

Mr. TATE. I would agree that we have spent over $5 trillion, that is with a T, trillion since the 1960's. But even more important than the money, more than the $5 trillion, if you added up the human toll that these problems have really caused for many Americans. It has spread the wrong kind of dependence.

It is a system that to me you subsidize, I have heard many times, subsidize what you want more of and tax what you want less of. What we have done is subsidize irresponsible behavior. If you have more and more children and you are not responsible, we are going to give you more and more money under the current plan.

We are trying to encourage people to be more responsible, requiring people to work. I can tell you there is no better self-esteem or social program than someone having a job, someone feeling the pride in getting up every day and going to work. If we want to help people, let us teach them to work, not just teach them, ''If I stay home, I'll get a check.'' That does not teach people the right kind of thing. Let us get them a job. It helps them to be accountable to the taxpayer as well and to themselves. So we break that cycle of dependence, we give them the self-esteem that a job brings, we hold them to be responsible for their action because we are not going to subsidize irresponsible behavior and we give States the flexibility to come up with plans that work.

Because I can tell you, south Tacoma is a lot different than the south Bronx or South Dakota. We need plans that fit those local neighborhoods.

Mr. JONES. Is it true that the President, President Clinton as a candidate for the presidency campaigned and said he is going to insist that we have welfare reform, he is going to see that welfare reform takes place, and I sincerely believe, I do not know if you would agree or not, that had it not been for the American people electing a Republican majority in the House and the Senate, I doubt we would have welfare reform which today we have on the House and Senate side, we are passing a major welfare reform bill.

Mr. TATE. The gentleman is exactly right. The President actually campaigned, and I hope I got the quote exactly right, to end welfare as we know it. Basically the plans that we have seen from the administration have been to tinker with welfare as we know it. Window dressing, maybe a fresh coat of paint, call it Workfare, but it is basically the same old packaged plan. We are trying to come up with a plan that transforms, gets people out of that cycle of dependency, out of the system that really brings them down and trying to change the system.

□ 2200

I believe the Democrats controlled the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives for 2 years, and I do not remember any welfare proposals passing. But we have been able, and some people can agree or disagree with the proposal or the fine print, we have come up with a plan that I think transforms the welfare system and really gives people the hand up they really need instead of just a handout that traps them there.

Mr. CHABOT. Moving along with the items in the Contract With America that we passed in the House this year, another item that I think was very important was we rewrote the so-called crime bill that was passed in this House last year. I think we would all agree that crime in this country is far too high, the fact that people, oftentimes many of our senior citizens, are prisoners in their own homes, cannot take a walk on the street because they are worried about being mugged or being raped or something just awful happening; I mean, it is a crime itself that that level of crime has been able to go on all of these days, and much of it is linked to the drug problems that we have, much of it is linked to the fact that kids do not have appropriate parental supervision at home. They hang out on the street corners. They get involved in crack dealing and shoot each other, and it is just a mess.

So, unfortunately, the crime bill that was passed last time I do not think did much good. There were a lot of social programs in there. There was midnight basketball and many of us, in talking with the people in our districts last time when we were running, heard over and over again, ''We want a real crime bill. We want something that is really going to battle crime in this Nation and not just have some feel-good legislation that makes people think something happened.'' So we passed, I think, a very, very good, comprehensive crime bill earlier this year. It gave flexibility to the States to determine what really worked in those particular communities. If midnight basketball works in a community, that is something they can have an option to do. Other communities may choose to do something entirely different. It required truth-in-sentencing where, if you have a violent criminal, they are going to be locked up because when they are behind bars, they are not out on the streets preying on the public.

It toughened the death penalty in this country. I firmly believe in the death penalty. Most of the people in this country believe in the death penalty. There are some people that have just a moral feeling about it. They do not agree. That is fine. It is a free country. We can have both sides of the

issue. We do have a death penalty in most States. The problem with the death penalty, and some people argue it is not a deterrent, the poor deterrence is the fact of the way we handle the death penalty in this country. We let people sit in death row for 15 years, 16 years. We need a short appeals process, and then the death penalty, I believe, should be carried out. Then I think it would be a deterrent. That is one of the things this crime bill did. It shortened the death penalty appeals process. I think we need to go even further in that area. It was certainly a step in the right direction.

The levels of crime has gotten far too high in this country. We are actually doing something about that finally in this House.

Mr. TATE. I want to commend the gentleman for his work on the Committee on the Judiciary on these issues. I remember the gentleman speaking several times on the floor trying to toughen the legislation, and I think the gentleman should be commended. He hit it right on the nose: Block grants, once again letting the cities and States decide how the money should be spent. Instead of mandating what I call hug-a-thug social programs down on to local governments, we are going to let the local governments come up with their own plans, community policing, more police, more equipment, whatever they need. Every community is different. Cincinnati is probably different than Seattle. The cities in North Carolina are different than the city of Tacoma.

Mr. CHABOT. We have a better baseball team.

Mr. TATE. I would have to dispute the gentleman from Ohio on that particular phrase. That was not part of the contract.

But I appreciate his comments. But once again, truth-in-sentencing, you hit it on the nose. If someone is caught and convicted and sentenced, should they not serve at least 85 percent of their sentence? Once again, we want to bring credibility back to our system, whether it be in our own House as we pass reforms, or in our justice system to make sure we truly have a justice system, not just a legal system. We want to make sure there is some justice in our system where, if you commit a crime against society or against an individual, you ought to serve time.

Mr. CHABOT. The gentleman mentioned I am on the Committee on the Judiciary. A couple of the other things in the contract, many of the items passed through the Committee on the Judiciary, so we had our hands full in that earlier 100 days. Tort reform, for example, was something passed through the Committee on the Judiciary.

We had a lottery system in this country where trial lawyers oftentimes benefited, made tremendous amounts of money. It is arguable whether the people that got hurt got very much at all. We wanted to change the lottery system.

There was a case in New York City, for example, that gives you an example of what was wrong with the system. There was a case where a homeless person decided to commit suicide, threw himself in front of a subway train. He was unsuccessful. He did not die, but he was injured seriously. He turned around and sued the city of New York, and he won, and that just shows one of the ridiculous types of cases that, under the existing laws, happened.

Another case a lot of people have heard about is the lady who spilled coffee on herself at McDonald's Restaurant, turns around and sues McDonald's and gets a multimillion-dollar verdict. It was reduced somewhat to the hundreds of thousands, but we all pay for higher insurance premiums, and we need to have a system that, rather than just lawyers making out, we need for people who have really been injured and people who need justice to be able to get fair and equal justice under the system, and that is what our bill attempted to do.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield to touch on another subject or item in the Contract With America, and the gentleman or the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] might speak to this, that we had legislation that would strengthen families by giving greater control to parents as it related to education. We also strengthened the child support programs so that the fathers that were not meeting their responsibilities of being a father in a divorce situation, that they would have come up with the money to support that child and also we got tough with child pornography. I believe that these were part of the Contract With America and, generically speaking, some of the areas that we spoke to in our legislation, again, what the American public wanted to see.

Mr. CHABOT. Those are very good issues, points, and things that we certainly made progress in.

One of those things which is near and dear to my heart is the area of education. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] and I are cochairmen of a group that has been trying to get rid of the Federal Department of Education up here in Washington, so that instead of bureaucrats making the decision about how our kids are going to be educated, we let parents and teachers and local school boards determine how the money ought to be sent and how the education ought to be carried out and what books they ought to have instead of some nameless, faceless bureaucrat up here in Washington, and we would save billions of dollars in the process.

Mr. TATE. Is there anyone that sits in that big building out there, I think on Independence Avenue, in the Department of Education, anybody in that building teach anywhere in the district of Ohio that you represent?

Mr. CHABOT. The gentleman has got me stumped. I cannot guarantee that there is not somebody in there.

Mr. TATE. I can tell you I do not know of anybody there that teaches anywhere in the Ninth District of Washington. That is our point, once again these are people, good family people that work there. They do not know the families in my district. So why are they making decisions? I think you made a good point.

Mr. CHABOT. The bill that we have sponsored up here is called the Back to Basics Education Act, and we have 111 cosponsors, meaning that 111 Members of this body have indicated they support this legislation. Again, what it does is it takes the power away from the bureaucrats up here in Washington and gives it back to the folks at the local level, parents, teachers, and local school boards.

Education is a very, very important issue with me. I am a former schoolteacher. I taught in an urban school in downtown Cincinnati and taught the seventh and eighth grades. In fact, my daughter is in the eighth grade this year, so I can identify very much with her and the kids we taught and why this particular bill is so important to the education of children all over this country.

It saves money, too, which is important to the taxpayers.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield, I join you and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] in your efforts. I think I am a cosponsor of the bill, and I join you in looking at the possibility of downsizing or totally eliminating the Department of Education. I could not agree more, having served in the North Carolina General Assembly for 10 years; I know the States can do a better job of working with the counties, working with the teachers and the parents in the counties and throughout the State, of doing a better job of educating our young people than the Federal Government can.

Mr. CHABOT. What we have done thus far this evening is we have kind of talked about what we did during the first 100 days, and the time after that, the Contract With America, what we passed, what we still have to do. We are in September now. We have got a few more months left in this year, and at this time we are setting the budget for next year and we are in very significant times for the future of this Congress and the future of this country, and I think what might be helpful at this time is to show what are the most important issues right now that we have facing us and perhaps discuss those.

I have here a chart which shows four of the issues, and perhaps one of my colleagues might like to indicate what we see here and what the significance of these issues is.

Mr. TATE. The thing that really strikes me is if we just passed just one of those this year, this would be a truly historic Congress. If we just balanced the budget for the first time since 1969,

we could go home and say we have accomplished something, that is goal No. 1, in 7 years, and as the gentleman from North Carolina stated, a child born today will have $187,150 in taxes that they will have to pay in their lifetime just to the Federal Government just to finance the national debt, not to pay it off, but to finance it.

Mr. CHABOT. Why do we not drop down to the third item and maybe come up to the second item last?

Mr. TATE. Under welfare reform, as we talked earlier, I mean, truly historic as well. If we come up with welfare reform between now and the rest of the year, one has passed the House, one has passed the Senate, we are going to work out the differences and some fine-tuning to do between now and the middle of November, come up with plans to give States more flexibility, come up with plans to truly break the cycle of dependency.

The fourth item on there is providing tax relief for working families and job creation, giving more working families money back to them, creating jobs so those people on welfare will not be stuck in a cycle of dependency but will have a job that pays good wages, that gets the engine of the economy going, which is small business.

Mr. CHABOT. The four items that we have up here are the important issues we still have facing us this year, the ones we really want to accomplish, the ones we will not back down on, we will not blink on, we will not flinch on in dealing with the President, things that absolutely have to be done for the future of this country.

The next item that we want to talk about now, for the balance of the time that we have left this evening, is the fact that we have to save Medicare from bankruptcy, and that is the issue that I think is so important that we are going to spend the rest of the time that we have here this evening discussing how we are going to save Medicare and why it is so critically important.

I think the way we want to start out here is that, first of all, I think most people around the country realize now that Medicare is in serious trouble, and Medicare's own trustees, including the Clinton administration Cabinet secretaries, Donna Shalala, Robert Rubin, and Robert Reich, have indicated that Medicare starts losing money next year and goes bankrupt in the year 2002. So that is what this next chart here indicates.

This is the conclusion of the Medicare trustees. This was in April of 1995. Again, I want to emphasize that three of these trustees, these are not Republican Members of Congress, they are not our staff people. These are President Clinton's top Cabinet officials, Donna Shalala, Robert Rubin, and Robert Reich, and what it says here, ''The fund is projected to be exhausted in 2001.'' By funds, they are talking about Medicare funds. The funds will be exhausted in the year 2001.

Here are their signatures. Here are their names right down here.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield, is it not correct that 1996 will be the first year that there will be more money going out of the fund than coming in, and, for an example, what we are talking about is $1 billion more going out of the fund in 1996 than coming in?

Mr. CHABOT. That is one of the scary things, that it goes bankrupt in 7 years, but it starts losing money next year, and this has not happened before. This is the first time in history it goes completely bankrupt in the next 7 years.

I would argue very strongly that it would be immoral for us to let that happen. My mom and dad, you know, are on Medicare. They receive the benefits. Many of our relatives do. People in my district do, thousands and thousands of people. It is something that they paid into. It is something that was sacred, that the Government basically made a contract with them just like we made a contract with America this year.

I think it is our responsibility, as Members of Congress, to not let Medicare go bankrupt. We have to save it. We have to preserve it. We have to protect it for the seniors now, for this generation and for future generations. That is absolutely critical.

Mr. TATE. If the gentleman will yield, I could not agree more. This is to me, to sit back and do nothing is the absolute worst thing we could do. We cannot just bury our heads in the sand. We cannot just say, ''I wish it would go away.'' That is not the way things work.

We are elected to be responsible. We are elected to save programs that the public believes are important and come up with ways to save it.

I happen to have a copy of the summary right here, ''Status of social security and Medicare programs,'' and it clearly states the HI, the hospital insurance fund, which pays for hospital bills, continues to be severely out of balance and is projected to be exhausted in about 7 years.

□ 2215

I mean that is about as clear as it gets. It is projected to be exhausted in 7 years.

I guess I cannot look at the grandparents, the retired folks in my district, the people that depend on Medicare, in the face and say, ''I'm sorry. I'm not going to do anything. I hope it goes away.''

I mean we have to do something. We cannot afford not to. We have a moral responsibility, a moral imperative, to do something, and I just appreciate the gentleman bringing this issue out tonight because I can think of no more important issue than keeping what I call the original Contract With America, a contract from one generation to the next to help our seniors, and, boy, I would do everything I can to preserve, protect, and strengthen it, and that is what our program is all about.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I think one thing that we absolutely should make clear is that although some of the folks who want to scare senior citizens across this country are talking about us cutting Medicare, that could not be further from the truth. What we are talking about doing is increasing the spending on Medicare, but at a slower rate. Right now in the private sector medical care has been increasing at about 5 percent, 6 percent, thereabouts, a year. Medicare has been going up 10 percent, 11 percent a year, so just about double what it has been in the private sector.

So what we have to do is we have to slow the growth of Medicare so it is more consistent with what is going on in the private sector so that we can save Medicare, and in fact the dollars in our plan go up, and I will give you the dollar amounts. Right now for every senior in this country on average, Mr. Speaker, we spend $4,800. The U.S. Government spends $4,800 on Medicare per senior citizen this year. Under our plan over that 7 years' period of time it will go from $4,800 up to $6,700, and that is more than the rate of inflation every year. So we are talking about increasing spending from $4,800 to $6,700.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, that ain't a cut, and even up here in Washington when oftentimes folks on the other side of the aisle are trying to scare seniors and trying to mislead, that is not a cut, it is an increase, and that's the way we have to save Medicare.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on something the gentleman is going to touch on in a second. I just want to read a paragraph to him and the gentleman from Washington that is in the Washington Post dated September 15, Friday, and I do not think any one of us could say that the Washington Post is pro-Republican philosophy. So, therefore, I think it is worthy that I should read this to you and those that might be viewing. It says:

> Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole accused the Democrats and their allies yesterday of conducting a campaign based on distortion and fear to block the cuts in projected Medicare spending that are the core of the Republican effort to balance the budget in the next seven years. They're right; that's precisely what the Democrats are doing—it's pretty much all they're doing—and it's crummy stuff.

This is from the Washington Post, September 15, and I read that because of what you just said. I want to share with you and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] that back in my district we are basically a rural district. Many of the senior citizens are so dependent on Medicare, and I can honestly tell you that right now they believe that we are sincere, that we are going to do what has to be done to preserve, protect, and strengthen the Medicare for our senior citizens, and I can tell you even though the other side, and not everybody on the other side, but some, are trying to scare the senior

citizens in my district, it is not working.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. You have mentioned the Washington Post. I have a couple of articles here. This is exact wording from the Washington Post here, and I would just like to refer to a couple of these things, what the Post has to say about the Democrats' mediscare campaign. This is an exact quote from the Washington Post:

> They have no plan. Mr. Gephardt says they can't offer one because the Republicans would simply pocket the money to finance their tax cut. It's the perfect defense. The Democrats can't do the right thing because the Republicans would then do the wrong one. But that has nothing to do with Medicare. The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and to duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it is wrong.

This is the Washington Post.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington because in this display of distortion by the other side, and again not talking about every individual, but talking about the—those of a very liberal nature that are not willing to address this every serious problem facing Medicare in the future. Congressman TATE, is it not true that the other side has been running some very distorted, unfair ads in your district pointed at you?

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say that was not so, but, you know what? It is. In face, they have purchased about $85,000 over the last week or so, running ads on television, running advertising on the radio, having Medicare vans going through the district.

The amazing thing is these same organizations are also people that receive grants from the public government, which is amazing, taxpayer funding of the big lie, saying that somehow we are cutting Medicare, and I can tell you the people in my district have been calling our office, and as of last Thursday or Friday we had over 700-some calls, and only 22 have called in and said, ''You know, don't cut Medicare,'' and the vast majority of whom, or 90-some percent, said, ''RANDY, we're not going to listen to these ads. We're tired of outside groups coming in trying to scare us, trying to threaten us, saying the sky is going to fall, the Chicken Little approach,'' and I can tell you that the people in my district understand that Medicare is going broke. The trustees have come out and said that we need to save it, that we are going to increase the amount that we are going to spend on it.

Mr. Speaker, I have had town halls. I know probably all of us have had town halls, senior advisory committees. They have had 20-some hearings, Ways and Means, Commerce Committee this year, soliciting ideas. Instead of a top-down approach, we have gone out to the people in our districts and asked, ''How can we fix the plan? Here is the problem. What's your solution?''

And that is what we are trying to incorporate. The people in my district are ignoring the ads. They are saying they are tired of the lies, they are tired of it being financed by their own dollars. You know, these are same groups, the same American Families Coalition, who receive money from the Federal Government. It is outrageous and it is blatant.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have another Washington Post, and obviously these are blowups here, but what the Post has to say about the Republicans' Medicare plan—this is the Washington Post:

> Congressional Republicans have confounded the skeptics. It's incredible. It's gutsy. It addresses a genuine problem that is only going to get worse.

This is the Washington Post talking about the Republicans' Medicare plan, and I brought a couple of articles here from two of my hometown newspapers, the Cincinnati Post and the Cincinnati Enquirer. I am not going to read the entire articles, but I would just like to read a couple of quotes. This is from my district in Cincinnati. This is the Cincinnati Post talking about the Republican Medicare plan. It says:

> Will the Republican plan actually cut anything? No. It just slows the rate of growth.
>
> But it is extraordinary, in an age when political truth-telling and courage are often thought in meager supply, that the Contract-With-America crowd is following through on its pledge to balance the budget and is going about it the only way possible, by reforming an entitlement program hugely popular with middle-class voters.
>
> And the plan is, in fact, meritorious, not only because it would save billions upon billions of dollars if enacted, but chiefly because it would introduce market principles into the program, enabling the elderly to shop around for what suits them best.
>
> Democrats, carrying on as if the Republicans were caught building concentration camps, have been trying to scare the elderly into paroxysms of protest, so far to no avail.
>
> Perhaps the elderly have noticed that per capita spending under the Republican plan would rise from $4,816 this year to $8,734 in 2002. That's just a few hundred dollars less than without the proposed changes.
>
> Still, action, above all, is what's needed. Now, that is why the House Republicans' plan is such a valuable start to badly needed Medicare reform.

That is the Cincinnati Post.

Let me read briefly from the Cincinnati Enquirer.

> The quacks who have been playing doctor with Medicare for decades always prescribe the same treatment: Bleed taxpayers to keep the cash transfusions coming, but don't close the wounds—that would be painful.
>
> Finally, Republicans have dared to propose some surgery to get Medicare healthy again. And the response from the Clinton administration has been the same old faith-healing.

And then they quote Donna Shalala's response to our plan. They quote Donna Shalala as saying:

> We will not go back to the days when older Americans brought bags of apples to pay for their doctor visits,'' was the panic-inducing response from Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala.

And what the Enquirer says to her response, ''That's snake oil.''

''Considering the critical condition of Medicare, the Republican therapy is fairly painless.''

And then it goes into some of the details about our plan, and it says:

> Unless something is done, Medicare could go broke and double the federal deficit by 2005, soaking taxpayers and the elderly with increases measured like a runaway fever chart.
>
> It's long past time for a healthy cure before Medicare has a massive stroke. The Republican remedy is a good place to start.

That is a Cincinnati Enquirer.

Mr. JONES. Would you clarify, you or Mr. TATE, for those that might be watching that the tax cuts that have been proposed, $245 billion in tax cuts for working families are more than offset by reductions in savings in Government spending over the next 7 years excluding, excluding Medicare and Medicaid?

Mr. CHABOT. That is exactly correct. The liberals on the other side of the aisle are trying to link the two. They have absolutely nothing to do with each other. The Medicare pay cuts or, excuse me, the tax cuts, were taken care of earlier back in April, and we have a plan that does not affect Medicare at all. The two are entirely separate, but what they are trying to do is play the old political partisan game and scare senior citizens. I think that is reprehensible for them to play that game. What I wish they would do is come with us and work together with us so we can actually solve this Medicare crisis, and I hope the President ultimately will do the right thing as well.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I know that our time is running short, very short.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Actually the time is expired.

Mr. TATE. I just want to thank the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from North Carolina for letting me engage in this colloquy with you tonight, and working on the Contract With America, and preserving and protecting Medicare, and I just want to thank you for the opportunity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that are going to be speaking during the remainder of tonght's activity that they should direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience.

REDISTRICTING IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, as this legislative week begins, I would like to take an opportunity to once again