passed, I mean the President would obviously veto if it ever gets to him, the Senate probably has more sense than to ever take it up, but what they want to do is to establish a new law which would require Medicare beneficiaries to pay, on tap of their copayments and on top of other insurance that they might have now, under their proposal, an additional 40 percent out-of-pocket for routine health care procedures.

Now, that is guaranteed to undermine the public's confidence in the Medicare system and it is precisely what they want to do. It is clearly their motivation. It is so transparent that anyone, no matter how myopic they might be, can see through it.

So over and over again they want to destroy this Medicare program in one way or another by cutting the funding out of it, by pretending the Medicare trustees report is something it is not, trying to elicit fear on the part of people who are depending upon Medicare, and now by attempting to pass a bill which would provide that doctors can charge almost as much as they want and elderly people would have to pay 40 percent out-of-pocket.

It is really, I think, scandalous.

Mr. PALLONE. I am glad you mentioned this. I was actually assuming, which I see from the document I have, which is similar to yours from this Physician's Payment Review Commission, I was assuming that that 40 percent included the copayment, but that is actually beyond the copayment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Yes.

Mr. PALLONE. So you could have a 20 percent copayment and then have this 40 percent out-of-pocket beyond the traditional copayment, which is incredible when you think about it. Who is going to be able to afford that? I mean, very, very few.

Mr. HINCHEY. Oh, yes. That is exactly right. On top of everything else it is as much as an additional 40 percent. So if their bill ever became law, what we would have in the case of a senior citizen who required some surgery of some kind, say for example, that in an addition to the payments that would be made through Medicare and whatever additional insurance they might have, they would then be faced with the need to pay thousands of additional dollars out of their own pocket. And that is just absurd.

Mr. PALLONE. The other thing that I was thinking about when the gentleman was talking about this extra out-of-pocket expense is the fact that the majority of seniors now are covered by medigap. So they are already buying a supplemental insurance policy, in many cases called medigap, that covers services and out-of-pocket expenses in some cases as well.

I know that I saw an article in the New York Times just a few weeks ago that talked about how costs for Medigap supplemental insurance were going up in our States, the New York metropolitan area, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, something like 14 percent over the next year. So when one thinks about all these extra out-of-pocket costs for the seniors that would result, I would assume also that those Medigap premiums would soar as well, because as fewer services were covered, we would see even a higher cost for Medigap.

How far can these people go? How far can the seniors go?

Mr. HINCHEY. Well, there seems to be no limit on the temerity of some of the majority party in this House and their ability to attack Medicare and Medicaid.

I know you have talked about Medicaid earlier. In my State, and I assume it is probably similar in New Jersey, 80 percent of the funding in the Medicaid program in New York goes to pay for the expenses of senior citizens and people with multiple disabilities in nursing homes or similar settings.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly.

Mr. HINCHEY. Obviously, what would happen to the families of those people if Medicare were changed in the way that they are proposing to change it, to block grant it, reduce the amounts of money that is available, send what is left in the form of block grants to the States, the States then would have to add on administrative costs or take out of that administrative costs because now they will have to run the program and be responsible for parts of it. They would have to hire people to do that. They would have to have office space and most of the things that would be associated with making additional costs, which would take money out of the Medicaid program.

As the gentleman mentioned earlier, there is always the temptation for State governments, when they have access to Federal funds, to use them in what might be called creative ways and to spend that money out of the Medicaid system to help balance a budget or to do something else for some other kind of expenditure in some way.

The result of all of that would be far less money available for Medicaid recipients, elderly people in nursing homes, people with multiple disabilities in nursing homes. I ask myself, what would the families of those people do? How would they cope with that? How would they manage under those circumstances?

I can tell the gentleman in the case of many of the people I know, the families of people who have elderly parents in nursing homes or who have someone in their family who is severely handicapped with a severe physical disability as a result of an automobile accident, perhaps, or as a result of a condition at birth in some instances, they simply would not be able to deal with it. They do not have the financial resources.

So people would end up being taken and put into closets somewhere. We have all heard the horror stories that existed prior to the establishment of Medicare and Medicaid; how people, left to their own devices, without the resources to handle these situations in competent ways, what they had to resort to. And I know that we would be in many instances put back into those same circumstances. We have to prevent that and the way we can prevent it is by keeping these programs alive and preventing the opponents of Medicare and Medicaid from having their way, preventing them from destroying these programs, which is precisely what they want to do.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying, and I think that over the next few weeks we will be pointing out more and more about how Medicare and Medicaid are negatively impacted by these Republican proposals.

□ 1930

In many ways, even though we have not talked as much, we have talked about it, but there has not been as much discussion on the floor about Medicaid. In many cases the changes proposed on Medicaid are even more drastic, but I think fewer people will be covered. The impact on senior citizens is just as great, as the gentleman said, because so many senior citizens in nursing homes or other institutions will no longer be covered or will not have adequate coverage and will see increasing out-of-pocket expenses.

The same things we talked about for Medicare in terms of the overcharges, that is also in the Medicaid legislation that the Republicans have proposed. Those overcharges will not be paid by the seniors but will be paid by the family in many cases.

I thank the gentleman for coming down and joining me in discussing this. I know that over the next few weeks we are going to be talking about it more and more, and even though the budget comes before the House tomorrow, a lot of the details will be worked out in the various committees leading up to reconciliation, as we call it, later this year. So we are going to have to continue to fight this battle to preserve Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank the gentleman. This is one of the most critical subjects we have before this Congress, and the more light we can shed on those proposals, the better off the American people will be. They will be able to make competent decisions based on factual information rather than pretend on hysterical statements that we have seen coming out of some of the people in the House over the last couple of days.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentleman.

CONCERNS FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday was a historic day in America, well, at least in Indiana or at least in my house, because my daughter graduated from high school and it was a big event. I do not feel like I should have a daughter graduating from high school. It makes one feel older. It makes one reflective about when they graduated and what their hopes and dreams were at that point in life. Everything seems like it is going to go on forever, that the risks are small, that the adventures are great.

I remember my dad gave a plaque to my band instructor in my little high school in Leo. He thought it was the most hilarious thing, and the band director thought it was the most hilarious thing, and they posted it up over the band director's office so that every day when we practiced we had to see this sign that said, ''Why can't all of life's problems come when we are young and know all the answers?'' I think that is the way many young people feel.

At the same time, we get the sense that many of them are very concerned about their future as well. I think any parent, and many children, who look at what is going on around them, wonder what is going to happen in the next, 10, 20, 30 years. What if the vision on MTV actually becomes the complete reality in a few years? What if the attitudes towards the opposite sex that are reflected in those music videos, the rape, the abuse, the derogatory language towards women, would become the standard in our society? What if the violence that we see in the movies, and in those videos, and the talk of suicide that is rampant in today's rock music would become the reality of the society, even more than it is today?

What if the TV show families, very few of which represent the majority of America, were to become the reality of America for my daughter and my two sons? The Internet and computers have brought an incredible opportunity for all Americans in the education area. We, on our home computer, to be able to tap into the encyclopedias, to be able to tap into the type of educational games and the many things that all of us can go through Internet and other things is miraculous. But on the other hand one can get manuals on how to perform rape and all sorts of pornography right into our house, where we have little or no control as a family, and some of us can get accidentally into our house even when we want to try to control it.

In addition to that, what about the incredible national debt that has just been dumped on my daughter? We just heard a special order which illustrates why we cannot get real change in America. Medicare is going broke. They can talk around it as much as they want to talk around it, but the fact is that it is going broke and every report brings its final reckoning day another year closer in spite of the administration's attempts to cover it up.

And what do we do? We come up with this excuse and this kind of rhetoric, and we do not address it. We have all this big fuss about whether or not the Republicans were mean-spirited and shut down the government because of trying to cut government for senior citizens, when in fact our program was 75 cents a month different from the President's program, when in fact the President had proposed less growth in Medicare spending than the Republicans did just 2 years before we came into office; when in fact the President's proposal wanted to wait and delay those changes until after the election.

The ultimate of the problem that we came to try to Washington to try to change, we in the freshman class, yet we just heard an hour about there not being a problem in Medicare and whistling in the dark as the program goes broke.

My daughter is being struck with a long-term national debt because this government and the people in Washington do not get what the people in America do, which is, unless we change our behavior and start transferring some of the power back to Indiana and back to the homes and individuals and businesses and communities where they can take control of their lives, my daughter and my sons are going to be stuck with everybody else's debt from their irresponsible spending and lack of willingness to gain control of that.

And, furthermore, as we watch our freedoms being eroded, both because of the breakdown of moral values in our society and the breakdown of the willingness of local communities to handle the problems and the general takeover by Washington over our lives and our decisions and our flexibility, and see that power come here to Washington, what type of society is my daughter going to have? How much freedom is she going to have to maneuver?

Are we going to have so killed our market that we are only going to have a few oligopolistic companies or monopolistic companies from which to choose for a career? Is it going to be such a government that we have no economic growth because the government takes such a huge percentage of the taxes or runs up the deficit so high that the interest rates absorb a phenomenal number?

Unless we somehow change the inflationary nature of the health care for senior citizens from 10 percent down to more approximating the 2 percent of the health care growth rate that occurs in the rest of society, our entire Nation is going to go broke.

Unless we deal with Social Security, 43 percent of my daughter's income, 43 percent, will be going to FICA taxes within the next 15 years. We have to deal with these questions, and we in Washington cannot just keep trying to excuse it so we can get elected to the next one and hope we can retire before we have to deal with it and stock our children with it.

But these are not even the main concerns that I want to talk here about tonight. I came here to talk about two, and they are not directly related but they affect our families and our society. One is welfare, and the other is drug abuse.

One of the problems in our society is that we cannot really have freedom unless we have personal responsibility. If people do not exercise personal responsibility, freedom is gradually eroded.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that putting a policeman on every street corner and building prisons everywhere is going to solve the problem of crime. But the people in America and the people in Indiana are not going to stand for the inability to walk in their neighborhood, the inability to go shopping, the inability to talk to their neighbors without fear of being shot. So they will demand that we put a policeman in every corner and build more prisons if we have to. Freedom gets eroded.

The same if we do not control the pornography and the sexual appetites in this country. If we have to worry whether our daughters and wives and our families and single women are concerned whether they are going to get raped, then we are going to have more crime protection and more liberties will be restricted. If we do not get control of the budget and more and more money goes to taxes, more liberties will be restricted there. With freedom comes responsibility.

I believe that one of the dangers of what this administration is doing is they talk the conservative talk. When the President was here early this year, he sounded like the former occupant of my congressional seat, Dan Quayle. He sounded like somebody who was going to promote family values.

He said the era of big government was over. He talked about balancing the budget. In fact, he has gone around the country running all of these different ads about what a great conservative he is, but the problem is that the actions do not match.

Let us look particularly at welfare. We can have an honest difference in policy as to what the Federal Government should do and what the government should do on welfare, but what really frustrated me, I was a staffer here on the House side for 4 years and on the Senate side for 4 years and 2 years in the district, so I have been around. But to be in the middle of it, it is really disappointing to see how much posturing there is and how little really comes often from the heart.

There are honest liberals and honest conservatives, but much of it is just reelection gimmicks, and the rhetoric on the House floor gets very disturbing when we see that. It is one thing if a person says, ''Look, I believe we need a welfare program, we need to expand that welfare program.'' I believe that we have at least one Member of the House who is a member of the Socialist Party and is open about what he believes. One should stand up and say, ''I believe the Federal Government should do this.''

But it is another thing to say, ''I do not believe the Federal Government should do it,'' but then, as the President does, veto every welfare reform bill that comes to him and try to say in TV commercials that in fact he supports welfare reform.

We have been trying to do some welfare reform, but quite frankly part of the reason we are vulnerable when we do things like oppose the minimum wage—which I opposed not because I am not concerned about working families who are trying to make it on a low income, but I am concerned about the people who are going to be laid off because of this bill—but part of the reason many of my friends in the Republican Party voted for the minimum wage bill and why Republicans do not seem to know how to handle the welfare issue, is that we have not articulated a vision for how working families and those people struggling to get out of poverty, those people who are working poor and trying to move up to the next level, we as Republicans have been remiss in trying to articulate a vision. So, we become vulnerable when some of these controversies occur.

Let me start with a very simple point which to me seems so basic, that it is amazing that here in Washington we have to debate it.

That simple point is this: I do not believe that anybody on welfare should be making more or have any more take-home income than somebody working full-time on minimum wage. That seems so simple, does it not? That if somebody is working 40 hours a week for minimum wage, why should somebody not working be making more money through government transfer payments?

I had in our family business in my small town, this has been a number of years ago, we had what we called the second spot on one of our delivery trucks. It was an entry level position, a turnover slot that paid just slightly more than the minimum wage at that time.

I had a college graduate come in looking for a job, and at that point he was getting welfare benefits and his wife had a baby. He said that he would really like to work. He believed that it was the right thing to do to work, but in fact he could bring in this many more dollars staying on welfare than he could working, and would I meet the difference? He said if I came within a thousand dollars of the difference he would take the job, and I did.

There is something wrong with a society where that is the case. Right now, depending on your family mix and what State one is in and a few variables, somebody on welfare can usually get around $15,000. A minimum wage is more like $10,000.

I would take that differential, and by this I do not mean AFDC. We hear Aid to Families with Dependent Children as the welfare program. We have housing programs, we have Medicaid with health care, we have child care programs, we have transportation programs, we have job training programs. I mean the whole range of those benefits. We ought to have a basic point that says it is not going to be above minimum wage, take the dollar differential and help those who are working.

The people who are working should be getting the health benefits in the transition, so that each dollar they make, they get to keep most of it, so that we have the change in the Federal benefit level being slightly less than the change in what they are earning, so there is always an incentive to earn more which we do not currently have in our system.

It seems so eminently logical that we think somewhere along the line someone would try to do this, that instead of rewarding not working we would reward working, and we would build that incentive in for the working families and try to encourage people to work rather than order them to work. We can continue to try to order people to work but we also need to encourage people to work.

We also need to trust more in the people back home. Quite frankly, the people in Indiana, in fact the people in northeast Indiana, know a whole lot more about how to deal with the welfare problem than the people here in Washington know how to deal with the problem in northeast Indiana. This is generally true but it is not just rhetoric anyone.

We have Governors all across this Nation who have been innovative in their attempts to handle the welfare question, whereas Washington has floundered and been ineffective on the welfare question here in Washington.

We had the President praise the Wisconsin program and he said he would try to grant them a waiver, and he was a bit stunned when we actually passed it through the House. We are tired of the talk; we want to see the walk. We passed it through last week and now the Wisconsin model can go forward.

□ 1945

Furthermore, we heard a little bit more about Medicaid a little bit earlier tonight. Do you know in a Government Reform subcommittee that has oversight of this, what stunned me was, do you know that in the Medicaid Program, even though it has been increasing, the actual dollars to poor children and the actual dollars to the seniors have been declining. Do you know why? Because this Congress made—not this particular Congress, but the Congress here in Washington over the last couple years—made people who abuse drugs and alcohol eligible for Medicaid.

A tremendous growth in the Medicaid Program was mandated out of Washington that the State of Indiana and other States, Indiana, for example, did not cover that, had to absorb the cost of drug and alcohol abusers.

So we hear rhetoric about Medicaid helping poor children and rhetoric about Medicaid helping seniors, but in fact a Washington mandate said that they had to cover drug and alcohol abusers. Part of the reason, in fact a major reason why we are giving flexibility to the States on the question of Medicaid is so they can set their standards. And in Indiana, there will be more dollars for low income children and more dollars for seniors under the Republican plan because not every drug abuser and everybody who is abusing alcohol, who I feel very sorry for them, but there is a little bit of a question here, when working families cannot get health coverage and people who choose life styles that are self-destructive can get health coverage, there is some kind of a mismatch. It is your tax dollars that are being spent this way.

So my first point, and I will not belabor this first point any further, is that I think we can generally agree that the welfare program, as it currently stands, is not working.

Let me move to the drug issue. I have talked here on the House floor a number of times, and my friend from Florida, JOHN MICA, earlier talked about this tonight. But in Fort Wayne and in northeast Indiana we have had a tremendous problem with crack cocaine, in particular, as well as other forms of cocaine. We have had a huge increase in LSD, and we have been battling this problem for longer than most cities. It came down from Detroit 12 to 14 years ago and has been expanding.

This mentality of the drug abuse, particularly, and it is not just in the, while much of the activity is taking place in the central city of Fort Wayne, those who are abusing it are not just those residents there. The people from the suburbs and small towns have come in and they destroy those neighborhoods by patronizing the dealers in those neighborhoods. It has now started to expand outside of the central city of Fort Wayne. It is concentrated in the central city of Fort Wayne.

There that culture of crime and the desire for quick money has—not every case of these have been proven to be drug related, but they are usually drug abusers and the culture has infected it. We see at two different times about a year apart pizza delivery boys being shot for the cash they have on them. We had a 13 year old shot by a younger child. Police Chief Neil Moore in Fort Wayne told me a terrible story about a little girl who he found naked in a crack house, who had been selling her body for rocks of crack cocaine. And she was so small that they could fit a, they cut holes out of a burlap bag to put her arms and legs through and she was selling her body for drugs.

Yet what do we see coming out of Washington? We see, if you are going to smoke, do not smoke cigarettes, smoke marijuana. I did not inhale. Oh, we are going to take the things that we are using down there and divert one of the AWACS things up to Alaska to look for oil spills. We are going to send one over to Bosnia. And relax some of

the interdiction efforts of the drugs are pouring into my home town and around this country.

And it is not surprising that we have seen an increase in the amount of cocaine coming into America. We have seen an increase in the purity of that cocaine coming into America. And we have seen a decline in the price. While Washington is talking and posturing in other ways, we have been drowning. And we have reversed, instead of going down as we were for years in drug abuse, we are going back up. Instead of young people going down in their approval of marijuana and cocaine, it has gone back up. We are inundated again when you to go the mall, it feels like I am back in the late 1960's again. You see marijuana leaves on hats and on shirts and on the front of album covers. All of a sudden we are back in a drug culture.

I was fortunate enough to go with Congressmen HASTERT and ZELIFF and MICA down to Mexico and Central America and South America. And we met with the leaders of those countries and were saying that they needed to crack down on the cocaine and the coca leaves and the coca growing and all the transit into America. But do you know what else they said, they said, your appetite for drugs in America is also destroying our countries. And while they need to work harder at interdiction efforts, we also need to realize that we are not just destroying America, we are destroying the countries who want that money that our abuse and insatiable demand for drugs is causing.

When we look at this soaring drug and alcohol abuse in our society and the terrorism that it is causing in our neighborhoods and when you go in, have I visited a number of African-American schools in inner city Fort Wayne. One thing that always strikes me is almost every student there will have some story about how they are scared to go out at night, how a cousin was shot, how somebody was going through the neighborhood and got shot, that their lives are filled with terror because we are refusing to grapple with this problem in America.

So drug abuse is a big problem. So what are we going to do? Well, the first thing is we need growth and opportunity. Yes, that means one of the things we need is tax cuts. I know that that just drives the other side of the aisle crazy, but it works. And we need various types, both in the general society so there is economic growth, also in the urban areas and places where unemployment is high. That is not my focus tonight. But tax cuts do work. If the Government sucks all the dollars here to Washington and does not turn it into industries where you have high productivity rates, where you have a high velocity of the money, to use the business term sense, I have both an undergraduate business degree and a master's degree and velocity of money is one of the key things that you can get out of private sector that you do not get out of public sector. Unless we have that economic growth we can sit here and talk and we can play money shuffle games all we want, but unless that money grows, all we are doing is reshuffling a deck rather than, as Kennedy and Kemp, would say having a rising tide that lifts all boats.

Then I also agree, I think it was Congressman RANGEL who has said that we also have to worry about those boats that got stuck on the shoals. In other words, while a rising tide might lift most boats, some do not lift. And I am not going to argue that there should not be a minimal safety net.

In think, as Nicholas Eberstat has argued in an eloquent paper that I heard him present a number of years ago, there is a difference between destitution and poverty. Poverty is a relative term. You will never get rid of poverty. But destitution is an absolute term. Nobody should freeze; nobody should die of hunger; nobody should not have some sort of a roof over their heads. They do not necessarily need a color TV. They do not necessarily need individual private rooms for each of the kids. There is a standard here. But we ought to have the decency to say there is going to be a minimal safety net in society.

Furthermore, for those people who want to move up, for those people who want to work, we need some job training programs. I differ from some of my Republican colleagues, I think we have a lot of problems with affirmative action, but I believe affirmative action has played an important role. And I believe it would be a mistake to suddenly eliminate all these programs.

I also believe in certain things we need reach out efforts to reach out to particular minority communities often who felt disenfranchised in society and when all of a sudden you say here is an opportunity does not mean they necessarily rise up. They may have faced past discrimination. They may have faced past persecution, or they may simply not have had the family exposure around them to see how to capitalize on those opportunities. I do not believe it is inappropriate for Government to sometimes help give a hand up. But the goal needs to be how do we move somebody with the hand up. How do we move them into the workplace? How do we make them productive citizens? How do they become full and participating members of society, not to breed the dependence which the current government programs have largely done.

Furthermore, I believe that we need to look at some of the innovative proposals that have been put out. I am a cosponsor of Congressman TALENT of Missouri and Congressman WATTS of Oklahoma's different package to promote urban opportunity. I also, my former boss in the U.S. Senate, DAN COATS, has an initiative to do that. I think we should encourage and the party should encourage those.

I myself have pushed the charitable deduction, an increase in the charitable deduction. Let me tell you why. I have seen programs in urban centers around this Nation that have had a huge impact. Very seldom have they been Government programs. Let me give you a couple examples.

Rev. Lee Earl of Detroit, who is now working with Bob Woodson at the National Center on Neighborhood Enterprise, at one conference where they had grass roots activists, foundations, people from the government, he was getting this pitch about why religious groups should not have any access to the funds.

He said, let me tell you, and this is a paraphrase, I do not want to pull all these words in Lee's mouth, but the paraphrase is this. He said, my church operates a child care center. My church does job training. We have housing. We do drug rehab. We do all these different things, and we are having an impact on the city. Yet what I see out of the Federal Government, talking to HUD in particular, are housing projects that are crumbling, drug treatment programs that do not work, job training programs that do not work, and I see the whole range of failed programs. Yet you tell me that unless I do it your way we do not get access to the funds.

Part of the problem here is that I, like many Americans, am nervous about who might get the dollars if you do it through the regular Government transfer programs.

Let me give you another problem with the Government transfer programs. I just spoke at the Abundant Life Ministries, a jail ministry program, about 2 weeks ago. They have turned down a big Government grant. They have been tremendously effective. I have met with a couple of individuals who have been through 13 different drug treatment programs and they know how to beat every system. But when they gave their life to Jesus Christ they changed. And Abundant Life Ministries can get the Government money to help more people like them as long as they do not mention Jesus Christ. As long as they take out the components that works, they can have the money.

Now, this is going to be the way the Government operates. So one of the things we need to do—let me give you another example. There is a teen pregnancy program in northeast Indiana operated by a Christian organization that just got a grant. They can only talk about teen pregnancy if they do not mention anything about religious in the teen pregnancy. Excuse me?

If this is going to be the way the Government grants programs work, we need to make sure that more of the dollars get into the private sector where they are actually having an impact.

In San Antonio alone, with Juan Rivers and Freddie Garcia's program down there, I personally met over 200 addicts and dealers who have now become Christians, who are back in their communities, who have been working and

having an impact on drug abuse. Yet the department of alcohol and mental health in Texas for awhile was considering shutting them down because they do not have degrees. They are not licensed drug counselors.

Do you know what? The magic of this is they were not doing drug counseling. They were changing people's lives. When people's lives changed, they got rid of drugs.

We need to figure out how we balance the rights of individuals not to fund churches on the other side and at the same time get money into the hands of programs that are actually working.

In my home district, for example, Rev. Ternae Jordan's son was at a music lesson at a local YMCA. He was sitting on the couch out by the door and was shot in the back of the head by two kids who were shooting outside. The whole city was traumatized by the event. The son recovered, but it led to Reverend Jordan starting a program called Stop the Madness, trying to crack down and encourage neighborhood groups to work on the drug program.

Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to attend the seventh anniversary celebration at the Greater Progressive Baptist Church in Fort Wayne, IN honoring Rev. Ternae Jordan. Pastor Jordan has been a leader in Fort Wayne in many ways, not the least being through his antidrug organization, Stop the Madness. I particularly enjoyed this eloquent tribute by Cheryl Story, which I now include in the RECORD.

NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT THE PASTOR

(By Cheryl Story)

As a Pastor, Rev. Jordan, along with Angela, must not only have Faith, (belief without proof, but they must have Hope: Desire joined with expectation, the opposite of doubt with an anticipated promise of expected benefits and blessings.)

Now Rev. Jordan's substance material is ordained by God. Therefore, regardless of the magnitude of the metamorphosis of his physiological structure, that is whether he gets old, his hair turn gray, if his teeth fall out, whether he gets ugly or remains handsome, Ternae Sr.'s substance will not change. It does not matter how much he accomplishes and achieves in this life or how many mistakes he makes, how much good he does or how many lies you tell on him, his substance remains the same for he will always be a Preacher and a Pastor.

The Pastor is on duty 24 hrs. Day & Night. He polices the Community, he provides assistance/comfort to those in need. He must be an Educational Instructor, Therapist/Counselor, Philosopher/Psychiatrist, Mediator, some folk's 1st Attorney, a Marriage Officiator, a Funeral Eulogist, a Sick Room Specialist and a Dying Hour Confidant.

The Pastor must be a Persuaded Preacher, for he is a Salvation Salesman, a Paradise Pusher, a Jesus Junkie, a gansta for God, a Jehovah Witness, your best friend and satan's worse enemy. For Faith can and will move Mountains.

What is it that turns an ordinary man into an Addictive Apostle who is obviously strung out on a Jesus, who hung out on a Hill, who sends us a comforter, who calls himself The Holy Ghost, that runs with a Spirit that spoke Himself into being GOD, who ordained this man before he entered his mother's womb? I tell ya it was ''Faith!'' For March of 1989, Rev. & Angela took leave of their home, accepted the Greater Progressive Baptist Family, stepped out on Faith and told their God, ''Send me, I'll go,'' and left their Comfort Zone behind them.

''THE EVIDENCE OF THINGS NOT SEEN''

Evidence is the Proof of a Pastor's Faith. Let me give you a little documentation and you can determine the truth. When Pastor arrived, if you joined one of the four Auxiliaries you were guaranteed to automatically become an officer. Now we grown spiritually from skeletal Auxiliaries to full scale Ministries. We've got an up-front discipled Deacon Brd., a unified Trustee Brd., morning & night Bible Study & Prayer Meetings. I remember when our one choir consisted of the Nelson & Trice families with 5 or 6 others mixed in, now God has blessed us to have a full choirstand of children's choir, a dynamic young adult choir, a 30 & over Generation choir a full Mass Choir. We got Pam, 2 Dres, Tony, 2 Pianists, Gor'don and Sheila all in the same House. I'm talking about Faith & Evidence now.

The Lord has blessed us with CWF, a Brotherhood Men's Support Group and Promisekeepers. We had an old organ and ragged mikes, now we got high tech equipment and state of the art sound room. Sometimes we couldn't even make payroll or pay our bills and God has given us financial increase thru tithing members. Seven years ago, if you came to Church at 12:30 p.m. you could pick & choose your own ''Praying ground'' now it's standing room only by 11:00 a.m. We got Birthing of a Vision and Stop the Madness now has nationwide video presentations.

We've got an intergrated Congregation and we participated in inter-racial Church Fellowhips. Pastor Jordan is a Jefferson Community Service Award winner, the NAACP's Golden Anniversary Man of the Year and everybody else's Man of the Year. Certainly God has ordered the Steps of Rev. Ternae Tsgarias Jordan and We've Come This Far by Faith!

Also in addition to the Stop the Madness program in Fort Wayne, I just visited a couple of weeks ago with Rev. Jesse White and his daughter's wonderful computer program. Rather than just talk about the problems, Rev. John Perkins from Pasadena, CA, said too many people get their satisfaction from feeling good about talking about the problems rather than doing something about the problems.

Reverend White has a computer program where people come back, get the training and then either get a job or move up in their jobs because they have the skills with which to work in the job market.

It is one thing to whine about stuff; it is another thing to do it. People like their church and their program need to be encouraged, as another pastor in Fort Wayne, who is a friend of mine, Rev. Otha Aden has a similar program in the southeast side of Fort Wayne working with kids in the after school southside opportunities program where he, too, has working with local businesses, has computers there and is trying to promote among the young people in that hard hit area the importance of getting the training so that they can be important factors in the growth of Fort Wayne and in their neighborhoods and their families.

Another friend of mine, Shirley Woods, has started a center right in the middle of an area. There are five different crack houses in the immediate vicinity of where she started this neighborhood center for Saturdays and afternoons after school and in the summer, and it is not just an activities center for the kids. She also has some educational training and family training programs with the families and trying to work with the virtues and the things that families need to rehabilitate their families.

There are just a few. Another program in Fort Wayne at the Cooper Teen Center, they have been out here a couple times to visit with me. Andre Patterson and Carl Johnson have a program, Simba, of black pride and self-esteem with these kids and giving them training skills.

There is hope. I have been into Newark, South Bronx, I have been in the center of, just after the riots in LA, into San Antonio, inner city Chicago, some of the toughest housing projects, as well as in a rural area in Appalachia for multiple days, that everywhere you go, even where it seems most dismal, somebody is having an impact.

There are these little flower gardens in the middle of the toughest area where people are having an impact. What we need to do in America is figure out how to encourage those little gardens, how to give them the funds and encourage people to give them the funds so that they grow.

□ 2000

Rather than stomping them out through massive government from implying to America that the solution to America's problems is the Federal Government, or any government really, that it can be a supplement, it can be a time to be there when you are in great need, it can give a stimulus and some training. But it is not the ultimate answer to our problems.

That is the vision that we Republicans are trying to communicate, that the answers to America lie in people's heart, they lie in the families, they lie in the communities, they lie in the local governments, and only then to Washington, and hopefully we can accomplish that, and we will continue to try to communicate that message, and I thank the people in northeast Indiana for giving me the chance and for having so many of us here who share these views, and hopefully for my daughter who just graduated and for my sons who are still coming up, that they can look at America with hope and with opportunity rather than the type of America that we can see on MTV and the type of pessimism I fear we are going to have if we fall back into the trap of the deficit spending in the collapse of the families and morality.

CHURCH BURNINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 60 minutes.