found that three-fifths of Americans feel managed care has resulted in doctors spending less time with patients.

Americans are clear on the need for managed care reform. Congress should be clear on their commitment to enact it. The American people leave no doubt about their displeasure with health plans because of cost considerations and withholding important information from patients because of ''gag orders.''

As a lawmaker, registered nurse and businesswoman, I know the benefits of not only protecting patients, but also giving them choices. Protecting patients and giving them choices are good policy, good health care and good business.

This year, I will work to ensure that Congress answers the calls from Americans who are dissatisfied with their health care plans. It is important that Members of Congress from both parties work to provide Americans with a basic ''patients bill of rights.''

I ask that the leadership in Congress answer the President's call, but more importantly, the American people's call to pass a ''patients bill of rights this year.''

If we do not act now, we are faced with the reality that millions of Americans in private health plans may never be assured that they will also have the protections that their counterparts in federal plans enjoy.

I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to tell these stories because I think that it is only when we tell the stories of our constituents and the people that have been through the system and the public and the other colleagues down here understand what our constituents are going through that we will get a ground-swell of support for managed care reform. I think it is very important that we relate those stories.

I want to thank my colleague again.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the testimony to which I referred:

TESTIMONY OF CHERYL BOLINGER

January 22, 1998.

Good morning Senator Torricelli and Congressman Pallone. Thank you for your interest in hearing about the struggles my family has had in trying to receive good, quality medical care from an HMO for our daughter.

My name is Cheryl Bolinger and I am the mother of a 15-year old child who has multiple developmental disabilities and complex, chronic medical problems. My daughter Kristin's medical problems began shortly after her birth. At six weeks of age, she developed unexplained intractable seizures. Because of the severity and the debilitating effects of her condition, she must be followed by many specialists and undergo many specialized and expensive diagnostic tests.

Today, Kristin remains non-verbal and non-ambulatory, and requires customized durable medical equipment for every aspect of daily living. Customized equipment is also needed to prevent and minimize the effects of orthopedic problems. She also requires physical and occupational therapy to enhance and maximize her potential in terms of her orthopedic status and general medical condition.

During Kristin's infancy and early childhood, we were fortunate enough to have a free-for-service insurance plan. As long as our medical documentation was current and in place, (i.e., prescriptions, follow-up care, and letters of medical necessity), we did not encounter problems obtaining adequate and proper medical care regarding all areas of our daughter's acute and long-term care.

In 1993, however, our insurance plan was changed to an HMO. At that point, we encountered many difficulties regarding Kristin's medical care. According to the plan, we had to choose a pediatrician who had contracted with the HMO to serve as her primary care physician. The pediatrician who had been seeing Kristin for many years was not a participant in the plan. Likewise, the specialists who had been treating her for so long also were not plan participants. My husband and I were very upset over this change and need to give up the excellent care Kristin had been receiving from these physicians. We were very concerned about the future of our child's health care.

Nevertheless, we tried to be optimistic and we visited a plan-approved pediatrician who would serve as Kristin's primary-care physician. To our dismay and disappointment, we were not satisfied with the level and quality of care provided. Our freedom to choose a suitable physician for our child while receiving adequate insurance coverage had been taken away by the HMO.

After such a disheartening experience, we decided that it would be in Kristin's best interest to remain with her current pediatrician and specialists. They were the doctors who knew her best. As a result of our decision, our benefits were reduced and we were required to pay out of pocket.

Also in 1993, we were advised by our insurance company's medical review board that it had deemed Kristin's therapies to be not medically necessary. Even though medical documentation recommending these therapies was in place, benefits were ceased. Because of the importance and necessity of therapies for our child, we paid for them out of pocket.

In 1994, Kristin developed a scoliosis curve which required bracing. We used an orthotist in our HMO plan to manufacture the brace. When I returned to our orthopedist with the brace, he told me it was worthless and would probably increase the curvature rather than inhibit it. My doctor was irate that the HMO had contracted with a company that provided substandard equipment; he referred us to an orthotist of his choice who manufactured the brace free of charge.

I called and wrote to my HMO regarding the inferior quality of the brace the orthotist in their plan had made for us. They responded by telling me they wouldn't handle the problem and to contact the agency they contract with. I phoned and sent written correspondence to the agency regarding the problem. However, other than someone saying they would make a note of the situation, I never received a satisfactory answer or explanation regarding the inadequate and inferior quality of the brace.

In August 1997, Kristin underwent scoliosis surgery, which required spinal fusion and instrumentation—a complicated and serious surgical procedure. Fortunately, we were able to use a reputable prominent surgeon in New York City who was on our plan as a participating specialist. At this time, Kristin's post-operative condition was very fragile. Upon discharge from the hospital, Kristin was to receive nursing care and physical therapy at home. The surgeon wrote very specific orders regarding the medical care and rehabilitation needed at home.

After Kristin had been home for nine days, I received a phone call from the contracted nursing agency informing me that nursing services would no longer be covered and were to cease. Contrary to our surgeon's recommendations, the HMO opted to provide a home health aide instead of a nurse to care for Kristin's nursing needs. The level and quality of care provided by a home health aide was not adequate for my daughter's complex medical needs. I immediately became actively involved in requesting that the HMO cover the necessary nursing care. After several additional letters of medical justification, repeated taxes, phone calls, and communication, the HMO conceded that they should follow the initial recommendations of their surgeon. Nursing care was reinstated after seven days.

The surgeon also wrote very specific instructions regarding special therapy for rehabilitation. Physical therapy was ordered for 12 weeks. However, after only about six weeks—half the period recommended by the surgeon—I received another phone call from the contracted agency stating that physical therapy would no longer be covered and would cease. Once again after my repeated attempts to correct the situation, the insurance company reinstated therapy after a two-week lapse. In both situations, continuity of vital services for my daughter was interrupted due to poor decisions made by the HMO.

On our most recent follow-up visit to the surgeon (January 14, 1998) he was not satisfied with Kristin's post-operative rehabilitation. He requested Kristin receive additional physical therapy so that she could regain her post-operative abilities and level of functioning. To date, I am still awaiting a response to this request from the HMO.

Because of surgery and the changes in Kristin's body alignment, a new wheelchair is needed to accommodate her post-operative status. We have been waiting for three-and-a-half months for secondary approval of this crucial and essential piece of equipment and have still not received a decision from the HMO. In the meantime, we have no choice but to keep our daughter in a wheelchair that no longer meets her needs while we continue to wait for a response.

In conclusion, I would like to state that HMO's present the following problems to families trying to obtain health care for a family member who has developmental disabilities and requires long-term care.

Freedom to choose qualified physicians is compromised.

The quality, continuity, and duration of care is subjected and often does not meet the medical need of the patient.

Durable medical equipment that must be customized and is not a stock item is often inadequate and inappropriate for specific medical needs.

Many crucial requests are denied or delayed for too long a time.

The time and effort our family invests in trying to correct the poor judgement of our HMO and the stress this creates takes away from the valuable time we need to care for our child. Unfortunately, this is the constant battle we must wage to try to obtain proper, quality care for our daughter.

Thank you very much Senator Torricelli and Congressman Pallone for listening to the problems I have had in obtaining good quality medical care for my daughter, Kristin.

AN AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about this great Nation we live in. I was reminded over the weekend just what a great country it

is, and I would like to challenge all of my colleagues tonight that we dare to dream about what we can do next in this great country of ours.

Back in 1980, I was teaching math, earning about $8,500 a year. We had two young children. I can remember distinctly the day we walked through the store, filled our grocery cart. As a math teacher, I added up how much the groceries were and we could not pay for them. We stopped that day and we said, we have a dream. We would like to live a better life.

In this great country that we live in, we took a chance and we started a business in the basement of our home. We dared to dream that in this great country, the United States of America, that if you want to start a business on your own, work very hard, you could be successful.

The business grew and expanded and eventually we were able to move to an office. That was in Milton, Wisconsin. Six years later we dreamed again. We said, we have this dream that we would like to build something. We would like to provide job opportunities in this great Nation where we live. We would like to provide other people with the opportunities to live the American dream as our company grew.

We started building homes that year, 1986. We built nine homes. We lost $20,000 plus my salary, and it almost seemed like our dreams were going to be shattered in that year. But this is America. We would not let those dreams be shattered.

We turned the company around the second year. We built 27 homes, turning a profit, providing 54 job opportunities in southern Wisconsin; and by four years later we had put this circle on a map. It was a circle, a 60-mile radius of Janesville, Wisconsin. We had this dream that we could build houses all through that 60-mile radius of Janesville, Wisconsin.

By 4 years later, we were building 120 homes a year, providing 250 job opportunities. We had watched not only our own company grow and the job opportunities that that company provided, but we watched other people in the industry grow right along with us, a heating contractor and electrical contractor, all the other people that were so actively involved in this home building business.

We turned that business over to some other folks and ran for Congress. We lost twice. We had this dream that in this great Nation we lived in we were going to stop our government from spending our children's money. That was our dream. We left the private sector with this very positive business and ran for office twice.

I ran against Les Aspin. Looking back on it, a person who had been in office for 22 years, a very respected Member of Congress, it was a very difficult task, but I knew in the United States of America if you had a dream you were allowed to pursue that dream.

We ran twice and lost. We came back. The third time I was elected to Congress and I came here with a very definite dream.

That is why I rise tonight. I want to talk about that dream and how far we have come with that dream and then I want to dare to dream as we look forward to this country and look at what we could possibly do to make a America a better nation for our children.

When we got here in 1995, I dug this out to come over here tonight, this is a copy of what we called America's Contract with Our Children. In our first three months in office, with the help of lots of other folks, we put together a budget resolution, and we at that time were in an environment where we kept hearing about how we were going to promise the American people we could balance the budget by 2002. Many of us came in from the private sector, never having served in government before, and we had heard these promises, way back to 1985, of Gramm–Rudman-Hollings. In 1987, we heard them again. In 1990 they said they had to raise our taxes to get the job done; 1993, they said they had to raise our taxes again.

We came in with a different idea. We came in with a dream. We came in with this dream for America that rather than raising taxes on the working people, getting more money into Washington, that instead we would control Washington. And people looked at us and they said, you cannot get Washington spending under control. There are too many special interests out there. There are too many other people out there that are not going to let you control the growth of Washington spending.

That did not stop us from dreaming. We put this budget plan together and it really, at that point it was a dream. The main components of this budget plan that we put together, and it was very detailed, it was not just a few sheets of paper, it showed exactly how to get the job done; we were going to balance the budget, and not in the year 2002. We were going to balance the budget in 1999. Our dream was that we could get there not on time but ahead of schedule.

We realized that the right move was to control the growth of Washington spending so we could not only balance the budget, but by controlling this Washington spending, we could also reduce the tax burden on the American people.

In this dream, this budget plan that we put together, in this dream that we had for America, we called for lower taxes, but our dream did not end there. We realized that this government had been taking money that was supposed to be set aside, much like a pension plan in my business that we used to run, a pension plan for our employees. We realized that this government was taking the pension fund called Social Security, but instead of putting the money aside that was supposed to be set aside to preserve and protect the system, it had been spending that money on all sorts of other things. We dreamed in this budget plan that we could set that money aside like any other pension plan and restore Social Security for our senior citizens.

Our dream did not end there. Our dream recognized that even after we got to a balanced budget and set aside the Social Security money and lowered taxes, we still had run up a $4.5, $4.9 trillion debt to be exact, at that point in time. Our dream was that we could start paying down on that debt so that our children would not inherit this huge burden as we looked forward to their future.

I brought this with me tonight. I would just like to refer to a couple pages in it, just to remind Members what it was like back in 1995, as we think about this dream that we had back then.

□ 1945

Page 1–1 of this budget says that we are going to balance the budget in 4 years; that is by 1999. We are going to pay off the $4.9 trillion debt over a 30-year period of time. We are going to quit stealing the Social Security money. We are going to provide a strong national defense. Medicare is on the verge of bankruptcy, so we were going to restore Medicare for our senior citizens. We were not going to require tax increases to do this. And we were going to provide tax cuts for workers all across this great Nation that we live in.

The next page in this proposal said what is the difference between this and what else is being proposed in Washington? Remember, this is 1995. This is our class coming in here and laying out our dream for the future of this country.

The difference, number one, page 1–2, in this thing: The plan calls for immediately setting aside surplus funds from Social Security. That was part of our dream. The plan sets out a path.

Definite difference two: The plan sets out a path to repay the $4.9 trillion dollar national debt by the year 2025.

Difference three: The plan balances the budget not in 2002 but in 1999. Not only that we provide suggested spending reductions for this government that exceeded the amount necessary to balance the budget in the year 1999 by $70 billion, so that we can debate what was the highest priority and not reduce spending in areas that were most important to our country but go after areas that were least important to our country. This plan laid all those things out.

I would like to read through a few of the other things; the environment that we were in back in 1995. Here are a few of the things that were going on around the world back in 1995 when we dared to dream that this could happen.

The U.S. debt had grown from $1 trillion to $5 trillion in a 15-year period of time. Orange County files for bankruptcy. Washington, D.C. experiences major financial problems. Barings Bank of England collapses. The dollar slides to record lows against the yen

and the mark. Interest rates, not coming down like they are today, interest rates rise 3 percent in a 15-month period of time. The Mexican collapse is imminent or probable. Canada has serious financial problems. The January U.S. trade deficit is the worst on record.

This is what we came into in 1995. Just think how much things have changed and how, by daring to dream, we have been able to bring about some of these changes in this great country we live in.

So tonight what I would like to do is to challenge my colleagues to dare to dream with me again. I would like to dare them to dream about a future in our country, and I would like to dare them to dream about a few different aspects.

We have already come to a balanced budget. We are going to make our first payment on the Federal debt three short years into this thing. Those dreams we had back in 1995 of a balanced budget before the turn of the century, it is here and it has happened. Our dreams have come true for the good of the future of this country.

So let us talk about dreaming for the future of America and let us dare to dream about a better America for the future of our kids. Let us start by paying off the Federal debt so our children can inherit a debt-free United States of America. And let me translate that into what that means.

For our children, if we could be successful at this, we could allow them to keep $580 a month for every family of five in America in their home instead of sending it to Washington. Because that is the amount of money that is necessary to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

So let us dare to dream. And for our seniors, let us dare to dream that we restore the Social Security Trust Fund. Let us stop taking that money and spending it on other Washington programs and putting IOUs in the trust fund. Let us dare to dream we can actually get this government to do the same thing any business in the private sector would do for their employees, and that is put real dollars or real assets into that trust fund so our senior citizens can rest assured that Social Security is safe and secure for them as we go forward.

I want to dare to dream about the tax rate, too. Because in this great Nation that we live in, when we go to work and earn a dollar, 37 cents out of every dollar goes to taxation of some form, whether it be State, local or Federal or property taxes. Whatever form we want to look at, 37 cents out of every dollar our American worker earns is paid in in taxes.

So I want to dare to dream again. I want to dream about reducing that tax rate by a third and more if possible. But let us dream again about getting our tax rate down to not more than 25 cents out of every dollar that our American workers earn. And, frankly, I think that number is too high and maybe we should even dream for a lower number. But for the time being let us set our dream that we at least reduce the tax burden on American families all across this Nation by at least a third.

I suggested this at one of our town hall meetings recently, or one of our meetings with a group of people, and somebody stood up in the room and said, ''God only asked for 10 percent. Where does government get off asking for 37?'' That person made a good point. And I think she said it half tongue-in-cheek, but she was also right on track. Why does it cost 37 cents out of every dollar of our workers' paychecks to do nothing but run government at all the different levels, State, local, and Federal?

And I want to point some more about an education system that makes our kids number one in the world. I do not like these scores that I am hearing, where our kids rank somewhere 20th in the world. That is not acceptable, and I do not think that should be acceptable for us as a nation.

So when we think about this thing, let us dare to dream that when we restore our educational system in America to a point where our kids finish not in the top 2 or 3 or 4, let us get our kids number one in education in this great country.

How do we go about doing that? Let us fill in some of the blanks of this dream for education. Let us restore the ability to control education, put it back in the hands of the parents, put it back in the hands of the teachers, put it back in the hands of the local community so they once again control education.

I know my colleague from California is here, but if I can mention one specific bill that relates to education to help us get to this dream, one specific bill was introduced by a good friend of mine, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS). His bill would require that 90 cents out of every dollar spent for education be returned to actually help the kids in the classroom.

Because what happens today is our government collects that money, brings it out here to Washington, spends 40 cents on the dollar on the bureaucracy here in Washington, and then our government here in Washington makes a decision of where to send that other 60 cents back to. And that is not right. So this bill requires at least 90 cents out of every dollar be returned to the classroom. I think it would be a great part of this dream for the future of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN).

How can we do this? First of all, good government does not have to be an oxymoron like it is today. People want their tax dollars to go to fund good government not wasteful government.

I am glad the gentleman talked about education. I have two focuses in Congress; one is national security and the other is education. I think both sides, no matter what the opinions are, education is the key to a lot of many different areas. It is anticrime, it is antidrug, it is antipoverty.

My father and mother, who were Democrats, focused on education because they knew that that was the future. I remember my dad telling me, he said, ''Son,'' he said, ''if you get a good education,'' and neither my father or my mother went to college, but they said, ''If you get a good education and you work hard, you can make tomorrow better than it is today.'' And that was their definition, very simple definition of the American dream.

Where are we today? We are sending billions of tax dollars to Washington, D.C. Now only about 93 percent of education dollars come from the State. Less than 7 percent come from the Federal Government, but yet that 7 percent represents about $35 billion. So that 7 percent is no small number. Now, what I would think that the American people want, if they send their tax dollars to Washington, is that they get a return on that dollar that is going to enhance education.

The President, for example, wanted $3 billion for a new literacy program. California, the State that I come from, is 50th in literacy. So the gentleman can imagine the jubilation that the folks that said, hey, California is 50th in literacy; $3 billion for a new literacy program. That will be good. But if we look at it, the Federal Government has 14 literacy programs. Title 1, which is the biggest user of that $35 billion, is one of those. Title 7 is another.

What is wrong with taking one or two of our literacy programs, of the 14 that we currently have, and not just funding them 100 percent but increasing them because they work, and taking the other 12 that are not working, and getting rid of the bureaucracy? We have to pay all those salaries, the buildings, the overhead, the cost of paperwork, the retirements, which gets us less than 48 cents out of a dollar down to the classroom. In doing so, by having this other 12, we have to send our tax dollars to support this level. And that is wrong.

That is what we are saying, is that government can be good government. We can reduce the cost of government and yet at the same time benefit the American people, especially in education. And that is just one example.

And I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. NEUMANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the next thing I wish to mention is an area the gentleman is also very concerned about, and I know of the gentleman's fine work in the area.

As we continue this dream for the future of America, and I do think it is important we dare to dream, if we had not dared to dream back in 1995 we would not be here today standing here talking about a balanced budget and

lower taxes for the first time in 16 years and a Medicare system that has been restored. That was part of our daring to dream back in 1995.

So today, as we look forward, I think part of this daring to dream as we look ahead is a strong defense system, a defense system that other nations around the world look at us and recognize us as the one world power as it relates to defense. That means we have to adequately fund the defense budget.

I know that is an area the gentleman is very concerned about.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the gentleman, if he will continue to yield, that we just finished with a readiness hearing in San Diego. We had both Republicans and Democrats from the Committee on National Security and the defense appropriations committee. And I was proud of my Democratic colleagues because they not only recognized but praised the individuals and swore to help the situation.

Our service chiefs will come and tell us that the budget is okay, but then between the lines they will tell us of increased operations of 300 percent above the Cold War. Our equipment is 1970s. We have large numbers of our senior NCOs and aviators getting out of the service because they are forced to go away.

Take, for example, the U.S.S. *Constellation*. She got back from a cruise. This is typical of all services. She got back from a 6-month cruise. She goes into port into San Diego. April, May, June, July, August. She has to go up to Bremerton for repairs. Now, all of those families are in San Diego. So those personnel again, besides on cruise, have to leave their families.

They are having to cannibalize parts. Several aircraft or squadrons have only one aircraft to fly because they have to steal those parts. They call it cannibalization, take that part off those airplanes and send them to Bosnia and Iraq and where our forward forces are deployed.

Mr. NEUMANN. To that end, I just interviewed a former lieutenant commander. We were talking about the possibility of him working in our congressional office. He told the story of every third flight something breaking down in the aircraft he was flying, and that is one of the reasons he left the service. It is a very serious problem.

Again, I do not think we should get bogged down, that we look at this in a very pessimistic way, but rather we need to dare to dream as Americans that we can find it within ourselves to restore our military to the strong position that it should be in this world.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would agree with the gentleman. And instead of bogging down in the sadness of the state of readiness, there are ways in which we can actually make a three-cornered Pentagon.

A couple of examples: One, I was able to get $12 million through both the authorization process and appropriations to copy all defense maps. All services for $12 million. That was a reduction of 1 to 100th of the cost. The office of Secretary of Defense held onto the money. They wanted to steal it. They wanted to reprogram it. They wanted to give it to NAVCOM. They wanted to do other purposes with it. And we fought for 1 year to get the money released so we could copy those systems. The services continued at the old rate of copying those services. They copied 10 percent of those maps, costing $16 million.

One of the things we can do is reduce the size of OSD by at least 35 percent, and streamlining the bureaucracy in the military. That is just one of a thousand suggestions.

□ 2000

Mr. NEUMANN. So what the gentleman is saying or suggesting is that by more efficiently using the dollars that are already being spent for defense and without raising taxes on the people to fund more defense spending, there are a lot of ways within the defense plan already that we could better spend the dollars that are already being spent to provide for a better defense of our Nation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Exactly. And when we are trying to balance the budget, we can look forward that for all of those wastes, from the 12 to $16 million for only 10 percent of what we could have done for 100 percent, taxpayers have got to send their dollars to Washington, D.C., turn those around at a very low rate, we can totally eliminate it. And it is not a question of giving money back from taxes; it is having not to send it here in the first place to balance the budget.

Mr. NEUMANN. I couldn't agree more. Going on with this dream, we talked about a debt-free America for our children and how wonderful it would be if when they had their kids, that they didn't have to pay $580 a month to pay interest on the Federal debt. We talked about restoring the Social Security Trust Fund. And I think it is important that we have this dream that our senior citizens can again get up in the morning and not worry about whether Social Security is going to be there; and the dream of reducing the tax rates from 37 percent down to 25 percent, that is 37 cents out of every dollar is going to Government, to down to less than 25 cents, a one-third reduction.

And we have this dream about restoring our education system so that we are, once again, the number one education system in the entire world, not two, not three, not four. That is not our target. Our target is set, number one. And we do that by restoring the control of the education system back to the parents and the teachers and the community.

I know my colleague from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is very concerned in this issue as well. I want to continue with this dream for the future of our country. I want to dream of a drug-free America. I do not want to dream of a America that has 400,000 or only 400,000 on drugs at the eighth grade level. I want to dream of an America where we eliminate drugs. I want to declare war on drugs in this country. And I want to devote as much time and effort and attention to the drug war as we do all the other things that are going on in this city right now so that our kids can once again feel safe going into school, and that they do not have to feel compelled to try drugs because so many of their friends are.

We saw a study here that the average student believes that in one hour they can go out and purchase marijuana in virtually any school system in the United States of America, and that is not acceptable.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But that takes real commitment. We cannot just wish it away. And it is like fighting a war. We cannot just say education is going to stop drugs. We cannot just say interdiction is going to stop it. But we have got a gross base on which we have got to reach across and stop it. And that takes real commitment from the White House, which we have not had in the past.

We can win the war on drugs. There are always going to be those that use it and sell it. Those are the ones that you put away and they never see the light of day. But what we are proposing is not just a word game to stop crime and drugs, but to actually fight it.

Example: The $7 billion that we spent, and the quote was 100,000 cops, just like a 100,000 teachers, there was no 100,000 cops. The most they could fund is 20,000, and it was to rain money down to the big cities so they could get support for reelections. What we want to do is take the money, give it to the local police force.

Just like my colleague was talking about with education, we want the teachers, the parents, the community and the extended communities and the administrators to be able to handle it. Because they know the needs, they know the first names of your children, not a bureaucrat here in Washington.

And the same is true in law enforcement. You put the money in the area. Do you need equipment? Do you need standby? Do you need more force? And instead of controlling with strings back here in Washington, it takes an all-out war with generals. And that is why we are calling for General McCaffrey to get on with it and give us some information on what he forsees on this real fight and we will back him 100 percent.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding. And I listened with interest to my colleague from California. Because, Mr. Speaker, as I stand here in the well of the Congress of the United States, I am truly in awe not only of

the responsibility my constituents conferred upon me constitutionally to represent them in this hall and in this Chamber, but also with the quality of people who come from coast to coast and beyond; and here I stand with one who distinguished himself first as an educator and then fought this country's battles in southeast Asia where he quite fittingly earned the title of top gun.

And I stand with another who distinguished himself first as a teacher, as did my colleague from California, but my friend from Wisconsin, who worked so hard as a teacher, and then went into home building. And we really have the essence of the American dream embodied in these two gentlemen.

But Mr. Speaker, I would simply concur with the statements that have been made tonight as we try to dream a dream that can be reality for our children. This is something achievable. And I especially, Mr. Speaker, appreciate the comments of my friend from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). Because what we need is not a war of words, what we need is a solid commitment to our families and to our children.

Think if you would, Mr. Speaker, what we would say today if we sent an army into battle and lost 10,000 young Americans. Now, Mr. Speaker, think for a second. That is exactly what is happening. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, that may be an understatement of the number of deaths we see on an annual basis due to drug addiction.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I travel the width and breadth of the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona, an area in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I hear firsthand in the smaller communities that challenges those small police forces and those rural areas are facing as big city gangs and big city drugs are sent from the cesspools of organized crime to the very heartland of America.

So what we have, Mr. Speaker, is indeed a call to arms; not the traditional battle, nor the war on words so offered as Washington's version of Madison Avenue; a war on poverty, a war on drugs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Let me give my colleagues a good example of coming to arms. I had a doctor come into my office about 3 years ago. And I was fortunate enough to write much of the welfare reform bill, being on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. He said, ''Duke, I had a lady come in my office with a 13-year-old daughter. She wanted to know what was wrong with her daughter that had just had her fourth menstrual cycle that she couldn't have a child. She wanted the welfare money.''

Now, what happens to those children? There is one view that would continue to spend trillions of dollars in the old welfare system. To me, that was a waste. And we have to send our tax dollars there. But what we did is stood up to the plate, made a commitment that we are going to solve the welfare and slavery problem of the people trapped in the inner cities.

Now, that child, what chance do they have of the American dream? Zero. Is it because the parents raised them? No. They are busy having other children. Is it the grandmother? Usually. If it is a male child, that child is in a gang. And if it is a female today, that child is in a gang. And where do they turn? Can they get a job? No. Do they have an American dream? No. They go to drugs and crime, and then it is perpetuated over and over again.

But we stood up to the plate. And in many States like the gentleman's, over 50 percent of the welfare roles are coming off just because we said, you should go to work. The average welfare recipient was 16 years. That is a perfect example of stepping up to the plate and making a commitment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think my colleague from Arizona, Mr. Speaker, makes an excellent point. And I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding some time as we talk about this, how we work through problems to solve them.

The other thing we should note, Mr. Speaker, is that there is an achievable objective for success. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, what we have been able to do within this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats alike reaching across America, has said, when it comes to the dilemma of dealing with a self-perpetuating welfare state as we help people go from welfare to work, we now measure success not by the numbers of people who are on the welfare roles, but by the numbers of people who are out in gainful employment.

Just this last Friday, in Mesa, Arizona, I had a chance to go in and work with a program. Initially, it was called Women Off Welfare, or WOW. Now they call it World of Work because nontraditional opportunities are opening up for women and men alike in our society. And the four people that were supposed to be there as part of the program, my colleagues, they could not be there to tell about what they have done because they were busy at work earning money for their families having a brighter future.

Mr. NEUMANN. Reclaiming my time, listening to you talk is why it is so exciting. My colleague was here; he cosponsored this legislation, and we said we were going to balance the budget sooner than 2002. We said we were going to lower taxes so people could keep more of their own money and make decisions about how to spend their money instead of sending it to Washington. We said we were going to get Social Security taken care of for our seniors and start paying down the debt.

Do my colleagues remember back in 1995, when we first came how they reacted? But we dared to dream. I think that is what is so important for this country and to these young people. Sometimes they have it taken away from them because they hear all of these class warfare arguments where somehow if you do not have a lot of money to start with that you cannot get ahead in this country. And I just point to our own example in my own family where we started with nothing and you can work very hard, and if you do work hard, there is an opportunity to live the American dream.

I point to this booklet. I point to our dream that we can balance the budget before the turn of the century and lower taxes at the same time, but getting Washington spending under control, or at least taking a good stab at it. This stuff can happen and it is real, and it has happened in the first 3 years here and there is lots more to come.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And what is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this is recent history; this is within the last 3 years. I remember sitting here on the front row when we talked about the budget plan where we dared to dream, less than 100 Members of this body would join with us.

Mr. NEUMANN. Eighty-nine, to be exact.

Mr. HAYWORTH. They derided it as extreme. Now look at what has happened. We see that it makes extremely good sense to have Washington spend less so that families can spend more, to make sure that the money that belongs to the people in the first place stays in their paychecks; and in so doing, actually letting Americans have more of their own money to save, spend, and invest, create new jobs and new opportunities.

Now, we are in a situation where the tables have turned. Oh, there is still work to do, as my colleague has pointed out; our commitment to our seniors in terms of the Social Security Preservation Act, which we cosponsored, the challenges we still confront in terms of ending the scourge on drugs. In a free society, it is an ongoing battle. But we have made the first steps toward realizing those dreams for our children.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, what the gentleman just said is what William Wallace, in the year 1312, I do not know how many saw the movie ''Brave Heart,'' in his death throes he screamed out ''freedom.'' We are giving those freedoms back to the American families that have given up those freedoms so Washington can rule and control their life.

Just in these few short minutes we talked about a balanced budget, but yet a balanced budget in which we actually have education reform or education receives more and families and parents, administrators, teachers have more freedom to teach their children and the results are better.

We can talk about DOD and reform, to have a stronger defense, but yet to have it reduced and more like a business, and welfare reform and saving Medicare. Remember the blast that we got from Medicare from the unions and from the DNC? But at the same time, this is the same Medicare plan that the

President signed in the balanced budget, and everybody wins. We do have areas to go.

When we have got a 50 percent fraud, waste, and abuse with food stamps and those areas in which, again, taxpayers have to send their money to the overhead of Washington bureaucracy to support, we can actually get more of the money down to the families, down to military, down to the welfare recipients and have good government, which, again, does not have to be an oxymoron.

Mr. NEUMANN. Reclaiming my time, I would like to turn this into some very specific examples. Because we have talked about returning this freedom to the people and letting them keep more of their own money in their own homes to decide how to spend it, I would like to talk about some specifics for just a minute on this very topic.

For example, starting next year, every family with a child under the age of 17 in the middle-income brackets will get down to the bottom line of how much they would have sent to Washington in taxes and they will subtract $400 off the bottom line because of the $400-per-child tax cut.

In Wisconsin, sometimes I am out at these meetings and people look at me like, ''Are you kidding? Is this a political promise,'' or ''What are you talking about?'' This bill was signed into law next year. And starting next year when they do their taxes, they literally will get down to the bottom line how much they would have sent to Washington and subtract $400 for each child under the age of 17.

If they have college students, I have got two in college myself, and I will not qualify for this particular benefit, but a lot of families that are in the middle-income brackets, they are going to qualify for this. It is tough to pay college bills; it is expensive. So if they have got a freshman or sophomore in college, again they go through their taxes and figure out how much would they have sent to Washington, but they subtract $1500 off the bottom line. This is very real money.

I just want to add a specific family that I know of. I want to turn this into a very real situation. This family I am thinking of has one child in college, as a matter of fact, goes to the same school my daughter goes to. They have got two kids still at home in their family. And they are middle-income folks.

I do not know exactly what they earn, someplace between 40 and $60,000 a year, I suppose. But with their household, with one in college, a sophomore by next year, and two kids at home under the age of 17, they get $400 off for each one of the two kids, or $800 for the two kids at home, and $1500 to help pay that college tuition. We are talking about a $50,000 a year family here, reducing their taxes by $2,300. That is a lot of money.

When we talk about this idea of returning power to the people and freedom to the people, we are talking about letting then decide how they are going to spend their hard-earned money, as opposed to sending it out out here to Washington so people in this city, bureaucrats out here, Members of Congress, can figure out how to spend their money for them.

□ 2015

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, a new Member, and we are happy to have him with us.

Mr. THUNE. I would like to, as always, commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for the bold leadership he has taken a number of these issues. We talk about the subject of daring to dream and again the enormous challenges that are out there in front of us as a country and some of the things that have been accomplished in the past.

I want to again compliment the gentleman for the extraordinary work he has done to draw attention to the need to be debt free as we move into a new century and to do something that is very positive for our children, for our grandchildren, in the legislation he has introduced which would put us on a systematic plan to where we will eliminate the $5.5 trillion debt that soaks up more and more of our tax dollars every year just in interest payments.

It gets mentioned often, but I do not think often enough that before we do anything else, the Committee on Appropriations in this Congress writes that $250 billion interest check right off the top, before we do anything that assists people who are in need of education. Before we do anything in terms of the other programs the government funds, roads and bridges, national defense, we take the first $250 billion and pay it off in interest.

The plan that he has introduced would in 2026 completely eliminate the $5.5 trillion debt and put us as a country on a path toward being debt free. That is something that is absolutely historic in terms of what we can do for the future of this country. I would like to see us take that same sort of passion, that same sort of courage and leadership that the gentlemen did in the 104th Congress, and the gentleman from Arizona who is here and had a part in that process, in reforming welfare and in dealing with some very tough and controversial issues, issues that people said, ''That can't be done, we can't do this, this thing is just too complicated and too big.''

Yet you demonstrated the courage to get that done. I think it is proof of what we can accomplish when we want to work together.

If we could turn that same sort of intensity to the war on drugs, I was just reading today in the Sioux Falls newspaper about the methamphetamine crisis we are facing in our State. There is a quote here from a young lady. It says the powerful drugs also stole every good thing she had, including her three children and her freedom. She quotes, ''I have never in my life felt so helpless and out of control. There is no good outcome to meth use. You use everything. That includes yourself.''

In fact, South Dakota has been designated as a high intensity drug trafficking area because of the growing methamphetamine traffic in our State. We need to apply the same type of leadership in this particular area.

I hearken back to the 1980s when Nancy Reagan started her Just Say No campaign and the demonstrable impact that had on drug use among young people and the powerful and immediate impact that the message has. If we are willing, as a country, and if we could get the White House and this administration to take some leadership on this issue, we could work with them, because this is an increasing problem, particularly in rural areas.

Again, another statistic here, in 1991, 14 grams of methamphetamine were seized, that has grown each year to this last year, 984 grams of methamphetamine seized by law enforcement officials. It is a very serious issue in parts of this country. It demands very serious leadership and something that I think we all need to provide as public officials.

Mr. NEUMANN. I would just add that when we dream about the future of this country that is going to be a drug free nation for our children, when we have that dream about the future of America, I do not think we should temper it with not inhaling or some of the other things that we have heard from some of our leadership. This Nation needs leaders that are willing to stand up and say, it is not acceptable, drug use is not acceptable in the United States of America; and we have today declared war on the use of drugs in this country. We need leadership that is willing to stand up and say these things.

There are many other values that we could talk about that would be along the same lines as what we just talked about with drugs. People need to stand up and say that a married couple, that either spouse in the marriage should be committed to that marriage and that it is not acceptable to go off with another person of the opposite sex; whether it be the same age or a different age or whatever, those things are not acceptable in the United States of America.

This Nation needs leaders that are willing to stand up and say, ''Mr. President, if you in fact had a problem or had a situation with Monica Lewinsky or Gennifer Flowers, that is not acceptable as an example for our Nation and for our children in this country.''

Somebody needs to tell our kids that it is not the norm that our President or any other leader in a community, or for that matter any other member of a marriage, whether it be husband or wife, this is not acceptable practice in the United States of America and we do not want to tolerate it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think that also goes when we are talking about drugs, not to come across to MTV and say

they would inhale if they could, the leader of our Nation.

I have talked to drug agents and I have talked to people in rehabilitation. The kids sneer. They say, ''Look, the President said he would inhale if he could.'' That is the wrong message.

Let me give my colleagues another example. Remember the young man that was caned in Singapore for spray-painting cars? I am not saying that we cane people, but I would guarantee that that individual, that young man, when he went back to Singapore would never spray-paint another car nor would any other individual. But yet look at our streets and the tagging and the graffiti and those kinds of things that take place because we let it go on. That is just a symptom of the lack of commitment, from drugs to graffiti, that juvenile crime has gone exponentially up, a 600 percent increase and the viciousness of it has increased, to be paramount.

Those are the kinds of things I think the gentlemen are talking about.

We need a commitment, not just words and not the wrong direction. You do not say, let us increase rehabilitation dollars and cut off why they are getting on drugs in the first place. I want to stop it so I do not have to put as many dollars in rehab, and save those children.

Mr. NEUMANN. When we think about the war on drugs or bringing education back to number one in the world for our kids here in America, can this goal, can this job of getting from where we are today to a drug-free America and back to where our education is number one in the world, can that really be tougher than what we have already been through between 1995 and today, getting to a balanced budget, actually lowering taxes, restoring Medicare for our senior citizens?

When we think about this, a lot of people would look at this and go, ''We can't do this.'' What I am suggesting tonight is that we dare to dream, because you have got to have the dream before you can bring about the results, and we commit ourselves to this dream in the same way we committed ourselves to getting to a balanced budget, to starting to pay down the debt, to lowering taxes for our families and to restoring Medicare for our senior citizens.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would say this gentleman's dream has guided a lot of us on this House floor on how to balance the budget and how to achieve that. He has been a leader across the board in how to have more effective government and yet reduce the penalties on the American people, and I would like to thank the gentleman.

Mr. NEUMANN. I think it has been a lot of us here together, getting this job done. But I do think that it is the American people that deserve the credit for sending a group of people here that were willing to commit to these dreams.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this is the essence of our constitutional republic. The brilliance of our founders is found in the sense that they had the foresight and the sense of commitment to set up this unique institution where we can represent and where we can dare to dream, but then take the steps firmly rooted in reality to make those dreams come true.

Certainly we have talked about a far-flung and ambitious agenda of where our dreams will take us, not only fiscal responsibility and a better future for our children, not only fighting this war on drugs, not only realizing the successes and seizing upon those for our seniors as well as the youngest among us, but making this translation work.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about the legislation offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin and the innovative programs that the gentleman from California has been involved in and the fresh new perspective the gentleman from South Dakota brings. In a moment of personal indulgence, might I also, Mr. Speaker, offer something that I have introduced, that the Committee on Resources just held hearings on 2 weeks ago, that my staff has taken to calling HELGA in one of those moods you get here where you have an acronym, for Hayworth Education Land Grant Act.

It is born out of something that happened in my district, something that you may find in your districts, the folks you represent. In rural Arizona, there is a real shortage of private land. The little community of Alpine, Arizona, nestled there on the New Mexico border, in my first term in Congress came to see me. They said, ''We have scraped together enough money to build a new school. We meet right now in an old church. It's not exactly a one-room schoolhouse, but it's close. We have the money to build a school, but we don't have the money to purchase a site on which to build the school. This is a real dilemma.''

What makes it ironic is the fact that the town of Alpine sits on the edge of a national forest, government-controlled land. They said, ''Congressman, could you help us get a conveyance of land?''

And so we did so. The good news is they are building a school because they could save their money to build the school and concentrate on students and teachers and the future instead of worrying about buying land.

As Mark Twain pointed out, ''History doesn't repeat itself, but it rhymes.'' And so learning from that experience and the experience of Congressman Morrill, quite frankly, in the last century with the Land Grant Act for Higher Education that transformed higher education in this country, I came up with a plan that offers a standard, uniform way for rural school districts to apply for conveyances of federally controlled land, so again they can concentrate their resources on what is most important, the children and their education, and not worry about buying land and not have that economic impact hit them adversely in trying to build a new school.

We held hearings, as I mentioned, 2 weeks ago, a subcommittee of the Committee on Resources. I am very optimistic about this legislation, labeled H.R. 2322. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to be involved, to take a look at this legislation, because it can do important things across America in rural districts for those school children and their future, because again as we all concur, Mr. Speaker, education is too important to be left up to Washington bureaucrats. We have got to maximize flexibility and innovation and what happens at home on the front lines to make sure that different districts are armed with different alternatives so that they can decide what is best.

I would commend the legislation to my colleagues and move in that type of common-sense direction to focus on educating children, not worrying about the shifting of dollars but focusing on what works.

A couple of quick admonitions I would offer. If you are worried about Park Service land, no Park Service land can be taken for this, nor can any Federal wildlife refuges be taken for this. But there is a uniform way to convey land, and I believe that it can transform rural education in this country for students K-through-12 not only in school districts, but in charter schools that have sprung up in places like Arizona and come to full flower and full fruition.

And those types of innovative ideas, based on the best of what our heritage teaches us when applied to the challenges of today, those are the ways that we translate our dreams into reality. That is why I am so pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be here with men and women of conviction on both sides of the aisle, who are willing to look to translate those dreams into reality.

Mr. Speaker, I would invite my colleagues to take a good look at that legislation and join us in taking that step toward helping rural children.

Mr. NEUMANN. Just briefly, I would like to point out that the great State of Wisconsin, as we find in many cases, is quite far out in front on this particular issue. When you develop land of any sort in Wisconsin, at least 5 percent of the land is dedicated to schools, to community or to parks. We find in many cases that not 5 percent, it is more like 10 or 15 percent of the land is set aside permanently for our families that then build in these subdivisions and realize the American dream in buying their own home. They then have this land preserved for them, whether it be for schools or for parkland or whatever.

In Wisconsin, it is standard operating procedure that at least 5 percent of your land is set aside for schools, parks, community recreation and community service. In Wisconsin, we are already doing some of these things. I certainly think what he has there is a pretty fair idea.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. The gentleman from Arizona makes a pretty compelling case, I think, with respect to what his legislation would do. I think again it points to at least one of the issues that we are discussing here this evening, and have been for some time, and that is how do we go about making sure that more education dollars get into the classroom where they are benefiting our young people and preparing them for the future.

In South Dakota, we have taken some steps in terms of wiring the schools to bring technology, the high technology that is available to us today, to see that our kids are equipped so that when the time comes for them to transition into the workplace, they are ready for that.

I think again that happens when you look in a very systematic, disciplined way at moving power and control out of the Federal bureaucracy, making the Federal bureaucracy smaller, the family budget bigger, the budget of schools and local and State governments; and I think that is something that all of us in the Chamber this evening are very interested in doing and seeing come to pass. I think it points again to the broad need in this country to address the real problems that real people are facing.

The gentleman from Arizona made some reference to common sense, which is something that is very terribly lacking, it seems, here in Washington.

□ 2030

However, if we look at these things in a very commonsensical way, and in dealing with the issue of drugs, if we could eliminate the scourge of drugs in this country, the very best thing that we could do to preserve the future for our kids, making our future debt-free, giving them the resources that they need in the classroom to see that they have the very highest possible quality education opportunities available to them at the best value to the taxpayer, and working in a way as well to address the retirement needs.

When we talked about welfare reform, and we did, we took some important steps in this last Congress, of which my colleagues were a part, and in the 105th since I have been here in terms of balancing the budget, reforming Medicare and trying to secure a better future for all people of all ages in our country.

And in the area of retirement where we have so much to do in the area of professionals today looking down the road, looking at Social Security and saying, ''By golly, I just do not think that that is going to be there for me,'' and we need to give them some options. Now, for the first time, in a very bipartisan way, we are hearing people talk about what we might do to provide a better future and to ensure that the retirement needs in this country are met when the time comes.

Finally, I would simply say, and my colleagues have touched on it this evening, lowering the overall cost of government on the taxpayers in this country, the goal of trying to get to 25 percent so that the Federal Government, the State and local governments are not taking more than 25 cents out of every dollar of the family in this country so that we can make the family budget bigger, strengthen families and not government institutions, I think that is the direction we are going.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, or less than 25 cents. I like the idea of going for a lower number.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, the problem is, as my colleagues know, is that they were going to put a cap on it, but they were worried about ever getting that high. So yes, probably 25 percent or less, actually, before it is all said and done.

But that would move in a very dramatic way toward making again the Federal Government smaller, making the family budget bigger, and strengthening our families in this country so that they can address the needs that they have, whether it be retirement or health care or education or child care.

As I travel the State of South Dakota and I talk with real people, these are real needs, real problems that require real leadership and not a lot of the same old Washington-based solutions that have dominated the agenda in this city for such a long time.

So again, I am delighted to be a part of the agenda that we are on, talking about these issues and talking about real solutions. Again, leading by example. One of the things that the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned earlier is that sometimes we need to be using the bully pulpit. The fact of the matter is, as C.S. Lewis once said, that we laugh at honor and are shocked to find traders in our midst.

When we talk about the use of drugs in a very cavalier way, when we talk about the things, the values that we hold near and dear, the importance of keeping the family together, family relationships and the various activities that have been on the front page of the newspaper for the past several months, it is important for people who are in positions I think of public leadership to not only provide leadership in economic areas, but also in the moral area. That is something that I would hope that we will continue to emphasize and talk about in the discussion as well, that values be a part of our debate in this country.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, just one comment on that. I know the gentleman is alluding to a situation that many people here in Washington have taken a hands-off policy and are just plain not talking about it, but at the risk of making a suggestion to the President of the United States, I would like to take this opportunity to suggest to the President of the United States that he come out with a very public statement that says, ''No, I did not do that. If I had done that, I would immediately resign.'' That would be a very different message than the message our young people in this country are hearing today.

The message, ''No, I did not do it, but if I had done that, I would resign immediately from this office,'' would send a message to our kids that he does not accept what he is being accused of as acceptable behavior or practice in this country, and it would be very different, what our kids are hearing, than what they are hearing today. I would encourage him to come out with that as soon as possible so that our kids hear a different message.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would like to compliment the gentleman from South Dakota. I know he has taken a leadership role in education. Again, a dream that the gentleman is talking about, a vision, it takes commitment. Mr. Speaker, those folks that started off to the West on covered wagons, they could dream about it, they could have a vision, but unless they were really committed, they would never make it.

We look at Martin Luther King. He had a dream, he had a vision, but yet it would not have become a reality unless he was willing to commit, and he did that.

But just like in education, if we get so little money out of the Federal Government down to the classroom, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, a State bureaucracy is just as bad as a Federal bureaucracy if it keeps the dollars away from the classroom. But if we get so little money, and I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues have ever tried to pass a school bond in their districts, but I know in California it takes two-thirds, it is very difficult.

So if we have very little money from the Federal Government, if we cannot pass a school bond, how are we going to bring those classrooms up when we are last of the industrialized nations, 15th in math and science? And that was duplicated in a major study just this last month, where over half of the 4th graders could not identify the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean, and we got over half of our students coming out functionally illiterate.

One of the commitments, and the President signed this bill in the balanced budget, and what we looked at is taking the 21st century education bill to where we take companies who are dumping computers on schools but the school did not have the technology or the teachers to upgrade them, and they ended up in a corner. So what we did is we said, okay, if you have a computer that is under 2 years old, you can write off that computer and we are going to give you a tax benefit for donating that computer.

Now, we have a company, a nonprofit corporation in California and it is in 21 States, called Detwiler Foundation.

They take that computer and they use prison labor to upgrade that computer. If they do not serve so many hours in working on education or work, they do not get their privileges. So it brings a triple force right there. They then turn that computer down to the school, ready to plug in.

So that is what it takes as a Federal, a private, and a State partnership. But again, the focus should be on the teachers, the parents, the families and the community to make those decisions. But that is what we talk about as far as commitment, and making it happen and coming up with those kinds of solutions, which means less government.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are very near the end of the hour here and I would just kind of like to wrap this up. We talked about daring to dream. We talked about my personal life where we reached a point that we could not pay our bills, where we started a business and turned it into something.

We talked about starting the home building business and suffering through years where we lost money, and turning that company around and getting to the point where we were building 120 homes a year and providing 250 job opportunities. And daring to dream that in the United States of America, even if you have no political background, that in this great Nation that we live in, where if you want to run for office you can run for office, and we ran twice and lost, but we had a dream that it could still happen.

We got elected and came in here with a very specific dream. We came in here in 1995 and we dared to dream that we could balance our budget before the turn of the century and quit spending our kids' money. We dared to dream that we could make payments on the Federal debt and start paying this thing down, so instead of our kids getting a legacy of huge debts and interest payments, that we could actually start paying down the debt and maybe give our country to our children debt-free. We dared to dream that we could start putting the money away for Social Security so our senior citizens could once again rest assured that their Social Security was safe, and we dared to dream that we could reduce the tax burden on American workers.

Those things have all come about in less than 3 years. They have come about far faster than anyone even dared to dream that they could possibly happen.

Now we are here. It is time to look ahead and to look where we are going to. I would like to challenge my colleagues to dare to dream for the future of this country.

For our kids, let us give them a debt-free, drug-free America where education is once again number one in the entire world. For our workers, let us reduce the tax burden at all levels of government by at least a third, so that they are once again empowered to make decisions about how they will spend their own hard-earned money. For our senior citizens, let us start putting the Social Security Trust Fund money aside in real dollars so that the Social Security Trust Fund is restored and safe for our senior citizens, and let us make sure that our Medicare system is solid and solvent so that our senior citizens are assured that their health care will be taken care of.

For all Americans, let us make sure that we provide a strong defense for this Nation and a clean environment as we look forward to the future. Let us dare to dream that we can restore this great Nation and once again have the greatest Nation in the world. Let us not be afraid to dare to dream.

BUDGETARY PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REDMOND). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about the most important subject we have to deal with here, and that is finances, budget and appropriations. I want to talk about it in the context of financing two societies and the way we deal with two different groups.

One society I would say is the international banking and investment community, which when they approach us for help it seems always to get an immediate response of billions of dollars to go into the International Monetary Fund or to bail out Mexico. Now we are talking about bailing out South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the immediate response of billions and billions of dollars.

In the other society I would lump all of us together and start with my most important concern, and that is schools, financing for schools, assistance for schools. School construction at the top of that list, but everything related to education.

There is a double standard with respect to the International Monetary Fund and the way it comes to the relief of the international investment community, versus the funding that we receive and the kinds of debate and deliberation that we have when we are funding education or when we are funding other vital domestic programs, or when we are funding certain African and Caribbean countries, Caribbean aid and Caribbean trade always have a second class status. They are in the same category as funding for domestic programs that help poor people.

We are committed, we say, both parties say that we are really concerned about using Federal resources to help people who are disadvantaged. Low-income people should be helped as opposed to special groups, affirmative action is condemned as helping special groups, and the justification for that is condemned.

I do not agree with that approach where affirmative action is tossed aside as not being legitimate, but let us suspend that argument for a while and say that opportunity programs which help all poor people are certainly desirable, and if both parties, Democrats and Republicans, want to join in doing that, let us do that. But as we debate the process, let us understand that if we are going to help people who need help, the poorest people in our society, if we are going to help the children in inner cities' education systems, the schools that need repair most, the schools that need new classrooms, the schools that need to be wired for the Internet, if we are going to help them, it costs money.

So whenever we have a discussion of money, let us not retreat from the necessary resources to provide the opportunities for people who do not have opportunities. That is going to be our modus operandi. We are going to focus on providing opportunity versus providing corrections and adjustments for people who have been discriminated against. Then let us really provide the funding.

Let us deal with the funding for the schools in the inner city communities. Let us deal with the funding necessary for school construction, necessary for increasing classrooms, so that as we increase the number of teachers and we decrease the ratio of children to teachers, we have the space to do it. As we pursue those objectives that have been outlined by the President for education, let us deal with the funding the same way we deal with funding for the international investment community.

We have on the agenda in a few weeks a bill which will call for at least $18 billion to be added to the International Monetary Fund. The American taxpayers are going to be called upon to add $18 billion to the International Monetary Fund.

Now, there are some complications about one portion of it is $3 billion and the other portion is $15 billion; it is not really going to affect the budget, and it is not really an aid program, it is a loan program, and we only contribute to it and other nations contribute; there is a whole lot of malarkey which seems to hide the fact that it is money out of the Treasury, out of the coffers, which could be going to some other purpose, and it goes into the International Monetary Fund.

We are the biggest contributor there. Some people say we are approaching a point where almost 50 percent of the funds in the International Monetary Fund will be funds from the taxpayers of this country.

□ 2045

So we are going to have that bill on the floor. We have a bill tomorrow on the floor related to Africa, the African Growth and Opportunity bill, which I think is related to the discussion, too.

We are going to have, I hope, later on a bill related to the Caribbean Basin Initiative NAFTA Parity, how we deal with trade with the poor, sparsely populated countries of the Caribbean: These are all related.