brains had shrunk. They could not establish human contact in a certain way because of what had not happened to them in terms of human interaction.

So millions of slave babies over the years were put into hovels with a few human beings caring for them. What did that do to their brains? These are some of the things we should look at as we study slavery, as the commission looks at the past and connects the past with the present.

What about property inheritance? A slave could not inherit. Did any State allow slaves to inherit anything? When a slave died, the few belongings they had, could they pass them on to anybody? They could not even recognize their own children, so they did not know any children they had. So where did their little bits and pieces go? When a slave died, he could not pass anything on.

The primary way in which wealth is accumulated in America, or anyplace, handed down from one generation to another, no matter how small it is, a few pots and pans, a wagon, a mule, the little house, maybe an acre, maybe a big farm, things that had been handed down over the years were not there to be passed down. For 232 years nothing could be passed down.

So is it any wonder that African-Americans are the poorest people in America, even poorer than the immigrants that came over, who brought some tools with them in a bag, who brought some know-how with them, who brought contacts? They had contacts with relatives who lived here. They had more than the slaves ever had.

All of that can be put in perspective if we really begin to talk about it and look at it, and we will see there is a need, there is a need to treat African-Americans and maybe native Americans different from the way we do other people, to try to make up for what did not happen in the past and for some of the negative things that happened in the past. All of this should be put on the table and examined.

We do not want the equivalent of 40 acres and a mule. Forty acres and a mule might translate into, the mule might be, in 1997 dollar terms, that might be a jet plane by now. One might have enough money to buy a jet plane. The 40 acres might be the size of an airfield.

So we are not going to deal with those kinds of solutions, but we ought to think about our inability to formulate a policy which provides opportunities to learn for all children; our inability to get a construction program going, $5 billion is all the President asked to stimulate construction which would help inner-city communities; our inability to pass a Ways and Means bill which would provide for the establishment of a lot of empowerment zones in cities. All these are directly related to the fact that we have no sense of the past and no sense of where we can go in the future.

We are the richest Nation that ever existed on the face of the Earth. We have a lot of options and opportunities. We have a lot of wealth. We helped Europe a great deal with the Marshall plan. Billions of dollars. We should help the inner-city communities where descendants of slaves live in large numbers with the same kind of generosity.

We should put it all together. The President is on the right track, and I hope we will all step in line and be positive about race relations and what it means in the context of today's America.

NATIONAL DEBT REPAYMENT ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about a bill which will be introduced later in this week. It is called the National Debt Repayment Act of 1997. But before I begin, I want to just pause and recognize some very special people in this country.

Sunday was Father's Day, and children all across America, myself included for my own father, we paused to say ''thank you'' to our dads for what they have done.

Tonight, I want to pay special tribute to some other very important people in this country, and that is father-in-laws. Many times father-in-laws provide the insight and wisdom that contribute so much to the success of our families all across America.

So before I start the debate on the National Debt Repayment Act this evening, I wanted to just start by paying tribute to a very special person in my life, my father-in-law, and to others like him all across this country who have done so much to make it the great country that it is.

Having said that, I want to address the national debt, where we stand and what we can do about it, and how the National Debt Repayment Act might have something to do with it.

To begin with this evening, I want to take a look at how the debt has been growing. The debt facing this Nation from 1960 to 1980 did not grow very much. It is a pretty flat line from 1960 to 1980. But from 1980 forward it has been growing at a very, very rapid rate.

And to all my colleagues out there, I know the Democrats say, well, 1980, that is the year Ronald Reagan got elected, so let us blame him. And to all the Republicans out there, I know they say, well, in 1980, there was the Democrat-controlled Congress and they spent too much money, and so all the Republicans blame the Democrats.

Well, the bottom line on this thing, when we look at this chart, we are way up here on this debt chart right now. Here is 1999, 1998, 1997. We are way up near the top of that debt chart. It is time we stop blaming Republicans and Democrats, depending on which side of the aisle we are on, and start addressing this for the problem it really is, a problem that is facing the American people, a problem that has the potential to bring this great Nation to its knees if it is not addressed.

For the folks that have not seen how serious this debt problem really is, we currently stand about $5.3 trillion in debt. The number looks like this, and it is a pretty big number, but let me translate that number back into English. Before I came to Congress, I was a math teacher. And here is a math problem we used to do in our math classroom.

We took that total debt and divided by the number of people in the United States of America. That is to say, every person in the United States of America is responsible for $20,000 of this debt. Or put another way, the Federal Government has borrowed $20,000 on behalf of every man, woman, and child in the country.

For a family of five like mine, I have three kids at home, one is 20 now, another 18, another one 14, for a family of five like mine, they have borrowed $100,000 basically over the last 15 years. It is a staggering sum of money.

The kicker in this whole thing is really this number right down here. The average family of five in America today, or any group of five people in America today, they are paying $580 a month, every month, to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt. Let me say that once more, because it is important to understand how much money is being taken out of the pockets of American citizens and sent to Washington, DC to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

The average family of five in America today sends $580 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

I know a lot of my colleagues out there go, ''Well, a lot of the families I know, they do not pay that much in taxes.'' But the reality is every time we walk into the store and we buy a loaf of bread, the storeowner either makes a small profit on that loaf of bread or he is going out of business. So we hope he or she is making a profit. When they make a small profit on that loaf of bread that we just bought in the local grocery store, part of that profit gets sent to Washington and it is used to pay this interest on the Federal debt.

So the reality is we are currently in a situation in this country where an average family of five is sending almost $600 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

The American public seems to be a little cynical about what we are doing about this. And in fact they have had so many promises made to them in the past that, frankly, I understand why they are cynical.

In the 1980's, I was not in politics. In fact, I had never been to a political

event at that point in time. So in the 1980's, I watched something called the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill, and I watched it with great interest because under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill, passed in 1985, we were promised by the people out here in Washington that we would see a deficit stream that follows this blue line. In fact, it would lead to a balanced budget by the year 1991 under that original plan.

The problem is the deficit did not follow that blue path. In fact, they hit their target only once and then the deficit skyrocketed. So the people in Washington decided, well, we could not really hold the line on spending out here in Washington, there are too many new programs we want to institute from out here in the District of Columbia, so what we will do is make the American people a brand new promise. We know we cannot keep our first promise, so we will make the American people a brand new promise, and they wrote the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings fix of 1987.

Again they promised the American people a balanced budget with deficit streams following this blue line, but again deficits did not match up. They did not hit their target.

□ 2115

The reason I came to Washington, the reason I left a good business in the private sector to run for office in the first place is because I got kind of fed up with the promises that were being made out in this city that were not being kept. It seemed to me that this Government should be made up of people of integrity, that when they told the American people they were going to balance the budget they would actually do it.

I know all the pressures to do something different, and I understand the huge pressures on the people here to spend more money and to allow these deficit here to spend more money and to allow these deficit lines to go anywhere but along the path to balance the budget. But there is an interesting thing that happened. In 1995, a whole new group of people came here. They were elected in 1994. And that group of people said, we are not going to tolerate this. We are going to balance the budget. And we made a hole bunch of promises to the American people.

This fact is almost unknown. We promised the American people a balanced budget, too. This red line shows what we promised for a deficit in the fiscal year 1996. This blue line shows the actual deficit. Please note, the red is taller than the blue. What that means is we not only hit our deficit targets for 1996, but we are ahead of schedule.

So we are now in fiscal year 1997 and it is almost over. We promised the American people a deficit line along this red column again. We not only hit our projection in fiscal year 1997, but we are $100 billion ahead of schedule. So the facts are we now are in the third year of this plan to balance the budget, the promise made in 1995, and in fact in the third year of this plan, we are once again ahead of schedule. And under the budget resolution with the guidance of the gentleman from Ohio [JOHN KASICH] that was just passed out here, we will stay ahead of schedule right straight through to the year we balance the budget.

We are going to talk more about that later. Because the facts are we are so far ahead of schedule in this plan right now, we may actually balance the budget sooner, not later. Let me say this once more because it is really important. There is a huge difference between 1988 and the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bills and today, 1995, 1996, 1997.

The promises made back there in the 1980's made the American people very cynical. When people in Washington talked about balancing the budget they said, yeah, sure we have heard that before. Folks, things have changed out here in Washington. In fact, we are not only on track to balancing the budget; here is what we promised for 1996. Here is what happened. We are ahead of schedule. Here is what we promised for 1997. Here is what happened. These are not promises anymore. These are in the bank. There are done. These years are finished. We are ahead of schedule in both of the first two years and we are now working on the plan for the third year, and we are going to stay ahead of schedule by at least $50 billion again in the third year.

How did all this happen? In 1995, we came here with a theory. The theory did not go, like 1993, how much taxes should we raise? How much more money can we take out of the pockets of the American people? We did not come here with the idea of increasing taxes to get this thing under control. We came here with this theory, and the theory went like this: If we can just control the growth of Government spending so Government spending did not keep getting bigger and bigger and bigger, if we could control the growth in Government spending, that would mean the Government would spend less, therefore, borrow less from the private sector. When the Government borrowed less out of the private sector, that meant that there was going to be more money available in the private sector.

Well, this does not take Einstein to figure it out. Where there is more money available, interest rates stay down. That is a looser money supply leading to lower interest rates. Lower interest rates meant people bought more houses and cars than anyone expected. And when they bought more houses and cars, of course that meant somebody had to go to work to build the houses and cars. And when those people went to work building the houses and cars, they left the welfare roles, thereby reducing the cost from Washington and they started paying taxes in.

So this working model of reducing Government spending, meaning less borrowing, leaving more money available in the private sector, keeping the interest rates down, so people buy more houses and cars and other things and other people go to work building those houses and cars, led to lower numbers of people on welfare, more people working, and of course that meant less cost and more revenue coming in.

And the results are very, very clear. This is no longer a theoretical model. The results are clear. Our promised deficit for 1996; our actual deficit. We are ahead of schedule. Our promised deficit for 1997; our actual deficit. We are ahead of schedule. We are now onto year three and again we are projecting at least $50 billion ahead of schedule in year three.

Folks, this is great news for the future of this country. This means a whole bunch of things. The most important, of course, is that we will get to a balanced budget. But beyond that, it means that we now have a group of people in Washington who have made promises to the American people and those promises in year one and year two, they have been kept. It is not a question of will they be kept. They have been kept. It is history now, it has been done.

So now we are into year three and we are back into the promises. We are in the third year of our plan to balance the budget. Sooner or later, though, the American people need to understand that we are into the third year, 2 years under our belt, 2 years of successes, and we need to start accepting the fact that this is actually going to happen in the not too distant future.

Again, how did this come about? Well, it did not come about by raising taxes. We did not go back to 1993 and start this discussion, how much more money can we get out of the pockets of the people and which taxes should we raise this highest. That was not the discussion. The discussion in this city in 1995 was how do we control the growth of Government spending? Can we just get this Government to a point where it is not growing bigger and having more and more influence over all the lives of the people? Can we get to a point where the influence of the lives of the people is back in the homes where it belongs? Can we get Government spending under control? That is what it was all about.

This chart shows what happened. In the 7 years before 1995, spending was growing at an average rate of 5.2 percent, the red column here. In the first 7 years after 1995, we are in the third of those 7 now, in the first 7 years after 1995, spending only grew at 3.2 percent. That is a 40 percent reduction in the growth of spending. This theoretical model of slowing the growth of Government spending is working. And that is very, very important as we look forward to future years.

In fact, if we adjust for inflation, we would find that the rate of growth of Government spending has been reduced

by two-thirds. Now, I have to pause on this chart also and I have to just mention that I have heard so much discussion out there about Government cuts and cuts in Government spending and then name your program. Well, the reality is we have not cut Government spending. Even under the Republican plans where we are controlling the growth of Government spending, it is still going up 3.2 percent a year.

There are a lot of people out here, myself included, that think we can do much better. But the fact that we have improved it by 40 percent, that is a good step in the right direction. It has been done in two short years. And I think we will do better as we go forward. But the reality is this is a huge win for the American people.

By reducing the growth in Government spending by 5.2 to 3.2 percent, or in real dollars from 1.8 to .6, at two-thirds reduction in the growth rate of this Government, that means people will maintain more control over their own money and over their own lives. And that is what this chart is all about. It means people keep control over their own money and their own lives in their own homes where it belongs. And that is what should be read into this chart, and that is the direction we are headed.

And frankly, when we look at this and we see that growth of Government spending controlled, that is how come we are ahead of schedule, that is how come when we said we were going to have deficits of one number we were ahead of schedule in both years, and that is how come it is different than back in the 1980's with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act.

The reality is we are doing it and it is happening, and it is very exciting. Something else that is about to happen and this brings us to the national debt repayment act, because even after we get to a balanced budget, whenever that occurs, we still have a $5.3 trillion debt hanging over our head. And that brings us to the National Debt Repayment Act.

Now, I brought one more chart with me and there are a lot of numbers in this chart, but I am going to point out just a couple of them so we get a handle on why this National Debt Repayment Act is so important. First off, the National Debt Repayment Act, after we reached a balanced budget, caps the growth in Government spending at a rate of one per lower than the rate of revenue growth. So if revenues were to go up by 6 percent, spending growth would be capped at 5 percent, still faster than the rate of inflation but capped at one percent below the rate of revenue growth.

If we do that, the entire Federal debt, all of it, is repaid by the year 2025 and we can pass this Nation on to our children debt free, which means that our families a generation from now, instead of sending $500 a month to Washington to pay interest on the debt will be able to keep that money in their own homes.

We hear so many discussions out here about education and about things that families could do with this money like education. Would it not be great if we had a zero debt and instead of sending $500 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the debt, you could keep that out there in your house. That is the National Debt Repayment Act. But it does something else that is very important, too.

As we are repaying the debt, we are also putting the money back into the Social Security trust fund. I see I am joined by my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona, J.D. HAYWORTH.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and those who join us coast to coast in this Chamber this evening. I just wanted to say that my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] offers a very commonsense approach to the next step. And I think the gentleman from Wisconsin in his introductory remarks has pointed out and offered to us a very reasonable approach here based on what has happened before.

And certainly we understand, coming from outside the Washington merry-go-round, as so many people called it for so many years, outside the beltway, that there is a lot of cynicism out there. And I appreciate the fact that my colleagues pointed out that our budget agreement really projects very modest growth and that is why we have the realistic point of view.

But even more so, the notion that we can repay the national debt is vitally important. Because when I go across the width and breadth of the 6th District of Arizona, an area in square mileage about the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and hold town hall meetings, people will come and, yes, they will talk about the annual deficits, but inevitably someone steps to the microphone and says, Congressman, that is fine. But how do we get a handle on this five plus trillion dollar national debt that we are leaving our children?

I just think, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] offers a lot of commonsense based on his background as a math teacher, based on his business acumen as a home builder; and I just appreciate this foundation, if you will, of a practical, commonsense plan to make sure that our children have a debt-free future.

And I cannot help but remark as I heard my colleague from Wisconsin talk about his father-in-law, I think about my father-in-law down in Yuma, AZ, someone who spent his years in the Marine Corps defending this country away from home for years on end, and I think about the legacy of those who have gone before, many of the veterans I visit with in the 6th district, veterans of World War II, the Korean war, Vietnam, Desert Storm, people would have answered the call. And do I believe, as President Franklin Roosevelt said, to different generations fall different responsibilities.

And God willing, if we can avoid a major worldwide conflict, and certainly we hope and pray with a strong national defense and reasonable approaches worldwide we will be able to do so, but our challenge, our rendezvous with destiny will be a reconciliation and elimination of this national debt after we take the first step of eliminating these annual deficits.

So I just wanted to come down here and tell my colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. Speaker, and those who join us that this plan bears definite consideration and support as we ask the reasonable, logical, and practical question: Where do we go from here? For these reasons, I salute my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I think we should jointly here show the American people just how positive and how close we really are to a balanced budget and how far ahead of schedule. If we look at the average Federal revenue growth, how much Government growth, revenue, money coming in, your money, the American people's money, how much money has been coming in each year, average Federal revenue growth, in the last 3 years it has been going up by 7.3 percent average. The last 5 years it has been going up by 7.3 percent average. The last 10 years, 6.2 percent average; 17 years 6.8.

I read those numbers off because I think it is significant in the budget resolution we just passed, we did not project 7 percent growth or 7.3 or 6 percent growth, we only projected 4 percent growth. So I asked the question, what would happen in fact if instead of 4 percent growth in revenue, it did what was more historical here. I did not even put in 7 or 6.8. I only put in 6 percent. And in fact if revenues to the Federal Government do grow by 6 percent, not as much as they have been going up, but by 6 percent, we will in fact have a balanced budget by the year 2000.

This is almost inconceivable in this community. If revenues keep going up the way they have been going up and we hit our spending targets, and this is the challenge of course, but if we just hit the spending targets that are in that budget resolution and revenues grow by 6 percent, we in fact have a surplus in the year 2000. Our first year of a balanced budget is the year 2000, and we would in fact run a surplus. And that is when the National Debt Repayment Act would kick in.

The act would do two things. First it would cap growth in Government spending after that first balanced year at a rate 1 percent below the rate of revenue growth. That guarantees a surplus. Because if we are at balance and spending goes up 4 percent, revenue would have to go up 5 percent, at least a 1 percent gap. That guarantees us a surplus.

□ 2130

The first thing this bill does is it caps the growth in Government spending 1 percent below the rate of revenue growth. The second thing it does is it tells the treasurer what to do with that surplus money because my fear in this community is that they are going to want to spend that money. So what the second thing our bill does is it says that two-thirds of that surplus goes to pay down the debt, and one-third goes back to the American people. It is, after all, their money. All we are doing is letting them keep it out in their homes instead of sending it on down here to Washington, DC.

When we start paying down the debt, a very important thing happens. Social Security has been collecting more money than it has been paying out for a long time, since 1983, collects more money than it pays out to seniors in benefits. That money is supposed to be sitting here in a savings account. It is not here. All that is here is a bunch of IOU's. That is part of the debt, though. So when we start paying down the debt, we also put real money back in the Social Security trust fund so Social Security is once again solvent.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think this point can be stressed enough. I know that I joined with the gentleman in the Social Security Preservation Act with this purpose in mind. I am glad to see this notion incorporated into the National Debt Repayment Act, so that we have real funds, tangible funds and not some sort of slips of paper that say IOU when we are dealing with something as sensitive and as important as Social Security, something else that affects my parents, affects my colleague from Wisconsin's parents and obviously affects many of our constituents. Again, I salute this very rational, reasonable framework.

Let me just depart for a second, because I think this is important, too, because, Mr. Speaker, ofttimes when we come to this floor for purposes of explanation, and certainly given my colleague's ability to explain these concepts in very simple, easy-to-understand terms, there is a temptation by those who oppose us to claim that we have simply got on our green eyeshades, to claim that we are simply sitting here with calculators. Indeed there are those critics who would claim that within our chests beat calculators instead of human hearts. Let me assure, Mr. Speaker, those who might rise in opposition to us that it is precisely because of compassion that we offer this, that it is precisely because we want a firm foundation and to fulfill promises made by this Government to our seniors but also to provide for those generations who are younger, for those generations yet unborn a reasonable framework and a reasonable, rational way that they can have a constitutional republic and enjoy the freedoms that we have had. And so that is what I think is important to stress. This is not something that needs to be necessarily caught up in decimals and in dollar signs, if you will, but with a very real, compassionate, tangible goal. That is, the preservation of this country, the preservation of this constitutional republic to silence and to diminish this very genuine, silent killer, if you will, the twin maladies of annual deficits and the national debt. That is another reason we have to look at this with great interest, because it is the ultimate act of compassion. While of course it is inevitable that we talk about numbers and explain this in a common sense term, undergirding all of this is the example and the notion of true compassion. As my colleague from Wisconsin mentioned earlier, as we cannot say too often, Mr. Speaker, the money belongs to the people that earn it. The money does not belong to this government. Our job, our mission here poised for the next century is to realize and act upon that basic truth. The money belongs to the people of the United States. They should hang on to more of it and send less of it here to Washington, DC. That is a point that I think we should reemphasize.

Mr. NEUMANN. I cannot emphasize enough how strongly I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman is right. There are a lot of numbers up here. I think we do have to have a plan in place that is going to lead to this, but it is not about these numbers. It is about the families that get to keep $500 a month more instead of sending it down here to Washington to put as interest on the Federal debt. It is about those families and what they can do with that $500 a month. Our current tax cut package, I have talked to a lot of families in our district, I really get a kick out of the people out here who say the American people do not want tax cuts. Wrong. When I talk to folks in our district, family friends from church, three kids, one headed off to college, I say, ''Do you think you're going to use that $500 per child?'' They have got two kids still at home so it is $1,000. The college tuition credit, of course, is another $1,500. They are looking at receiving $2,500. They are not rich people. They are middle-income folks, probably $40,000, $50,000-a-year kind of people, nice friendly Janesville kind of people from Wisconsin. When we talk to them about keeping $2,500 more a year in their pocket, they understand these tax cuts. When we start thinking about the National Debt Repayment Act, can the gentleman see this vision of America where instead of sending that $500 a month down here, and now we are not talking about a year, we are not talking about the $500 per child per year now, we are now talking about our families keeping $500 a month because that is how much this interest is, that is what these numbers really mean, they keep that money in their own homes to buy education for their kids, to buy the things that are most important to their family. The National Debt Repayment Act also means our seniors do not have to go to sleep wondering whether or not there is going to be Social Security. When we talk about this Social Security issue, one problem is that the money needs to be in that savings account so we can continue making the payments to our seniors. But the other thing is that if there is no money in the trust fund and we reach a point where we do not have enough money to pay out Social Security benefits, and that will happen sometime between now and 2012, that is a given, if we reach that point, the people in this town are only going to have two choices, get more taxes out of the working people or cut Social Security benefits. So the other very, very important thing that happens here is we restore the Social Security system to solvency, we put real dollars in the trust fund instead of the fictitious IOUs that are currently in there. As we keep going, the other thing that happens here when people fill up their cars with gasoline, every week or whenever you fill your car up with gas, you pay Federal gasoline tax. Some of that tax money has not been spent to build roads. It has been taken and spent on other programs. There is a highway trust fund, sort of like Social Security where they have collected these tax dollars when you fill your car up with gas, but instead of spending it to build roads like we would expect, it has been spent on other programs and they put an IOU in the highway trust fund, too. As we are paying on down the national debt, part of that debt is the highway trust fund. We would restore the highway trust fund as well. The other thing is we hear so much about the environment and how important the environment is to the future of this country. The environment trust funds exist also, trust funds for like cleaning up Superfund sites. Those areas have trust funds that have not been restored either. We have collected money but the money has been spent on other Government programs and there are IOU's in those trust funds, too. As we pay down this national debt, we are looking at restoring the Social Security trust funds so our seniors are safe, we are looking at the highway trust fund being restored so we can have a safer and more efficient road system in this country, a better infrastructure, and we are also looking at the environmental groups having the money that was supposed to be put into their trust fund actually spent to improve the environment in this great Nation.

The kicker of all of this is at the same time, we get to reduce taxes even further on the American people because one-third of the surplus goes to tax cuts.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If my colleague will yield further, again that points to one of our other aims as there have been changes in this Congress as we rethink the future, and that is the notion of transferring the money, power, and influence out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats, back to people at

home, beginning with the family but also including those local and State governments, those who are on the frontlines. Janesville, WI, differs greatly from Scottsdale, AZ. Indeed within Arizona in my own district which spans from Franklin to the four corners, to Flagstaff in the west, there are different circumstances and different challenges in an incredibly diverse district. So much the better, then, that we are able to establish a framework that pays off the debt that puts the trust back into these ironically named trust funds. If there is one of the oxymoronic phrases of Washington, DC, certainly as we stand here at this juncture of our history, it would be the notion of trust funds since so much of those funds have gone to other matters, pressing matters to be sure but matters for which those funds were not originally intended. We put the trust back into those trust funds but most importantly we have the money stay in the pockets to working Americans. That is vital.

Mr. NEUMANN. This whole vision that we are talking about here for the future of our great country, it is so different than the 1980's where there were promises made under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and those promises, for whatever reasons, could not be kept or were not kept or however we want to put it; they did not meet those targets to get us to a balanced budget.

When we talk about trust, it is not only the trust accounts, it is the trust of the American people once again in their government, because after all this is their government, it is not you and me out here, it is the people's government out here.

As we are now in the 3rd year of a 7-year plan to balance the budget, we are ahead of schedule in the 1st year, we are ahead of schedule in the 2nd year, we are ahead of schedule in the 3rd year. Some of that trust needs to gradually be restored and some of that cynical attitude out there that occurred because of what happened in the 1980's where so many promises were made and so many promises were broken. Is that not a great vision? We not only get to a balanced budget so that we quit spending our children's money and our children have hope for a future in this country, but we also pay down the national debt so our children inherit a nation debt free. When we are paying down the debt we put the money back in the Social Security trust fund, and by doing these things we restore the faith in the American people back in this institution, back in their government, because it is their government. It that not a great vision for the future of this country?

Mr. HAYWORTH. As my colleague offers this scenario, I concur wholeheartedly. I also salute my colleague because, again, the temptation is when you come to this town, and obviously there are some philosophical differences, I find that many of us can oftentimes end up in partisan arguments that are almost pointless games of what if, or what happened in the past.

I think it is worthwhile and quite candidly refreshing, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Wisconsin comes here not to point fingers at that side of the aisle or necessarily to try and gain partisan advantage, but simply to offer a plan that people of all political labels should seriously consider as we say, OK, what is past is prolog, that has gone before, we can continue to play these games of revisionist history, or we can deal with the problems that we have encountered with the simple notion that my colleague and I learned in Scouts: Try to leave this a better place than we found it.

Really is it just as simple as that; that we can play the hand we have been dealt, that yes, we have made some changes; that yes, those changes have us on the road to a balanced budget much more quickly; that yes, last week in the House Committee on Ways and Means we were able to fashion a tax bill that does not offer as much tax relief as I would like or my colleagues from Wisconsin or indeed many folks would like, but is an important first step. Moving on that, we can build.

Mr. NEUMANN. Is it not a wonderful fight we are going to have out here over which taxes we should cut and how far we should cut them? Think back to 1993. Does the gentleman remember 1993? The question was which taxes should we raise and how far should we raise them. This body by one vote passed the largest tax increase in American history. Then it went over to the Senate and the Senate by one vote cast the largest tax increase in American history.

We are not talking about raising taxes to balance the budget. We are talking about reducing taxes and at the same time reducing the rate of growth of government spending because when the government grows less, we do not have to take as much money out of the pockets of the people. What a wonderful fight we are going to have out here as we debate which taxes should be reduced and how far we should reduce them and what a huge contrast we have between 1993 and 1997. Is it not a wonderful debate?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I absolutely agree with my colleague from Wisconsin. I am heartened by the fact that as we take a look at the tax bill that moves out of the House Committee on Ways and Means that I was pleased to vote for last week, last Friday, 93 percent of those tax cuts go to families earning under $100,000; 75 percent of those tax cuts go to families earning less than $75,000. Though there is a temptation, and I heard earlier tonight when I had the privilege of sitting in the Speaker's chair for a previous special order, though there is the temptation to try and tinker with the numbers and cast a partisan light on them, these conclusions are drawn by the bipartisan Joint Tax Committee.

So we have Republicans and Democrats taking a sober, practical view, not for political gain, simply saying that without a doubt, these tax cuts go to help working Americans more than anyone else. It is an important first step.

Mr. NEUMANN. I think it is important that all of our colleagues understand part of this tax cut debate that is about to occur. What is being asked out here in Washington, DC, is can we cut taxes for people that are not paying taxes? When is a tax cut not a tax cut?

Does the gentleman realize that we are about to enter into debate, that there are going to be people telling us that we should cut taxes for people that are paying no taxes. Let me explain how this might work. If you are on welfare today and you have got two kids in your house, you are not paying any taxes, you are already receiving a welfare check. There are some people out in this community that would like a tax cut to include those folks that are already on welfare and not paying any taxes in. To me, if you cut taxes on people that are not paying any taxes, does that not become a welfare program as opposed to a tax cut?

□ 2145

And that is what we got to watch out for as we go forward here. These tax cuts are designed to reach the people that get up every morning, make a lunch, go off to work, work hard all day and come home. This is money that we want them to keep in their own pockets as opposed to sending out here to Washington, DC.

Tax cuts are designed for people who pay taxes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I again just want to comment on my colleague from Wisconsin making this very practical common sense point. How do you offer a tax cut to those who pay no taxes, and, Mr. Speaker, although there are those who might misunderstand, this is not standing here pointing the finger of blame toward any one segment of the society. It is simply asking the very practical question. It would seem to me that only in this town, with some who champion the notion of government being the source of so much, that even the notion would be advanced that those who pay no taxes should somehow receive a tax cut. But again, when you leave this Beltway and the culture that has grown up around this Capital City, and travel to the Sixth District of Arizona, or travel to the great State of Wisconsin, or places in-between, and go to any town and talk to any taxpayer, they will reaffirm the absurdity of the notion of offering tax cuts to those who pay no taxes.

And again, Mr. Speaker, and this is something again not to cast a pall of partisanship, but to simply rejoice in the fact that here in this institution we can debate reasonable differences in a reasonable fashion. It astounds me, quite candidly, to look at some of the other figures that have been proffered

that actually take on another absurd notion when there are those who come to this Chamber and talk about these very modest tax cuts, 93 percent of which go to families making under $100,000, that somehow anyone could characterize those as what is that tired, sad phrase we hear? Tax cuts for the wealthy? Simply is not true, but using some of those peculiar numbers people are incorporating what homeowners would earn in rental income on their own homes.

My colleague, who is a home builder, who understands the intricacies of mathematics far better than I do, can simply attest to the absurdity of that notion which is being proffered as a reason to oppose our plan and our very modest array of tax cuts.

Mr. NEUMANN. You know, all this discussion about tax cuts, we sometimes get lost in the fact that we are even having a debate about cutting taxes as opposed to raising taxes from 1993. Whenever I am out with folks back home and I have got a problem conveying to them all the technical details of the tax cuts, I challenge anyone. Just walk into your church on Sunday and find one of the families with 3 kids, and when they are walking out of church just ask them if they understand the idea that they are going to get $500 back for each one of those children. It is their money to start with. They get to keep $500 more for each one of those children, and if one of them happens to be going off to college, they are going to get up to $1500 to help pay that college tuition, which is a huge problem for many families in America today. They understand that. They absolutely understand that they get a tax , they get to reduce the taxes they are going to send to Washington by a thousand bucks for the 2 kids still at home, and they absolutely understand that they get to keep $1,500 to help pay for college tuition. They understand that.

And you can have all the jargon you want out here. They understand that they are going to get to keep more of their own money in their own pocket instead of sending it to Washington, and that is what this is all about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And that is the basic common wisdom of those who involve themselves in the process, not to get caught up in micro or macro economics, but simply to provide for their families, to answer the call to duty, whether it is found in wearing the uniform of one of the branches of service in this country or contributing in other ways to our economy and to their communities and to their families. That is the simple elemental, yet vital, wisdom behind the plan that we are offering that essentially provides tax cuts for life, those child tax credits, those credits that help youngsters go on to college, those ways to save through those saving years that my colleague from Wisconsin and I found ourselves in as we are trying to provide for our children, also prepare for that final phase of life, those retirement years. And that is what is so appealing about this modest first step in tax reduction.

And again, as my colleague from Wisconsin points out, Mr. Speaker, here we are poised to offer the American people the first tax cuts they have really enjoyed in a decade and a half, and the thing that we should note about this, the wonderful thing, is that this will actually help our economy grow, this will actually help raise the revenue rates, as again in a bipartisan fashion, as President John F. Kennedy said in the early 1960's: ''A rising tide lifts all the boats.''

And so it is in that spirit that we offer this based on historical perspectives, not only the Reagan presidency, but before that with President Kennedy, so that people from both sides of the aisle understand the value of cutting taxes, allowing people to hang onto more of their own money and really conferring, as if this government had to confer, the honor and the privilege and for all practical purposes the money that belongs to the people in the first place, keeping it there in their pockets and taking less and less of it for what has grown into a Federal leviathan here on the banks of the Potomac.

Mr. NEUMANN. I think I will conclude my part of this by just reminding the folks one more time how different 1997 is versus the 1985 Gramm–Rudman-Hollings bill where they said they are going to balance the budget and they missed their targets. They never got on track. They fixed it in 1987. They hit targets once, but they never stayed with it. The deficits just ballooned.

We are now not in our first year and not in our second year; we are now in the third year of our promised plan to balance the federal budget, and we are not only on track, we are ahead of schedule. The theoretical model that we dealt with back in 1995, this idea that if we control the growth of government spending, that meant the government would spend less, which meant they had to borrow less. When they borrowed less out of the private sector, that left more money available in the private sector. More money available in the private sector meant less money supply and lower interest rates. Lower interest rates meant people bought more houses and cars, and I get excited when I talk about this part because when people buy more houses and cars, somebody has to go to work to build those houses and cars, and that is job opportunities. That meant people left the welfare rolls and went to work and started paying taxes in, and it becomes a snow ball down a hill where this thing gets easier, and easier, and easier to make it happen.

We are in the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the budget. We are not only on track, we are ahead of schedule, and this leads us to our vision for the future of this great Nation that we live in. Our vision not only includes balancing the Federal budget so we are not spending our children's money any more, it includes paying off the Federal debt because when we pay off the Federal debt, it means our children a generation from now instead of sending $500 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay interest on a Federal debt, they can keep that money in their own homes.

A generation from now, just think about this. If we just capped the growth of Federal spending 1 percent below the rate of revenue growth, just 1 percent, that means we pay off the entire debt by the year 2025, and that means a generation from now our families do not have to send a $500 check every month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt. They keep that in their own homes to spend on their own families.

You know when we talk about a divorce rate at 68 percent today and one out of every three babies born out of wedlock, do not you think that allowing the hard-working families to keep more of their own money would relieve some of the burden, some of the pressures in this family and allow more of our American families to stay together a generation from now? I mean this becomes a very, very bright vision for the future of this country, a balanced budget so we quit spending our children's money, pay off the debt so that a generation from now our children receive this Nation debt free and they do not have to send $500 a month down to Washington. And that vision includes putting the money back into Social Security trust fund that has been taken out because then our seniors know that their money is safe and secure, and it includes additional tax reductions for the American people.

So a vision of a balanced budget, paying off the debt, our children's families keeping $500 a month more of their own money in their own pockets instead of sending it to Washington, restoring the Social Security Trust Fund so that our seniors do not have to worry about whether or not their social security checks; that is a bright vision for the future of America. That is a vision of hope, that is a vision of prosperity, that is a vision that includes an opportunity for my children to have a better life than we have had, and it has been a great country to grow up in.

And we have had a great life, but this vision puts it back at a point where our generation can look to our children and start thinking about our children having opportunities to have an even better life than we have had in this great Nation ourselves.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for taking this time, Mr. Speaker, to explain this very important, I believe, exciting and necessary concept of the National Debt Repayment Act, and again what undergirds this when you get past the math, when you get past the micro and macro economic models, is a very simple motion. People work hard for the

money they earn. They ought to hang onto more of it, send less of it here to Washington D.C., and in the process as we prepare for a new century we ought to focus on the notion of transferring money, power and influence out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats and back home to the families, to the local communities, to governments on the front line who confront these several problems.

I thank my colleague from Wisconsin.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POMBO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of attending the Convention on the International Trade of Endangered Species.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today and on June 18.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today and on June 18.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.
Mr. MCGOVERN.
Mr. KUCHINCH.
Mr. LAFALCE.
Ms. STABENOW.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
Mr. VISCLOSKY.
Mr. BERRY.
Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
Mr. ROEMER.
Ms. NORTON.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. KILDEE.
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Ms. BROWN of Florida.
Mr. GORDON.
Mr. GEPHARDT.
Mr. TOWNS.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mr. PAYNE.
Ms. HARMAN.
Mr. SHERMAN.
Mr. SANDERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WELLER.
Mr. COX of California.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. GINGRICH.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. CAMP.
Mr. PACKARD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEUMANN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALSH.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
Mr. PARKER.
Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
Mr. KLINK.
Mr. HORN.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. PEASE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 210. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam, the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and the Compact of Free Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and in addition, to the Committees on the Judiciary, International Relations, Government Reform and Oversight, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

S. 289. An act to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of Superior Road and Huron Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the ''Carl B. Stokes, United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 347. An act to designate the Federal building located at 100 Alabama Street NW, in Atlanta, Georgia, as the ''Sam Nunn Federal Center''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 419. An act to provide surveillance, research, and services aimed at prevention of birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce;

S. 478. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 475 Mulberry Street in Macon, Georgia, as the ''William Augustus Bootle Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 628. An act to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of 7th Street and East Jackson Street in Brownsville, Texas, as the ''Reynaldo G. Garza United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 681. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 300 Northeast First Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the ''David W. Dyer Federal Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 715. An act to redesignate the Dublin Federal Courthouse building located in Dublin, Georgia, as the J. Roy Rowland Federal Courthouse; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 819. An act to designate the United States courthouse at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia, as the ''Martin V. B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 18, 1997, at 10 a.m.)

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various committees, House of Representatives, during the first quarter of 1997, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, and reports of a miscellaneous group for calendar year 1996 and second quarter 1997, House of Representatives, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Eva Clayton	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Hon. Calvin Dooley	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Hon. Thomas Ewing	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Hon. Sam Farr	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Hon. Robert F. Smith	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		99.00		3,095.10		3,218.10
Hon. Charles Stenholm	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00