Democrats and the Republicans have finally found something that they agree on up there in Washington.

And so the reality is, Mr. Speaker, we are often painted, Democrats and Republicans, as fighting things over. I will say this, that I believe philosophically so often that my side is right, as my good friends on the Democrat side believe their side is right. But what probably a less than complete world it would be if one side always won.

I think that if the Chicago Bulls keep on winning the National Basketball Championships, people are going to get tired of watching basketball. I am real proud of the Atlanta Braves, as I know the folks in New York City are proud of the New York City Yankees. If every year it boils down to the Braves versus Yankees, this year it may be San Diego versus Cleveland, people would get tired of watching baseball all the time.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, you cannot always have it the Republicans win; you cannot always have it that the Democrats win. We do need to cooperate. We do need to get some things accomplished, but at the same time, I do not think either side needs to apologize for what they believe in.

I am very proud of what this Congress has accomplished under Republican leadership. We have the first balanced budget since 1969, 1969, when Neil Armstrong was walking on the moon and the Mod Squad was on TV. We have reformed, protected and saved Medicare which a mere 3 years ago was on the road to bankruptcy. Now Medicare, on a bipartisan basis, has been reformed.

This Congress, under Republican leadership, has passed the first tax cuts in 16 years. We have passed IRS reform. This year we pushed for some more tax cuts. We have pushed for ending the marriage tax penalty. And my chart over here, Mr. Speaker, shows you some actual people, some real people who will directly benefit from marriage tax penalty relief. We have Kris Hanson in Nyssa, Oregon; William Johnson, Reno, Nevada; Larry Bergman in Tracy, California; Tom Smith from Columbus, Ohio, and the names go on and on and on, as millions of Americans would benefit from paying less taxes and avoiding paying higher taxes simply because they are married.

How big is this tax cut? We keep hearing the tax cut is huge, but of our $9.6 trillion estimated expenditure over the next 5 years, the tax cut is a mere $80 billion. It is a slither of a slither, Mr. Speaker, as you can tell from this chart. It really has been exaggerated. So that people can see it, it is just a mere slice. If this was a pie, I can promise you, you are going to go away hungry.

How much is the tax cut from the surplus? It is about 10 percent. What do we do with the other 90 percent of the surplus, Mr. Speaker? We for the first time in 40 years protect Social Security. We do not take the Social Security money out of the Social Security trust fund. We build a wall on it so that that money cannot be used for roads and bridges. The first time in 40 years, 90 percent of the Social Security surplus would be protected.

What else has this Congress done? We have reformed welfare, welfare, Mr. Speaker, which was vetoed twice by the President and finally signed into law by the President. Today we have 37 percent less people on welfare rolls than we did 5 years ago. We need to continue to do that so that people become independent and that is a very important part of the American experience.

Mr. Speaker, finally let me say on education, we have a whole gamut of issues on education designed to put dollars back in the classroom and control back in local educators' hands and away from the Washington bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, is this Congress making progress? Yes, it is. Is it everything the Republicans wanted? No. Is it everything the Democrats wanted? No. But is America being served by the dynamic of the two-party system? I would say that it is, and we should continue working for these very important reforms.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about why it is that we are still here in Washington, why many of my colleagues are not back in their States campaigning for an election that is very near at hand.

I think we need to realize how important is the struggle that is going on in this city right now as it relates to a very important issue for so many senior citizens in America. That is Social Security.

About two weeks ago we had a huge fight out here about whether or not it was all right to use the Social Security surplus for tax cuts. And in the end that fight was decided, no, it is not okay to use Social Security money for tax cuts. That is not okay.

Tonight we are out here, and many of us have come back specifically for this reason, because there are so many people out here right now that want to take that Social Security surplus money and use it for new government spending. There are specific proposals, one, $14 billion to fund the IMF. Another one, let us rebuild embassies with the Social Security money. Another one, let us help Korean flood victims with the Social Security money. I am not here to debate the merits of the IMF or even the merits of building the embassies or helping the flood victims in Korea, but what I am here to suggest is that if this government sees fit that these are the top priorities, then it is necessary that we eliminate some other sort of government spending so that we can afford to fund these top priorities. Because what is wrong is going into the Social Security trust fund and taking the Social Security money out to fund these new Washington spending programs. That is wrong.

If the government sees these as the top priority items, then the government needs to find less important items and get rid of them so that we are not in essence stealing the Social Security money to fund new government spending.

Another program that we are hearing a lot about in the news right now is education. There is a proposal from the President to increase funding for education. I got a call from a constituent. That is the other reason I came over here tonight. I had a discussion with a constituent this evening. She said, Mark, what exactly do you say when the President calls for more funding for education for 100,000 new teachers and building new schools? What do you say back to the President?

I said, I support having smaller class sizes and more teachers and newer school buildings, too. I think it is absolutely essential that we have smaller class sizes and newer school buildings. But the question that needs to be answered is not whether or not we should have smaller class sizes but who is going to control where those dollars are going to, who is going to decide where those new teachers go?

Should it be us out here in Washington? Is there something that makes us powerful or more knowledgeable than parents and teachers and communities? What exactly is it that would lead us to believe that we are better stewards of that money than the parents and the teachers and the folks in the local community who can then make decisions how to best spend that money and where to best put those new teachers. The debate is not about whether we should have more spending for education. The debate instead is about who should decide where those dollars are going to be spent.

One more thing, when we talk about the government collecting tax dollars out of working people's pockets, getting them in Washington and then the government, the Federal Government out here in Washington deciding where we are going to put 100,000 new teachers and where we are going to decide that it is all right to build new school buildings, when we collect that money out of the taxpayers' pockets, 40 cents goes to the bureaucracy before any money gets out to hire new teachers or before any money gets out to build new schools. That is wrong. That is what is wrong with the whole concept.

If we want to direct more of the Federal tax dollars to schools and to education, that is good. I have no problem with that at all. As a matter of fact, I think that is a very high priority in our Nation. But when we are redirecting those dollars, let us empower the parents and the teachers and the communities to decide how to best spend

those dollars to better educate their children.

My experience here in Washington, I have seen absolutely nothing, absolutely nothing that would lead me to believe that the people here in Washington are better able to determine how to best educate our kids, are better somehow than the people that are there in those local communities, in the Fox Valley where I spoke to this young lady this evening. I see nothing that would indicate to me that the parents and the teachers and the school boards and the other folks there in the Fox Valley in Wisconsin are not better prepared to make decisions on education that relate to their kids than the people here in Washington, D.C.

That is what this debate is about. It is not about more money or less money for education. Education is a very high priority. There are all kinds of government waste that we can eliminate so as to redirect more dollars to education. I support that.

To the extent that we are talking about allocating more of our Federal resources to education, I support that. But I also support making sure that it is our parents that are deciding where their kids go to school, what the kids are taught and how it is taught in those schools. We need to reempower our parents to be actively involved in the education process of our kids.

We found an interesting thing happens, when the parents are actively involved in the education process of the kids, we looked at a study of thousands of teenagers, what we found is that when the parents are more actively involved in the kids education, not only does the education get better, but we find that there is a decrease in crime rates, there is a decrease in drug use, decrease in teen pregnancy. So the bottom line in this whole education debate is not should there be more Federal dollars allocated to it or less. The debate is about who should decide how those dollars can best help educate our kids.

I keep coming down to, I have just seen absolutely nothing that would indicate to me that somehow, because we are here in Washington, we know what is best for educating our kids out in Wisconsin. I just do not buy into that. I think the right answer to this is go ahead and support reprioritizing the dollars toward education, but let us make sure that our parents and our teachers and our communities and our school boards are then deciding how to best use those additional resources to best improve the quality of education for our children.

CIA IGNORED CHARGES OF CONTRA DRUG DEALING

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, well, the CIA has finally admitted it and the New York Times finally covered it. The Times ran the devastating story on Saturday, with the headline: CIA Said to Ignore Charges of Contra Drug Dealing in 80s.

In a remarkable reversal by the New York Times, the paper reported that the CIA knew about Contra drug dealing and they covered it up. The CIA let it go on for years during the height of their campaign against the Sandinista government.

Among other revelations in the article were that ''the CIA's inspector general determined that the agency 'did not inform Congress of all allegations or information it received indicating that contra-related organizations or individuals were involved in drug trafficking.' ''

The Times article continued pointing out ''[d]uring the time the ban on [Contra] funds was in effect, the CIA informed Congress only about drug charges against two other contra-related people. [T]he agency failed to tell other executive branch agencies, including the Justice Department, about drug allegations against 11 contra-related individuals or entities.''

The article continues stating ''[the Report] makes clear that the agency did little or nothing to investigate most of the drug allegations that it heard about the contra and their supporters. In all, the inspector general's report found that the CIA has received allegations of drug involvement by 58 contras or others linked to the contra program. These included 14 pilots and two others tied to the contra program's CIA-backed air transportation operations.

The Times reported that ''the report said that in at least six instances, the CIA knew about allegations regarding individuals or organizations but that knowledge did not deter it from continuing to employ them.''

Several informed sources have told me that an appendix to this Report was removed at the instruction of the Department of Justice at the last minute. This appendix is reported to have information about a CIA officer, not agent or asset, but officer, based in the Los Angeles Station, who was in charge of Contra related activities. According to these sources, this individual was associated with running drugs to South Central Los Angeles, around 1988. Let me repeat that amazing omission. The recently released CIA Report Volume II contained an appendix, which was pulled by the Department of Justice, that reported a CIA officer in the LA Station was hooked into drug running in South Central Los Angeles.

I have not seen this appendix. But the sources are very reliable and well-informed. The Department of Justice must release that appendix immediately. If the Department of Justice chooses to withhold this clearly vital information, the outrage will be servere and widespread.

We have finally seen the CIA admit to have knowingly employed drug dealers associated with the Contra movement. I look forward to a comprehensive investigation into this matter by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, now that the underlying charges have finally been admitted by the CIA.

MORE ON EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor tonight to talk about education and to first raise my disappointment with Congress being unable to provide funding for America's children in terms of education.

However, I am hearing that perhaps an agreement has been made and that there will be funding available for some of the President's initiatives that he proposed back in January in the State of the Union address.

What I have here tonight is a pamphlet that describes what matters most, Teaching for America's Future, that I provided to every Member of Congress at the top of the year. As the only Member who serves on the National Commission on Teaching in America's Future, I wanted Congress to recognize persons across this Nation, from governors to state superintendents to school superintendents, principals, educators, teachers and parents, coming together to talk about the importance of qualified teachers.

This is why we embraced this, the President's initiative on 100,000 new teachers to provide for our students. We must reform the methodology of teaching in which we have begun to do, and we must expand professional development for teachers. We can ill afford to have weakened professional development, thinking that this will make teachers more qualified.

□ 2045

Teachers need a more frequent involvement in professional development, and there needs to be a whole methodology of teaching whereby computer literacy will be part of this new methodology of teaching.

After-school programs is another phase by which we need to embrace this initiative. If we are going to divert those 3 hours of mischievous time for students who come home to empty homes, latchkey children, we will then need to have after-school programs where this will be a positive setting for our students and our children whereby they can divert from the violence that has seemed to just permeate that block of time where children are not supervised.

Smaller classrooms. We as former teachers and administrators recognize the importance of smaller classrooms, eighteen in a class, that is the best, more manageable classroom whereby students will get individualized training. We must ensure that qualified teaching and qualified learning be part of the structure of a reduced class size.

School construction. There is no way that dilapidated schools where roofs are falling, wiring is seen outside of the plastic, plaster is falling from the ceiling, there is no way that is an environment that is conducive to learning.

This Congress must make sure that the infrastructure of education become a priority just like the infrastructure in transportation became a priority in the T–21 bill. We must provide that infrastructure of education so that we