

HMO reform. Now basically these are the companies that spend millions of dollars successfully lobbying to kill any major health insurance reform a few years ago when the President put forward his plan. Well, now they are spending another \$2 million to make sure that people, that Republicans are returned to Congress who will continue to oppose HMO reform.

There is just some information here about how they are going about it, but this is a coalition and its member organizations from the health benefits coalition, and they are the ones that are essentially out there to make sure that Members are elected who are friendly to the health insurance industry and who will not be supportive of HMO reform.

But I want to say this:

This issue may be dead for this Congress, but it is not dead for the American people. This is the number one issue that Americans care about. It is the number one issue that is brought to my attention by my constituents, and I know that next year, when the new Congress begins, this issue is not going to go away, it is going to be out there as a significant issue once again. The public will be clamoring for reform because the problem is not going away. There is going to be more and more pressure, if you will, built up to do something about HMOs and to have these kind of patient protections.

So let us just rest assured we are going to be here again to deal with this, and even if Members of Congress are elected on some sort of platform because of what they owe to the insurance industry, that, you know, they cannot support this, I guarantee that the public is going to clamor for these patient protections and we are going to be back once again fighting for the patients bill of rights to make sure that it is passed in the next Congress.

CONGRESS FAILS TO ACT ON ISSUES AFFECTING OUR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Madam Speaker, first I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. PALLONE, for setting the record straight on the patients bill of rights and managed care reform. But, Madam Speaker, my desire to be a Member of the Congress of this United States comes chiefly from wanting to help create a better world for my two daughters and all children. That is why this Congress' failure to act on so many bills and issues affecting our children is so frustrating and distressing to me and mothers across this country.

We talk a great deal about child abuse and neglect as a tragic crime that it is, but is not what the leadership of this House has failed to do on

children's issues also child neglect? It is a sad indictment that the 105th Congress, even in these waning hours, still has not passed the President's education initiative to ensure that our children will have smaller classes and more teachers, safe and sound school buildings, the tools they need to be successful in life and the after-school programs that are proven to reduce juvenile crime. This Congress has also neglected the needs of working or would-be mothers and their children by failing to provide safe child care and training for those who provide it.

As we go back to our districts to ask our constituents to give us another 2 years to represent them in Congress, what will we say to those mothers who after we Democrats turned back more of the draconian measures of welfare reform began to look forward with hope for training and jobs so that they can have a better life for themselves and their children. We can only tell them that their hopes are being dashed because this Congress, under Republican leadership, has failed them by not providing the child care they need.

Madam Speaker, the 105th Congress by not passing a real patients bill of rights has also failed to provide mothers with the security of knowing that when our children are sick or injured needed care will be there, that their doctors will be able to refer them to the specialists required or be able to make the necessary decisions to bring them back to good health.

In my own District of the Virgin Islands and the other territories the issue of health care in children care and children comes together at its worst. It would be a travesty, Madam Speaker, if we were to adjourn continuing to shortchange the children who live in the offshore areas of the United States by not giving them equitable funding under the children's health insurance program.

We must not go home at the end of this week leaving American children in the territories without health care coverage, especially when Medicaid in the territory is capped at levels that lock many outside of Medicaid's doors as well. Madam Speaker, it is un-American for any citizen to be treated unfairly or excluded from these basic programs because of where they live.

Dr. Marian Wright Edelman reminds us that service is the rent we pay for being here on earth. Unfortunately my colleagues on the other side have not been serving our children because of their failure to bring these bills to the floor, so they have not been paying their rent for being in this Congress, and the voters of this country will send them an eviction notice on November 3.

I call on all of my colleagues to start paying our rent by insuring that children have adequate child care, Head Start and after school care, that they are protected from those who would neglect and abuse them, that the care is put back into health care and that

their schools return to be the centers of learning and safe haven that they once were and that all America's children are treated fairly.

THE VALUES OF CONGRESS ARE POISON TO THE SENSIBILITIES OF THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Madam Speaker, the impasse between the Congress and the President has now held this great body in session 5 days beyond our planned adjournment date. The principle disagreement is a typical one of whether this Nation will redistribute greater portions of the taxpayers' wealth or devote it to debt relief and the people themselves. Our failure to resolve these matters has delayed us from returning to our home States, to our constituents, and most of all to our families.

A few days ago, I came to this floor and addressed the House on my thoughts about the public morals and of the Nation's character. I directed that address at my three daughters, and tonight I intend to express to the House my thoughts about my son, Justin, who is 9 years old and wondering, I am sure, why his dad has been gone so long. He knows, I think, the importance of the Nation's business in Congress, and he knows I would not remain away for trivial reasons.

Madam Speaker, it is significant that a major or portion of today's debate involves the issue of public education. I believe the Republican agenda is the proper one, to send more education authority to the States, to local schools and to every family. Our opponents have the opposite idea. Theirs is to expand the scope of the Federal Government in this important area, to federalize various aspects of a traditionally decentralized system.

Now their plan is to grow the size of the Federal Government at the expense of State and local autonomy and liberty, and I raise this issue, Madam Speaker, because the debate coincides with one of the most historic decisions this Congress must resolve, and that is the matter of impeachment of the same chief executive who would be charged with commanding the education authority in question.

Education is about values. Public education is about public values. And the education of America's children is about the future of human civilization and life on the entire planet.

As a father of four children, three of whom attend public schools, I will tell you this:

The last thing we should do is give the bureaucracy in this city more power to manipulate the Nation's local schools. The values of Washington, D.C., are poison to the sensibilities of the Nation. There is no one, no one at

the White House whom I would trust to shape the academic structure of our schools, much less convey the moral precepts of our Declaration or shape the character of our children. In fact, our purpose here in this Congress should be just the opposite.

The values of America are strong. Our moral purpose has been defined by 222 years of glorious history as a mighty Nation based on simple precepts, that we are governed by basic truths, self-evident ones at that.

Our purpose, Madam Speaker, should be to apply the values of America to this city, not the other way around. The voices of decent Americans should be heard over and above the petty partisanship and unruly law-breakers of this capital.

For the truly patriotic Members of Congress, I know that this is why you are here at this very moment in time. Your courage is an inspiration because through you the decency of the American people speaks, and I want my son, Justin, to know that the innocence of a little boy is the hope for America, and he is the reason I am here.

So, as we debate whether to export the values of Washington, D.C., to Colorado and every other State, I want to make a case for the young boys and girls all over America, that they may be raised up in spite of this terrible folly that has transpired over the past several months just at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Madam Speaker, my message to my son is as follows:

Justin, how confusing it must be to grow up at a time when public behavior differs so much from what you know to be good, honorable and right. There are things I want you to know and remember forever. America is the greatest Nation on earth because it is a Nation under God, and we have come so far as a people because throughout our history great men and great women have looked to the Almighty for direction in making all the decisions that have affected you and me to this very day.

And I believe with all my heart that he has blessed America. America is not great because of Congress. It is not great because of the Supreme Court, or the Constitution, or the Declaration of Independence, or because of the presidency; not because of our military might, our natural resources or our prospering economy. No, America is great because common people with big dreams and caring hearts have maintained the faith that there is something bigger and more noble to pursue. America is great because of you and your sisters, little boys and girls just like you. You are the messengers that we will send into another time. And what message will you carry, what message will you carry with you when you one day lead as all American citizens lead?

As your father, I do not want you to lose hope because of the disgrace of certain leaders, I do not want you to be confused about what is good and whole-

some or why America is great or what it will take to keep this shining Nation glowing bright. America needs great men and women now more than ever, and America will need them always.

Now I have had the privilege to meet so many, many great men and women and know them well, and our history is replete with many more. My hope for you has always been that you might one day be called by your peers a great man.

One of my favorite presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, he once said and I quote, the best boys I know, the best men I know, are good at their studies or their business, fearless and stalwart, hated and feared by all that is wicked and depraved, incapable of submitting to wrongdoing and equally incapable of being not odd, but tender to the weak and the helpless.

These are the words I was taught as a boy. The rules which govern the behavior of truly great men are the same in the office as in the home. In the heart and in every action there is no separation.

Now some will say that it is perfectly okay to be immoral in one's private life or so long as one's public life is respectable.

□ 1900

They say a decent man need only be good in the eyes of others, not good in his heart or good when no one is looking. They say it is okay to tell some lies, as long as one tells some truths.

An honest man need not be totally honest, in their estimation. One need not be faithful or loyal, just likeable. One can be selfish to strangers, so long as one is generous to friends; can be cruel to adversaries, if he is kind to supporters. They believe that there can be victimless crimes. They believe the end justifies the means. They say they are sorry, but do not stop doing what they are doing.

In all these things they are wrong. I submit that what matters most is what is in a person's heart. Good people do what is right, even when it would be easier to do wrong. They do what is right when no one is looking.

People who are worthy of our respect hold themselves to high moral standards in every area of their lives. When the camera is not rolling and they are behind closed doors, good people are faithful. Good people are kind to everyone, not just their friends. They know that wrong actions always hurt someone. They know that wrong deeds diminish the doer as well.

There is no honor in a victory if someone cheats. How one accomplishes something is as important as what is accomplished. When good people make a mistake, they tell the truth. They recognize that people have been hurt by their actions and they apologize. They do not continue doing wrong. They are willing to submit themselves to authority. In the words of Teddy Roosevelt, these are the best men.

Some question the need for honor and integrity and truth and leadership.

They seem to think that the ability to wield power is sufficient. Character does not count, they claim; results are the only measure, they say.

Justin, just imagine if this were true for sports. People who are caught cheating would still get trophies and medals. When cheating is allowed, victory is meaningless. How one plays the game is as important as winning.

I think Teddy Roosevelt would have agreed that great men must first be good men. There cannot be effective leadership without honor and integrity. In fact, a man of integrity and honor provides leadership wherever he goes. In his home, in his office, in school, in his church, in his circle of friends, he is an example to others.

President Roosevelt was considered by many to be a great man, and, for the most part, our Nation has been led by great men.

Justin, the news of recent months have revealed stories about the behavior of a man who is very different. The television, the newspapers, Hollywood, these institutions might even persuade a young boy that this kind of behavior is somewhat normal, understandable, maybe even excusable. Young boys today are led to believe that everyone does these kinds of things.

Justin, no, they do not. No, they do not.

The kinds of things you have heard about and about which little boys giggle during recess are not normal. The example of the White House is not the way we live at our House, and, if I accomplish nothing else in Congress, I hope to successfully impress upon you this point. In that I would be most pleased.

You are my highest responsibility. I thank God every day for you, that he has allowed me to raise you in America.

Just a few hours ago somebody out in the hallways behind the Congress gave me some advice and asked me to pass it along to you, and it is good advice. It is good advice for all young boys in America.

I might say for any of my colleagues who are interested in acquiring this document, just please call my office, and I will be happy to pass it along or refer you directly to the source.

Number one, when people say marriage vows do not matter, you must honor marriage. Americans have always believed that marriage vows matter.

Number two, treat women and girls with dignity and respect.

Number three, character does matter. One of the most damaging aspects of the scandal is the idea that character in our leaders does not matter, so long as we are prosperous and at peace. That cannot be true. When you think throughout the history of America, all of the great moments in our existence, we do not remember the great heroes in our history because of some economic plan that they devised, because of some road they built or bridge they

constructed or some war that they won or some budget that they crafted. Take a walk around Washington, D.C. Those individuals who are enshrined in brass and marble are enshrined because they were men of character and women of integrity. That is what we remember. That is what makes America great. Character does matter.

Number four, honesty is the best policy. Lying is unacceptable.

Number five, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, is the code of justice.

Number six, take responsibility for your actions. Do not blame others if you are caught doing something wrong. Today we see numerous examples of people in public life who blame others for their wrongdoing. Do not do it.

Number seven, take responsibility, and that means accepting consequences. The higher your position, the greater your obligation to observe the law.

Number nine, because we are all imperfect, we must submit to the rule of law.

Number ten, put principle first.

Those are important words to live by. I hope you will never forget them.

Your mother and I have done everything we possibly can to give you these words of wisdom and occasions for guidance, so that you will not be distracted or discouraged when you see the kinds of examples that have been exhibited in the highest offices in the land.

Here is what other officeholders and famous Americans have said about character and how it does count.

Samuel Adams said, "It is not possible that any state should long remain free where virtue is not supremely honored."

Our first president, George Washington asked, "Can it be that providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a Nation with its virtue?"

John Adams said, "Public virtue cannot exist in a Nation without private, and public virtue is the only foundation of a republic."

Abigail Adams said, "Above all things, support a virtuous character."

Thomas Jefferson said, "Never suppose that in any possible situation or under any circumstances that it is best for you to do a dishonorable thing, however slightly so it may appear to you."

James Madison said, "But I go on this great republic in principle, that the people will have virtue and intelligence to select men of virtue and wisdom."

Frederick Douglas said, "The life of the Nation is secure only while the Nation is honest, truthful and virtuous."

And the Bible, Proverbs, says, "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; and when the wicked rule, the people mourn."

Honor and integrity does matter. Honor and integrity matters always. The rest of the world looks to the United States of America for leader-

ship and guidance for precisely that reason. They know that the Declaration of Independence was something that brave men and women shed blood over, that the principles are self-evident truths, that we are all created equal, endowed with unalienable rights, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And to that declaration and to that concept, our settlers, our forefathers, those who led the westward expansion, carried with them a vision for all Americans that we will in our moments of truth stand for those same principles and stand up for the Declaration of Independence and continue on that great revolution that they started 222 years ago this year.

They said at the end, "And in support of this declaration with a firm reliance upon the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to ourselves and each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

Honor does matter. It is what launched a country, it is what preserves us today. And it is how we should live, at home, at work, at school, and in the White House.

There is more great advice for us to live by, and I want to finish with this.

We all have gifts that differ according to the Grace given to us: Prophecy in proportion to faith; ministry in ministering; the teacher in teaching; the exhorter in exhortation; the giver in generosity; the leader in diligence; the compassion in cheerfulness. Let love be genuine. Hate what is evil. Hold fast to what is good. Love one another with mutual affection, outdo one another in showing honor. Do not lag in zeal, be ardent in spirit, serve the Lord, rejoice in hope, be patient in suffering, persevere in prayer, contribute to the needs of the saints, extend hospitality to strangers. Bless those who persecute you, bless and do not curse them. Rejoice with those who rejoice. Weep with those who weep. Live in harmony with one another. Do not be haughty, but associate with the lowly. Do not claim to be wiser than you are. Do not repay any one evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all. If it is possible as far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all. Never avenge yourselves, but leave room for the wrath of God, for it is written, vengeance is Mine. I will repay, says the Lord.

No, if your enemies are hungry, feed them. If they are thirsty, give them something to drink. For by doing this you will heap burning coals on their heads. Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

Madam Speaker, my son really is, and my three other daughters, are the most important things in my life. My wife and I work very, very hard to raise up a family where these children are given the guidance that we have been given.

These children really are the messengers that we send into a distant time, and it is important that they understand that these dark days that we

are enduring presently here in Congress in dealing with an unfortunate question which we must resolve can be just a temporary occasion from which this Nation can emerge even greater. That is my hope and my prayer. It is my message to my son Justin, and in a second I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Madam Speaker, earlier today our negotiators with the White House had been engaged, with the Senate, with the White House negotiators and others in trying to craft an appropriations bill to pay for the government. The longer we stay here in Washington talking, the more expensive it seems to get.

This Congress agreed earlier on in the year that we would work hard toward a balanced budget, and it was fairly exciting, I would say, for most people throughout the country, certainly my constituents back home in Colorado, when the numbers began to come in showing we have achieved those objectives, that we balanced the budget as a Republican Congress, in fact four years ahead of when we promised originally in the last election season. The budget we promised to balance in the year 2002 is in fact balanced this year in 1998.

The President of the United States has even gone to the point of heralding a budget surplus and devising plans on how to divvy up that surplus and how to spend it, and that really is what stalls us here in Congress now. Five days ago we would have adjourned, were it not for the President wishing to break his faith with that earlier budget agreement. Setting the surplus aside for additional spending is something that the Republican Congress is really not interested in, yet that is what the President is insisting upon as we stay here to negotiate with him.

We managed to pass the first tax cuts in 16 years, capital gains tax cuts that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board Alan Greenspan says is driving the most prosperous economy in the world today. In fact when he testified just at the other end of the Capitol before the Senate Finance Committee approximately one month ago, Chairman Greenspan said what is driving economic prosperity in America is capital gains, that the capital gains tax reduction has allowed for trillions of dollars in private capital to be available to be reinvested in the economy.

□ 1915

What that means, Madam Speaker, is that private risk-takers, families, farmers, business owners, small business owners as well as large, are taking the risks and making the investments to create jobs, to create wealth, to circulate and recycle that private capital in the economy over and over and over again in a way that has driven up consumer confidence, that has driven up investors' confidence, that has driven up every single indicator, or most indicators, in the American economy.

By lowering taxes, the capital gains tax, in this example, we have lowered the effective rate on the American people, but at the same time driven up the tax revenues collected by the Federal Government, because we generated an economy based on growth. By taxing the growth in the economy more often, more frequently, at a lower rate, we have managed to make for an occasion when the budget balances earlier than we had thought.

We also cut the inheritance taxes or the death tax. We have gone back for more, when it comes to death tax cuts, just recently. The farmers and ranchers throughout the eastern plains of Colorado tell me that is a critical tax. It is one that suppresses the farm economy, and they say that we have unleashed, to some extent, economic productivity in farm country by lowering the capital gains tax rates.

As many of these farmers and ranchers approach retirement age, they are looking for ways to hand the farm over to their children. It becomes prohibitive, as a result of the capital gains tax, to hand the farm over to the families presently, but establishing an estate structure to allow for the farm to be passed on to descendants in the event the current owner passes on or dies is the way most farms are actually broken up today. They are broken up because upward of 50 percent of the value of the asset, the farm, has to be given to the government. The family has to go visit the undertaker and the IRS tax agent on the same day, selling off equipment, selling off quarters of the farms. It makes for an economic entity that often just cannot survive economically.

Mr. Speaker, the inheritance tax is a devastating tax to America's farmers and ranchers. I would hope that we will be able to continue to press forward, not only with providing some relief for the inheritance taxes, but also reducing the demand on the other end, by shrinking the size of the Federal budget, slowing the rate of growth in Federal spending, so that the demand for onerous tax revenues can be diminished; so we can abolish the inheritance tax, for example, the death tax.

Imagine that, getting rid of the death tax. That is our goal on the Republican side. That is what is at stake in these debates that are taking place downstairs and tomorrow on trying to achieve some kind of compromise on this appropriations agreement.

Madam Speaker, our plan also called for a \$500 per child tax credit, in our belief that families are important and essential as the most central social unit in American society. We believe that finding ways to relieve the burdens on families is important, and we will continue to press for those, to make it easier to send our children to college, to save money for their health care, to put money aside for their college education, to put money aside for the things that any family believes to be important for their children.

We have also made, in this particular appropriations agreement that we are fighting for today, a number of significant steps to try to free up local schools, so that we can educate the children of America better.

There are two differences of opinion, certainly, here on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Democrats, their plan calls for hiring more government bureaucrats, growing the size of the United States Department of Education, tying more strings and red tape to the dollars that leave Washington, D.C. and go back home to the districts, to the people who worked hard to raise the money to send it here in the first place, so the bureaucrats could play games before they send it back, and generally to expand the authority and influence of Washington, D.C. over and above our local schools and our local communities.

We are for local control of education. The President insists that beltway bureaucrats, not teachers, parents, and local school districts, control education policy, including even deciding what type of teachers the District needs. I think that is ridiculous.

Our idea is pro-liberty, pro-freedom. We talk about the liberty to learn and the freedom to teach, cutting the red tape, cutting the strings, cutting the rules, cutting the bureaucracy that this city likes to attach to our city back home, so that teachers can do their jobs as they know best how to do, so that administrators can lead their schools in the directions that mirror the values and the priorities of their communities, so that school board members can make the kinds of decisions that they were in fact elected to do without the unfortunate and unnecessary intrusion of bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

We passed the Dollars to the Classroom bill, Madam Speaker. The Dollars to the Classroom bill was the legislation that insisted that 95 percent of every dollar that Washington currently spends on education actually makes it to a classroom.

The only opposition we had was from the other party, the Democrats. When it comes to distributing the Federal government's money, in the classroom or in Washington, the Republicans chose the classroom. The Democrats chose Washington.

We are also fighting for a strengthened military. The President has allowed our defense budget to shrink to dangerous levels while he expands our commitments overseas. Our soldiers, our troops, our sailors and airmen, are overseas engaged in police actions of various sorts, without clear direction from their Commander in Chief, without clear guidance as to the nature of their mission, in many cases without being on one side or the other, just standing in between warring parties, trying to resolve civil wars where America's interests are not all that clear, yet at the same time ignoring troubled hot spots around the world

where America's interests are very apparent.

It is unfortunate when we lack the kind of leadership that the chief executive ought to be able to provide, and that most chief executives over our history have been able to provide, and do so in a way when our troops are underfunded, when they do not have the support and the backup and the equipment necessary to do the job and do it right, and walk into any situation confident, knowing that they will never lose.

That is what America ought to represent overseas. That is what our military strength ought to show. That is what every soldier who wears the flag ought to be able to convey, because they are Americans and they matter to us.

Protecting our budget surplus is something that we believe in. The President wants to spend that surplus on more Washington bureaucracies, and even stopped the middle-income tax relief to accomplish that goal. When it comes to winning the war on drugs under President Clinton, teenage drug abuse has soared. His administration would even allow free needles for heroin users and other drug addicts. We are committed to reversing that trend, stopping the needle exchange and winning the war on drugs.

We stopped the President's \$130 billion in tax and fee increases. It is not enough for President Clinton to spend the Federal budget surplus. Remember, his budget called for \$130 billion in tax and fee increases to finance his bigger government, taxes on middle-income families, retirees, those who save, and job-creating businesses.

We are working hard to stop the President's \$150 million in new spending. The President's budget asks for 85 new Washington spending programs, including 39 new or expanded entitlements. The entitlement spending alone accounted for nearly \$53 billion for 5 years.

Do Members realize that when we cut taxes last year and relieved the tax burden on the American people, the American people became more productive? They invested more wisely and they worked harder. When consumer confidence went up, people consumed more, they invested more, they spent more. Private capital was recirculated through the economy at greater frequency. We taxed it more at a lower rate, we generated more revenue to the Federal budget and for the Federal Government than even our best economists had predicted.

What we proved last year, and again this year, is that President Reagan was right, that we can cut taxes and balance the budget quicker, improve the economy faster, in a way that allows us to save social security and pay down the debt even quicker. We believe that to be true. The Members are showing that we are right.

Really is what is at stake is whether we are going to allow this president

today to put the brakes on robust economic growth by passing a bigger budget than the country needs, by passing greater spending than the country has to have, and by further delaying the reductions in tax cuts, reductions and tax cuts that the American people so richly deserve.

We know that is a winning strategy on our part. We know it is a strategy that the American people want. We are willing to stay here as long as it takes to see that prudence prevails in these negotiations that are taking place downstairs.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I think it is real important for us to just have a good balance between reducing spending and trying to fund necessary programs.

This Congress has done a great job towards balancing and protecting and preserving Medicare, protecting and preserving social security, and reforming welfare, and providing, as the gentleman has stated, the first tax cut in 16 years.

I still think the American people are overtaxed. We have to be very, very careful with how we spend the money that we get from the hardworking American people. On the same hand we are going to continue to push for these things, even if we do not get the full load this year.

I think it is very important for us to stay at the table, get the job done, make sure that education is run as much as possible on the local level, not out of Washington bureaucracies, not out of State capital bureaucracies.

We have stood strong for lowering the teacher-to-student ratio. We want more teachers in the classroom, but we do not want those teachers to work for Washington, we want the teachers to work for the local school board. We want the local school board to be able to make the decisions.

It is similar to the COPS program, the community police officers on the street. In my area in Statesboro, Georgia, they have utilized COPS grants to put police substations in different housing developments, in high-risk crime areas. What has happened as a result of that is crime has gone down in this crime-infested area, and the little children are looking up to policemen. They are making friends with the policemen. Instead of running from policemen and seeing them as an enemy, they see them as a good citizen, and, if you will, a father figure, in many cases. It has been very positive.

The reason why that COPS program I think has worked in Statesboro, Georgia, is because they do not rely on Washington to tell them how to spend the money or where to spend the money and when to spend the money. We want to do the same with education.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. The history of the country since the

mid or late seventies has been to grow the size of Washington's bureaucracy when it comes to education. The Department of Education was created during the Carter administration. It has consistently grown and grown and grown.

The percentage of Federal funds or Federal involvement in our local neighborhood schools has grown dramatically, and I know the impact in my community back in Colorado has not been positive by the Federal Government's manipulative efforts here out of Washington.

I am curious as to what the impact of the growing Federal bureaucracy has had on the schools in the gentleman's local neighborhoods and local schools back in Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me tell the gentleman, I will give three examples. A teacher in Saint Mary's, Georgia, told me that she had just returned from Athens, Georgia, where she went to a seminar where they taught teachers from all over the State how to behave around students.

□ 1930

What they meant by that is one has to be careful to never be alone with a student because they might do something to the student. They should never go to a bathroom or a gym locker room alone with a student.

These are prudent things, but then they went on to say one should not ever hug a student and one should avoid being with a student after class hours. Now think about that for those who may be a little slow on algebra, need to hear the grammar for a second time in order to get it. I had to often go back after class and talk to the teachers. They are telling these teachers not to do that.

The worst part is she told me they were told not to hug the students, and she said I live in an area where we have a lot of young families, a lot of military families, dads are away, on ships in the Navy a long time. Some of these kids are actually from a broken home. They need a hug a lot more than they need an A.

She went at taxpayers' expense to hear from the bureaucrats at the State Department of Education, who heard from the bureaucrats in the Washington Department of Education, do not hug your children down in Saint Marys, Georgia. I think this teacher was capable of making her own decisions. A teacher in Darien, Georgia, I asked her how much paperwork she has to do each day beyond grading papers in the normal paperwork that comes with being a teacher and she said she spends about 30 minutes a day; 30 minutes a day. That is 2 to 3 hours a week filling out forms of statistics, often which are meaningless to the bureaucrats in Atlanta, who send them to the bureaucrats in Washington.

What we are trying to do, and I think this budget agreement is moving in that direction, is to give more power to the local teachers.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to show him some of the education components that we have passed in this Congress this year, which we are trying to get, and I think we are going to be successful in getting a lot of these in the budget, the Higher Education Act, the A-Plus Savings Account Act. Now unfortunately that was vetoed. \$500 million more for special education. The students in special education have particular needs that are not always met by the normal funding process.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. This is one of the most important points, I think, in the Republican accomplishments for education. The special education program, and the funding for special education, is a matter of civil rights. The Supreme Court has determined that the Congress has now a legal obligation to really look out for the children who are of special needs, that they deserve the kind of education, the highest quality of education possible, to live the American dream as all students would.

Yet, when the special education programs were created, this Congress, under Democrat leadership, has consistently eroded the funding for the program. So here again, we have a liberal model of government bureaucracy that establishes the rules and slowly drains away the funding that you need to comply with those rules.

Today we have many, many school districts, in fact every school district throughout the country is trying to deal with the red tape, the rules, the regulations, which are fine. Some of these rules make sense and they lead to noble and worthwhile purposes and we need them, but these schools also need the funding necessary in order to meet this mandate from the Federal Government.

This is a huge, unfunded mandate, and one that we are committed to resolving. By placing an additional \$500 million in this particular line item, we have dramatically increased the percentage of Federal funding for special education students.

This is a point of contention between the White House and the Congress. In fact, the President opposes our efforts to increase special education funding in this appropriations bill. He would rather take that \$500 million and spend it on a free needle exchange program, spend it on other kinds of ridiculous programs that are a high priority over at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, not up at this end of the street.

We are committed here. This is why these negotiations are carrying on as long as they are, because we are committed to funding this program for special education students to a much higher and greater degree than we have been able to do in past years. It is a real remarkable turnaround for the American people.

I know when I hear from school board members, administrators and teachers from back home, they really have their

eye on this particular line item. They are really hoping that the Republicans win out on this debate, that we are able to beat the President on this particular topic because they know the children back home who have special needs, who need additional funding, who need this particular line item, who are protected under the civil rights laws of our country now, and this is the one of the few legitimate areas of Federal funding that this Congress is constitutionally bound to deliver as determined by the Supreme Court.

Mr. KINGSTON. A number of parts of this are so important, teacher testing for teacher competency, Reading Excellency Act, high job skills training. One item I wanted to talk about, though, school nutrition, now I am on the Committee on Agriculture and my friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) also was formerly on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. We work hard to protect school nutrition, to make sure that our children have a good balanced meal, and it is not just lunch.

They often need to have a breakfast program, because the only warm meal that they get is at the school. So we want it to be a good meal. We want to make sure that the food is safe. We want to make sure that the food is nutritious and that it is quality. We do not want a situation where some broker is coming in there with some special deal to pawn off on American school children some third grade beef.

So we have worked hard to make sure that our children are served consistently good quality meals. We think that is going to make also a better education product, but these are things that Republicans and Democrats can and do agree on, and we move in the right direction of it with this budget agreement because we believe there is so much that we do agree on, and unfortunately so on in the negotiating process we go at it like it is the World Series and there is only one team that can win.

We have a vision that is different of government than the Democrats. Yet, when you put the two visions together, as we often will in a budget agreement, America wins; not Democrats, not Republicans, not the White House, not Congress but America. That is what these negotiations are all about.

One of the things that I do want to talk to the gentleman about a little further is the level of reduction in government spending, how we are moving in a direction where we are bringing down the level of government spending and we think that it is very important to bring that level down consistently because the smaller the growth of government, the bigger the growth of the private sector, and that is where jobs are created. That is where the budget actually gets balanced and that is where more quality goods and services get to people.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Remember just last year, during the State of the Union address, the President stood right behind where the gentleman is standing right now by just a few feet, stood here and announced to all of us assembled in this Chamber and also to the country that the era of big government was now over; signaling that he was now going to join hands with the Republican Congress and fight for a balanced budget, to fight for reduced spending, to keep us on that trend line that the Republicans had established as a long-term goal for the Nation.

I think that the Republican Party has done a good job and the Republicans here in Congress have done a good job conveying the message to the country, and persuading the country that less spending is better; that more savings at home through tax relief and through smarter investments and a stronger economy is more liberating, provides more freedom for the American people and they have really sent us all a message, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we need to start doing some more belt tightening, that there is still a lot of fat in government, that we are still funding programs that we do not need. Yet, when the President came over just last week and said, wait a minute, this plan we had all agreed on up to this point of balancing the budget, of trying to set money aside for Social Security, for other important purposes, is something that he does not agree with anymore. Heading into an election, just a month out from the election, he has gone back to his old ways and his friends over on the Democrat side, they are just joining him almost instinctively because now they are back talking their old language again, spend more money, spend more money, delay tax cuts, do not talk about paying down the national debt; do not talk about rescuing Social Security; do not talk about Medicare. Let us spend money right now while we have got it in our hands. That is the way they won elections year after year after year.

I am just curious as to the gentleman's opinion. I do not think it is going to work this year. Does the gentleman think it is going to be a successful formula for liberal victories around the country? Do the American people really want to see this Congress spend more money?

Mr. KINGSTON. I believe that the American people are interested in less government overall. They had more control over their lives and more control on a local level. If a local city wants to do something, provide a service, and then they want it in Colorado but they might not want it in Georgia, people want that decision to be made in Colorado and in Georgia, not in Washington. Unfortunately, as the government grows, it is all up to some unnamed, faceless Washington bureaucracy to say this is what is good for the people of Georgia and Colorado

and all of the States east and west of them.

There are not that many States east of Georgia right now, but the way the government is expanding they might put a few people out there on pontoons or something. One has to be careful with this crowd.

The reality is, though, the average hard working American, in my opinion, wakes up in the morning, scurries to get ready for work, both mom and dad, and get the children shoehorned into their clothes. In my house, and I know in the gentleman's house, we are full of children and the gentleman knows that their shoes disappear overnight. Even if they put them in a particular place, the shoes seem to walk under their own power, and somehow there is always a book, even though they have packed their backpack the night before there is a book that is missing, so somewhere in that dynamic the kids have to be dressed and organized and then fed, again, good nutritious breakfast so that they will be good learners.

Then they have to be scooted off to school to the bus station or drop them off in the car pool and then run off to work.

At work, we go back to a pile of paper or jobs that we could not complete the day before and we work real hard for that. Then we get an hour for lunch but we have to cut it off because we have some stuff to do. We are supposed to get off at 5:00, and it is kind of hard but the day care center closes at 6:00 so we have to push through, leaving some more stuff at work, to get the kids and then get home on time, maybe run by the grocery store to get something on the way.

This is the modern nineties marriage. This is the modern nineties family experience. These folks do not sit around and watch us necessarily on C-SPAN, as brilliant as we are, and they are out saying, I am spent. By the time I get the family fed, get myself unwound, get the dishes done, get the yard work finished for the day and whatever daylight is left, finish with the kids' homework and get them in bed and bathed and all the good stuff, it is over with. People do not sit down and read the paper and think about national policy.

What they do is say we voted. We expect the Members of Congress to do a good job. Republicans or Democrats, we expect them to put their party differences aside and do what is good for the country, and we want our government to work. By working, we want a budget that is balanced.

This Congress has balanced that budget for the first time since 1969 because of reductions in wasteful spending, and slowing down the growth of government. They want a Medicare system that is going to be there for them and the future, not one that is going to be imperiled year after year and fixed for election year purposes only. They want one that is solid, which this Congress has solidified on a bipartisan basis. They want a Social Security that is reliable.

We have put aside \$1.4 trillion for Social Security. For the first time in 40 years, Social Security has been protected. They want to know it is there for them. They also do not want to pay 45 to 50 percent of their income in taxes. They feel their taxes are quite adequate, and we ought to do well with the money we are already taking out of their paycheck.

That is why they are happy that this Congress has cut taxes for the first time in 16 years, and they want us to do it again because they are tired of busting their tails and having us share in it just because we have the power to do so.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. This is a point that I think many Americans are actually in tune with and understand. It takes a lot of hard work to shrink the size of this Federal Government. It takes a lot of hard work for the Congress to go do battle with those bureaucrats across the street and throughout the country to reduce the burden on taxation, to squeeze more efficiency out of the Federal Government. Every time we want to make some agency or some program do more with fewer dollars, there are a certain number of comfortable bureaucrats who are inconvenienced by that line of thinking, yet that is the way most Americans work every day.

The farmers and ranchers who live in the gentleman's district and mine, they know what it is like to squeeze an extra mile out of the tractor.

□ 1945

They know what it is like to, to put in a few more bushels in an acre by whatever way they can. Sometimes that's investing in technology or research or better seed stock or perhaps better fertilizer, what have you. But the American people understand continuous improvement. They understand continual efficiency measures. It does take hard work.

The Democrats, on the other hand, they look at balancing the budget, tax cuts, more efficiency as doing nothing. See, they measure success when they were in charge by how much money they can spend, how much of somebody else's money they can spend on the charities of their choice. Our measure is very different and I think more in tune with the American people.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the interesting part, the gentleman is talking about the farmer, is he is putting his savings back into production.

That middle class taxpayer out there often, when they have little money left over at the end of the month, and they are planning on taking a nice vacation in the summer time or adding onto their house or buying a new car, inevitably the dryer breaks or the refrigerator breaks down, or the transmission falls apart.

The money always seems to go back into the trappings of working and trying to be productive, sometimes the rat

race. I mean, they have a hard time liberating themselves from it. I think that is why it is so important for us to remember that, when we are spending money, it is not our money. It is the American people's money.

If we are walking down the street, and we find a wallet, the wallet has \$100 in it. We do not go rush out and say, okay, here is what I am going to do with \$100. We say, oh, man, a wallet. Somebody has lost \$100 how do I get it back to them? Oh, let us see, here is their address now. I am going to return this money and the wallet, and they are going to be happy, and I am going to make share day. That is what we do.

Here we have a surplus, people have overpaid, and we are saying, okay, how do we spend it. That is what I am very concerned about, that there are members of the administration who are taking this approach that, look, we have got this surplus, we are going out and obligate ourselves a new government and spending on new programs.

What we are saying is, give part of it back, put the rest of it, 90 percent, and protect it for Social Security purposes because we have never protected money for Social Security.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, let me pick up where the gentleman left off with the analogy of finding a wallet. When we get elected to Congress and we walk into the door, they give us one of these. We get a little wallet of sorts.

Inside, this is a plastic card. This is our voting card. Many people do not know how this works. There is a little computer chip inside of this one that says this is BOB SCHAFFER'S voting card from the 4th District of Colorado.

When we walk on the House floor, we put the card in the little boxes behind the chairs here, and we vote. When it comes to spending money, many of our Democrat colleagues and people over in the White House look at this voting card as some kind of a credit card, a remarkable credit card wherein we never have to pay back. We spend other people's money, and we can spend and spend and spend, and we personally never get the bill. Instead, the bill gets sent to our children.

Where we stand right now, \$5.5 trillion in debt from using this card too many times, without responsibility or accountability. To the point now, when we divide that \$5.5 trillion by every man, woman, and child in America, it comes out to a little over \$20,000 per person. That is what has been the result of using this card with reckless abandon when our Democrat opponents were in charge of this Congress.

The President downstairs is negotiating with the Congress right now, trying to see how long he can keep us here at election time, trying to see how many promises he can make for spending more money on programs that sound good at first, he is trying to persuade Members of Congress to pick up this card and spend again with reckless abandon and do it in a way that will

push any prosperity that America is enjoying now on to future generations.

We are determined to stand here and say, no, that we are not going to leave for home until we are convinced and able to stand proudly in front of our constituents and say we did our level best to continue this downward de-escalation of government spending, that we have tried to raise the amount of revenue that the Federal Government generates, not through higher taxes, but through more economic productivity. That is our promise and our message and what we are here fighting for tonight, and the reason we are here now.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention, the gentleman talked about the amount of national debt. The debt service is actually about \$2,000 per family. We pay I think it is the second largest expenditure in the budget is interest on the national debt, which runs to about \$2,000 a family, which would be half a year's college tuition. It would be a down payment on a new car, or it could be a nice vacation. So the interest on the national debt is already something we are facing.

Since the gentleman is from Colorado, and I have a mama and a sister and brother-in-law and nephew out in that great State. I also have to brag about one of my best friends two of my best friends, Ross and Paloma Fox, whose son Richard just got a full 4-year college to the University of Colorado. He is 6'10". He is going to be a Buffalo out there. I know that is not in your district. But he is a great guy.

I just want the gentleman to know, since he represents Colorado State, and I want him to know I have known Richard Fox, this 17-year-old boy, all my life. I know his brother David. They are both great kids. I know their families.

But I just want the gentleman to know that, when Richard Fox and the Colorado Buffalos go up to Colorado State in Fort Collins, I am going to be cheering for him. I want the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) to know that I hope they win, and that Colorado State can go win the national championship because they are not going to be able to beat Richard Fox and team. I just have to have this personal brag, because he is a good Georgia boy.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I sure appreciate that, and I am grateful that we are able to maintain our good friendship in spite of the disappointment the gentleman is about to suffer when that contest takes place.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I guess, in our time to close, let us just say, this Congress has worked and has balanced the budget. This Congress has worked to protect Social Security. We have worked to protect Medicare, not just for the next election, but for the next generation. We have reformed welfare. Thirty-seven percent of the people that were on it in 1994 have now gotten off of it.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, that, by the way, is about 2½ million American families which are no longer in welfare in the last 3 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. Which are very significant. That is not just measured in tax dollar savings, that is measured in people who are happy, who are independent, greater self-esteem, greater satisfaction, because they went out and found a job, and working they are working their way up the ladder.

Finally, this Congress has cut taxes for the first time in 16 years, which we believe the American people are overburdened, and they need to hold as much as their own money that they earn as possible.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for helping with the special order tonight to shine light on what has, I think, historians will record as one of the most productive Congresses in recent memory.

We have managed to balance the budget ahead of schedule. We have managed to turn the authority out of Washington and back toward the States and cut taxes for the first time in 16 years.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LEGISLATION TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1998

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 589, I hereby give notice that the following suspensions will be considered tomorrow, Thursday, October 15, 1998:

H. Res. 597, expressing the sense of the House with respect to the Brutal killing of Mr. Matthew Shepard;

H.R. 4829, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer administrative jurisdiction over land within the boundaries of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Historic Site to the Archivist of the United States;

H.R. 1467, a bill to provide for the continuance of oil and gas operations pursuant to certain existing leases in the Wayne National Forest;

H.R. 700, to remove the restriction on the distribution of certain revenues from the Mineral Springs parcel to certain members of the Agua Caliente and of Cahuilla Indians;

S. 2500, to protect the sanctity of contracts and leases entered in to by surface patent holders with respect to coalbed methane gas;

S. 2272, Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site Boundary Adjustment Act;

S. 2133, to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance;

House concurrent resolution, correction in enrollment to H.R. 3910;

H.R. 3972, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from

charging State and local government agencies for certain uses of the sand, gravel, and shell resources of the outer Continental Shelf;

S. 1132, Bandelier National Monument Administrative Improvement and Watershed Protection Act;

And H. Res. 598, Steel Import Resolution.

CLARIFICATION OF ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here this evening to clarify some of the issues that we have been working on. I was just in my office when my good friend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) were speaking.

I was working with my staff on some of the key educational issues, and I heard some of the comments. I thought, well, I better get down to that floor and clarify some of these issues.

Yesterday, I was in Maryland with the President of the United States, with leaders in the House and leaders in the Senate, and we had an opportunity to visit a school which has wonderful children, a great principal. We met the superintendent. We were there with the Governor of Maryland.

We talked to some of the teachers. We talked to the students. They are working so hard to give those children the very best education they could. Yet, I was shocked to see three or four trailers outside in which the children were learning.

This is the United States of America. This is not a Third World Nation. In a middle class community in Maryland, the children were forced to have classes in trailers because the community was not able to get school construction bond issues through their local communities.

I have worked on the issue of school modernization a long time and let me tell my colleagues why. A couple of years ago, I did a survey of the schools in the metropolitan New York region, and I was shocked.

I grew up in Bronx, New York. I raised my children in Queens. Now I live in Westchester County. So I am very interested in what is happening in the entire metropolitan region.

In this survey, it showed that one out of four, one out of four schools have children learning in classrooms that were meant to be locker rooms, meant to be bathrooms. This in the United States of America.

Two-thirds of these schools have boilers, have roofs, have other areas that have to be fixed. Around the country, there is \$112 billion worth of improvements that have to be made in these schools.

A couple years ago, CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN in the Senate and I introduced a

bill. We introduced it again with our good friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) that would do something about this problem. I do not think we should be talking about liberals, conservatives, right wing, left wing.

I am a mother. In fact, I am a grandmother. I bet Jillie is watching this program. Because we want to be sure that our youngsters, like my grandchildren, are going to go to schools that are going to give them the best education they could get.

I am shocked to think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would say only bureaucracies want to do this. Let me make it very clear what the school modernization proposal that our President is talking about and has been so forceful about, what our leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), is talking about, what TOM DASCHLE in the Senate is talking about, this is a proposal that allows local communities to make the decision. The Federal Government's role is to pay the interest on those bonds. But it is the local community that has to float the bonds.

Do my colleagues know what? My good friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about cutting taxes. What this proposal will do is help lower property taxes, because unless the Federal Government is a partner with local school districts, the local school districts will have to assume this burden.

Just a couple of weeks ago, I toured a school in my district in Westchester County. This district has about \$8 million in repairs. They cannot go out with a bond issue of \$8 million because this middle class community has so many responsibilities that it will be voted down. So they go out with bond issues of \$35,000 and \$45,000.

My colleagues and I know when we have repairs in the House, whether we are fixing a bathroom or some leaky pipes, if we go out piecemeal, we do not get as good a price as if we put it all together.

So by the Federal Government paying the interest, giving a tax credit to these bonds, and the local government going out and floating these bonds, the Federal Government is not making the decision. So all this talk about bureaucracies is kind of a joke. It is the local communities that make a difference.

My friends and all of the good people, the hardworking people who are watching us tonight have to understand that there is a real difference in views about school modernization. My colleagues, my friends on the other side of the aisle and I would love this to be a bipartisan issue, because, again, this is the United States of America. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not feel that the Federal Government should be a partner in modernizing our schools. The Democrats on this side of the aisle feel strongly, passionately that the Federal Government has