work on behalf of children and under-represented persons. She understands the ''double bind'' and dual challenges facing women of color living in a society that marginalizes people by both gender and race. Despite those obstacles, she has risen above these circumstances and has made outstanding contributions to her community, always working to uplift persons with similarly disadvantaged status.

Yvonne Bond Miller was born in Edenton, North Carolina, the oldest of 13 children. She grew up in my home district of Norfolk and attended Booker T. Washington High School in Norfolk. Dr. Miller earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Virginia State College (now Virginia State University), a Master of Arts Degree from the Teacher's College at Columbia University, and then a Doctorate from the University of Pittsburgh. She is also a recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree from Virginia State University.

She has had a distinguished career as an educator, teaching first in the Norfolk Public Schools and then at Norfolk State University from 1968 to present, where she is currently a Professor of Education. For seven years, she was the head of the Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education at Norfolk State University. In addition to teaching, Dr. Miller has had an outstanding career in public service as a legislator. She was first elected to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1983, becoming the first African American woman in that body. Her accomplishments earned her a second term in 1985, and her career in the state legislature continued when she was elected to the Virginia Senate in 1987, becoming the first African American woman in the Virginia Senate as well. Since then, she has served with a meritorious record on several committees, including the Rehabilitation and Social Services Committee, where she is the first woman to chair a Virginia Senate committee. In addition, Dr. Miller has worked steadfastly on behalf of children and the otherwise underserved on Virginia's Youth Commission and Virginia Disability Commission.

Throughout her career as a legislator, Dr. Miller has demonstrated a consistent concern for the disadvantaged. She has worked hard in promoting education and early childhood issues, maintaining a living wage, and ensuring access to affordable health care. Dr. Miller's sense of justice, generosity, and dedication to the underprivileged carries over into her personal life as well. Most notably, she has established a scholarship fund at Norfolk State University for women returning to school. Her accolades are too numerous to describe in full, but it is no wonder that she has been honored with the Vivian C. Mason Meritorious Service Award from the Hampton Roads Urban League and the Social Action Award from the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity.

So, as we honor today the contributions of American women to our nation, we must pay a special tribute to Yvonne Bond Miller for prevailing in the face of adversity as an African American woman and for working tirelessly on behalf of children and other marginalized persons so that they too may be able to contribute to their fullest potential. Women's History Month is a time to recognize and give thanks to those women who dared to brave uncharted waters so that we may all fully participate in our own society. Thank You, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Yvonne Bond Miller.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, given the fact that this is indeed Women's History Month, I would just include the names of some of the outstanding women who have served with distinction in my community, the community where I live, people like Ms. Mamie Bone, Ms. Devira Beverly, Martha Marshall, Cora Moore, Mildred Dennis, Mary Alice (Ma) Henry, Ida Mae (Ma) Fletcher, Julia Fairfax, Earline Lindsey, Nancy Jefferson, Rosie Lee Betts, Nola Bright, Dr. Claudio O'Quinn, Ms. Rachel Ridley, Artensa Randolph, Dr. Lucy Chapelle.

I would mentioned one other woman, two others, who have had tremendous impacts on my life—a woman, Mrs. Beadie King, who was the teacher in the first school that I attended which was a one-room schoolhouse where Ms. Beadie King taught eight grades plus what we call the little primer and the big primer at the same time. Many of the things that I know and learned, many of the values, many of the attributes that I think that I have developed have actually come from the teachings of Mrs. Beadie King. And so I pay tribute to her as an outstanding educator.

The other woman, Mrs. Mazie L. Davis, my mother, who probably more than any other single person contributed to my development, because it was she and my father who basically suggested to me that life has the potential of being for each one of us whatever it is that we would determine to make life.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in salute of African American women.

African American women have a unique place in the history of our country. Fighting against racial and gender discrimination, we have had to fight two battles often at odds with each other. However, many African American women have not let race and gender prevent them from fighting for equality. These women's heroic efforts have forever changed American history. Women like Harriet Tubman who helped slaves escape via her underground railroad. Without Ms. Tubman many future African American doctors, politicians, lawyers, and teachers would not be alive.

Mr. Speaker so many African American women have been a part of our history: Sojourner truth, Coretta Scott King, Ida B. Wells to name a few. Today I would like to acknowledge one of those great African American female leaders—Juanita Shanks Croft.

Dallas native Juanita Craft fought for desegregation in Dallas and all over Texas. This onetime hotel worker, use the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to fight legalized racism. She helped desegregate the University of Texas Law School, North Texas State University and the State Fair of Texas. She also helped desegregate many Dallas lunch counters, theaters and restaurants.

She worked with Christian Adair, who helped found the Houston chapter of the NAACP, to end segregation and promote African Americans. Because of their efforts, Hattie Mae White became the first black women elected to the Houston school boards in 1958. This also paved the way for the late Barbara Jordan to become the first African American woman and also the first African American since reconstruction elected to the Texas state Senate.

Ms. Craft served 25 years as the Dallas NAACP precinct chairperson. She helped found more than 100 chapters of the NAACP and helped Thurgood Marshall work on the U.S. Supreme Court case *Smith* vs. *Allwright*, which gave African Americans the right to vote in the Texas Democratic primaries in 1944. Ms. Craft was the first African-American woman to vote in Dallas and was elected to the Dallas City Council in 1975 at the age of 73.

Ms. Craft was a civil rights teacher to the young opening her home to anyone who wanted to learn about making change. Many of those young students today are teachers, lobbyists, community and civil rights activists and city officials.

Today her home in Dallas is a civil rights historic landmark where President Lyndon B. Johnson and Martin Luther King Jr. were once visitors.

I salute Juanita Craft's courage to fight for equality for African Americans. I salute her courage to teach others how to work for change. Through her legacy, we can see the battles which have been fought and can be proud of the progress our sisters have made so that we can attend any university, sit at any lunch counter, walk into any store and speak of this floor.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEMINT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight with several of my colleagues who I think will be joining me, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). I am in my fifth year as a Member of Congress from Oklahoma. I am also in my last term as a self-imposed term limit on myself.

One of the reasons I think that we only have 40 percent of the people voting in elections is that in fact there is a crisis of confidence in the Congress of the United States. I want to spend some time tonight outlining what we have heard many people say, whether it is the President in his State of the Union speech or others in terms about our budget, this so-called surplus that does not exist, explain to the American people why it does not exist and what it is really made of, and then talk about some of the facts of the last 3 or 4 years of what has gone on and what we can expect in the future if in fact we do not have honesty with the American public in terms of our budget, the budget process, and speaking honestly about where American tax dollars go.

I also might add that besides being a medical doctor who continues to practice and deliver babies on the weekends and the days that we are not in session, my original training is as an accountant. I can tell my colleagues, there is not an accountant in this country that would sign off on the books of the Federal Government. The reason is because it moves money around, it does not account for it, it uses the same money twice and then claims it as a surplus.

To start this discussion, I really want to try to explain to the American public the Social Security trust fund. Most people are paying 12.5 percent, half of it themselves, half of it by their employers, in to fund the Social Security system. At the present time, we have a significant excess number of dollars coming in above and beyond what is required to pay out benefits for our seniors under Social Security. What really happened is we are collecting more than we are spending in terms of Social Security dollars. What happens now is that the Federal Government uses the excess Social Security money to pay for more spending and to pay off publicly held debt. But as they pay off publicly held debt, they incur another debt and that is an IOU to the trust fund that says we will pay this back. That also incurs interest. The fancy way Washington talks about that is that that is a surplus. In fact it is only a surplus in that we have transferred the obligation to our children and grandchildren and they will pay that back through increased payroll taxes. So we put IOUs that are credited to the trust fund.

In 2013, we face a major problem, and that is the year in which the revenues that come into the Social Security trust fund will be less than the payments that we have to pay out. What is going to happen then? Social Security spends more than it collects. In order to pay all the Social Security benefits, Social Security is going to have to try to collect from the Federal Government on the IOUs, the money the Congress has borrowed. What happens? Having spent all the money, the Federal Government has to raise the income taxes or the payroll taxes on the people who are paying Social Security taxes just to meet the obligations.

That is borne out a little bit better when we actually see what the Social Security Administration says about what is going to happen to the fund. As you can see, all this in red is actually money coming in to Social Security in excess of what we are paying out. You will notice in 2013, we actually spend more money. But if you go out to the end of this graph, what you will see is we are getting close to $750 billion more a year in payments from general tax revenues, or increased raises in the tax paid on hourly wages in this country.

We have a terrible picture developing. I say all this because the politicians in Washington claim we have a surplus. There is no surplus. The money that they are using to pay down external debt is actually money they are going to be obligating our grandchildren for with a Treasury IOU that is interest-bearing. That money is a false surplus. All it is is the difference between what we paid out and what we have collected versus what we have spent more in other revenues that the Federal Government has taken in.

We are going to have only three options in 2013, and, better, we only have three options now to fix this problem: One, we can save 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and we can transition to a system that increases the earnings for all payments on Social Security between now and 2013 and thereafter. The annualized yield, the return on the investment on Social Security over the last 20 years, has been less than 1 percent. We would have been better to put it in a passbook savings account by 300 percent in terms of the power of compound interest. Had we done that, we would have displaced this day of reckoning where the imbalance in payments out versus revenue in would have been at least delayed another 10 to 12, maybe even 15 years, had they gotten some return.

I think the other point that needs to be made, why are we in trouble on Social Security? We are in trouble on Social Security because politicians easily spend your money without coming and saying, ''We're going to give you an increased benefit but we're not going to tell you that your children and grandchildren are going to have to pay that back.'' How do they pay that back? They pay that back by lowering their standard of living and sending more of their hard-earned dollars to Washington to pay for the benefits today that we did not have the courage to tell the American public that for this benefit, this increase in benefit, we have to pay for it.

What is easy to do in Washington, I have found in 5 years, is to pass on a benefit and not be responsible for paying for it. It is called spin. The real thing it is called is a half-truth. A half-truth, my daddy taught me, was a whole lie. We have seen a lie.

The second option we have, we can repay the money from the trust fund by raising income taxes. We are at the highest rate of taxing the American public that we have ever been with the exception of World War II. Almost 22 percent of our gross domestic product is now consumed by taxes in this country. That is not a good option.

The third option is we can change the retirement system. We can delay the onset, we can decrease the benefits. That is just like we have done to the veterans. We promise one thing and then we deliver far less. It is not a principle of integrity to do something less than what you commit to do. So we only have three options when we are faced with Social Security. I want to just develop this for about another 5 minutes and then I will recognize the gentleman from Minnesota.

Now, we hear Washington say we have a surplus, but the fact is, is every day $275 million is added to the national debt. If we have a surplus, if we have more money coming in than we are paying out, how come the debt for our children and grandchildren is rising? It is because we are not honest in our bookkeeping. We are not honest about it. In 1997, each citizen's share of the national debt was $19,898. By the end of this year, every man, woman and child from baby to grandmom will owe $20,693. You cannot have a surplus and the debt rise. The question that the American people should ask when they hear the word surplus is, ''Did the debt go down?''

There is another tricky word that the politicians use. They say publicly held debt. Because that is the debt that is external to the internal IOUs that the government has paid or made with Social Security.

□ 2145

So it is true that the external-held debt of the United States went down, but only because we took money from the Social Security Trust Fund and wrote another IOU. So the total debt in terms of the Social Security increased revenues or excess revenues have not changed at all. We have just decided we are not going to pay ourselves and we will slow down the pain to those people on the outside.

So less debt is held by the public; that is true, but the total debt is rising, and, as my colleagues can see, it is rising $275 million per day, and where I come from, $275 million is one whole heck of a lot of money. It is about enough to run the State of Oklahoma for a month. So, we are talking about huge sums of money.

Again, I would make the point Washington says we have a surplus. If we have a surplus, why is the debt that our grandchildren and children are going to have to bear rising? Why is it going up? It is because we are not honest in our bookkeeping.

Another way of looking at that, and this chart shows exactly what we have seen and heard about 1998, is what I call the politicians' surplus. Here is what we claim was a surplus, the Washington establishment. But, as my colleagues will note, here is the debt in

1997. What has happened to the debt? The debt went from $5,325 trillion to close to $5,440 trillion, almost a $120 billion increase. So, if the surplus was 60 some billion dollars, how come the debt went up $120 billion?

Look what is projected in 1999. We are going to have this great big surplus that everybody wants to save or spend in a certain way. But look what the debt projection is. These are not my numbers; these are from the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan agency made up and influenced by both Democrats and Republicans, and they are saying the debt is going to continue to rise despite this surplus.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we can see that there is a lack of honesty about our budget policy and there is only one answer. It is called restrained spending. We have to be fiscally disciplined in the money that comes to the Federal Government.

The other thing I have learned is that if we leave money in Washington, do my colleagues know what happens to it? It gets spent. Somebody always has a good idea on a way to spend the money, except the money we are spending now we are stealing from the Social Security system and we are transferring a lowered standard of living to our children.

And what we can see under President Clinton's budget, and this is real numbers by the Congressional Budget Office under the budget that he proposes to see that there is no surplus; the red indicates real deficit in terms of moneys in versus moneys out, and even though all sides of the aisle, Democrat, Republican and the President, are claiming the surplus, we can see from here that one does not exist. Even with a conservative plan that restrains spending we are still going to see a deficit up until about 2000. It may be that the economy is good enough that we may see a real surplus this year. But look at the difference if we restrain spending in terms of real surplus; in other words, something that will actually slow down the growth and the debt, decrease the debt, decrease or, in an inverse, increase the standard of living for our children, that if in fact we will restrain spending, that in fact we will markedly help the children of tomorrow.

Mr. Gutknecht.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having this special order.

I think we need to put this in some historical context though of where we were just a few years ago when the gentleman, and I and the gentleman from South Carolina who is going to be joining us in a minute, when we were first sent here to Washington after the 1994 elections. The Congressional Budget Office then told us that we were looking at $200 billion deficits growing to nearly $600 billion by the year 2009, and that was using the Social Security surplus to make those deficits look even smaller. So in reality, using honest accounting, honest bookkeeping, those deficits were probably between 350 and over a trillion dollars that we are looking at in annual deficits.

That is where we were just a few years ago, and I think it is important to note how far we have come just in the last several years in part because we have had the fiscal discipline. We have eliminated 400 programs, we have cut the rate in growth in Federal spending by more than half, and that coupled with lowered interest rates that helped bring about and the welfare reform, more people going back to work, a stronger economy; all of that has made it easier for us to get to what will be, I believe this year, the first real balanced budget; in other words, not using the Social Security surplus, the first real balanced budget I think this country has seen in many, many years.

Mr. COBURN. Let me add one thing.

I remember my first year in Congress. We rescinded and cut $70 billion worth of spending from this government that year, and I would tell my colleague that nobody in my district noticed that, and if we extrapolate $70 billion a year over the last 4 years, what we plainly see is the main reason that we are in surplus is what is 70 billion one year becomes 90 billion the next, becomes 120 billion the next, becomes 150, that that is worth about $160 billion in spending that is not happening today that would have happened had we not come in here and done a large rescission and also markedly cut the size of the government in 1995.

And so it is important to use that as a historical thing, that because we had fiscal discipline, that we, in fact, have an opportunity to truly lower the debt, not just the public debt, but all the debt, and that means creating a better future, creating opportunity, creating a standard of living that is going to be greater than what we have experienced for our grandchildren.

I yield back to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The gentleman is correct. I mean that in the end of this debate sometimes we get so caught up with numbers and statistics, we all have charts now, and we can use percentages, and we can talk about dollars and so forth.

But in the end the gentleman is absolutely right. What this debate is about is about generational fairness, and I think we have got to be fair to our parents, and I always talk about in my town hall meetings the fact that I was born in 1951.

Mr. COBURN. Youngster; are you not?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I do not feel quite so young any more, but I will tell my colleagues it is important because we are the peak of the baby boomers, and both my parents are still living, they are both on Social Security, they are both on Medicare, and the last thing I want to do is pull the rug out from under them.

But I also have three kids, and I worry about what kind of a country we are going to pass on to them, what kind of a standard of living are they going to enjoy.

And I want to get our colleague from South Carolina involved in this because something else the gentleman mentioned about using what Einstein called the most powerful force on earth, the magic of compound interest long term to allow individuals to save and invest for their own future. I have been told, and there are different numbers floating around, and it depends on which years you use, but, as my colleagues know, often we hear that Americans do not save enough for the future. But my colleague mentioned before that the average American between what they pay and what their employer pays into Social Security, they are saving about 12½ percent of their annual income.

Now the problem is not that Americans do not save enough. The problem is that we get such a lousy rate of return, and the number that I worked with usually and the average that I have seen provided by the Congressional Budget Office is for the last 30 or 40 years the average rate of return was 1.89 percent.

Now not many Americans would invest 12½ percent of their income into an IRA, or a 401(k), or even a savings account; can only earn 1.9 percent.

Mr. COBURN. It is interesting to note 1.9 percent is not in terms of real rate of return, that is not an inflation adjusted number, because when you do an inflation adjusted number, you go to .6 percent.

One last thing before the gentleman from South Carolina talks. I delivered 97 babies last year as a Member of Congress, and that is pure joy. But with that comes a heartache because I know that unless we change the environment in Washington that those children that I got to spank their back sides of and heard their first cry will never have the opportunity that my children had or I had as a youngster in this country.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman for doing so, and I thank him as well for convening this special order.

I want to follow up on what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) said, which was touching on the whole power of compound interest which cannot be underestimated. In fact, I saw an article yesterday in the Washington Post that I wish I had brought with me about an older man that put a little bit of money in stocks and lived a very simple life and yet ended up with a whole lot to show for it.

What I think is interesting on that point though is somebody on my staff was kind enough to do this, and this is a home-done chart, so I guess we are saving the taxpayer money by not having a professional chart done, but it

points out this power of compound interest because in 1937, and I did not realize this, Social Security actually ran a $766 million surplus. It is a pay-as-you-go system, so what is not spent ends up going into the general coffers the way it is now configured.

Now, if we grew that at about 10 percent, maybe that is too high a rate, maybe the appropriate number that the staffer should have picked would be 5 percent or 6 percent, but he picked 10 percent. Anyway, that would result today, that pot of money back in 1937, that $766 million pot of money, if it grew and compounded at about 10 percent, would end up today having about $1.17 trillion in your bank account.

And so when older folks at town hall meetings say to me, ''Mark, you know we wouldn't even be having this problem on Social Security if you all had kept your hands off the money.'' Well, it turns out they are right because just that one year alone you would end up with $1 trillion.

Now 1938 the surplus was $365 million. If again you compounded and grew that over this long time period between now and then, you would end up with about $485 billion in the bank. Well, you add those 2 together, and you get 1.66 trillion.

In 1939, our surplus in Social Security was 590 million bucks. Again, if you grew and compounded that over time, you would end up with $680 billion.

And you do that in 1940; surplus then was $305 million. You grow that and compound that over time, you end up with $310 billion in the bank.

In 1941, our surplus was $760 million in payroll taxes. You grew that and compounded that over time, that would be $670 billion.

In 1942, and I will not over do this point, but the surplus then was $926 million. You grow and compound that over time, you would end up with basically about $700 billion in the bank.

You add all that up just over the 1,2,3,4,5,6 years, that is about $4 trillion.

Now the contention liability with Social Security is about $8 trillion. In other words, very quickly you could get to the point wherein the people in my town hall meetings are exactly right. If Washington had truly kept their hands off the money, if the money had been in an account and had grown and compounded over time, we would not be having this conversation tonight, which goes straight back to what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is getting at, which is this power of compound interest.

The other thought I wanted to pick up on for just 2 seconds is what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was talking about, and that is just plain honest accounting, and that is, if you look at the numbers, and again just to pick a couple of numbers, this is fiscal year 1994.

Now everybody thought we ran a deficit of about $200 billion. That would have been the number that was talked about. But what is interesting here is, as the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) very correctly pointed out, if you actually look at how much the debt went up, the debt went up by $293 billion. Same thing happened in 1995. It looked like it was 164, but if you look at how much the debt actually went up, it was 277. Same thing a year later.

□ 2200

The same thing a year later. Apparently it appeared as if our deficit was $100 billion, but if we look at how much the debt went up, it went up $261 billion. Even just this last year it appeared, now that we are in the black, that we ran a surplus of about $70 billion. Again, if we look at how much the debt actually went up, it actually went up by basically $100 billion.

That is not the kind of basic accounting that people use back home in their businesses. It is not the kind of basic accounting somebody uses in balancing the family checkbook. It clearly states we have a real problem with this stuff here in Washington.

I have some other weird charts here in my home-done log of charts, but I do not want to belabor that point. I want to talk about these because it is what we are talking about.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, we will come back to that in just a minute.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) to comment on this situation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I have enjoyed listening. It just reinforces the things we do every day.

One of my colleagues once said that when we talk about all these numbers, people's eyes glaze over. It is, how does it affect them personally, and can the men and women at the Red Pig understand it. That is what I am going to try and do.

Once it was said that if we do not remember history, then we are likely to repeat it. I would like to take just a brief run, based on my colleague's 1 hour, and I will do it briefly. It is laughable, that Congress spends money, not the White House. We authorize, we appropriate; we authorize to spend it.

For 40 years, except for a small period of 1 term in the Senate, the Democrats have controlled the House and Senate, which controls all spending. When they say that they are fiscally responsible, that is an oxymoron. The debt was acquired, the deficit was acquired, and it put us on a negative road.

They have to spend. I feel sorry for my colleagues on the other side because they have to spend. By their party, they want big government because they believe government can do it better. That requires spending, and that increases taxes to pay for it. It is automatic. They have to spend that.

What I would like to do is take us on a walk through memory lane. When I came in in 1990, we said that enough was enough. We had the Gang of Seven. I don't know if Members remember that, for those who were not here. We shut down the House bank. We shut down the post office, because we knew that an individual here was dealing stamps. We set about to do the balanced budget. As a matter of fact, a lot of us wanted the Speaker to be changed at that point, so we could move ahead.

But my colleagues said in 1993 that it took courage for them to vote for that budget. It went by for me, because they said in 1993 their highest tax increase in the history of the United States is responsible for the economy today.

Let us take a look. In 1993, they promised a tax cut for what they call the middle class. First of all, there are no middle class citizens in this country, they are middle-income. I think we do a disservice to people by calling them middle class.

They said they would give tax relief for that group. They increased the tax in that budget. They increased taxes themselves by $270 billion. They cut defense $127 billion. They increased the tax on social security. They cut the COLA for veterans, they cut the COLAs for military. They had no welfare reform, they had no education reform.

When they had the White House, the House and Senate, did they have a minimum wage increase? Absolutely not. They said that was not the way to stimulate growth or jobs.

When we took the majority in 1994, we did away with the 1993 tax increase. We dissolved it. What did we do? The first thing, we gave back middle-income tax breaks. There are a whole host of ways we did that. People are enjoying that today.

We were not able to increase defense. It went down under that watch. That is one of the low points, I think, of our particular budget. But we took away the increase on social security tax. We reinstated our veterans' COLA. We reinstated our active duty military COLA, and while the Democrats put $100 million against us, while we were trying to save Medicare, and blasted us from the unions and all sides, at the end, the President signed our Medicare bill, after he vetoed it.

Because of welfare reform, the welfare reform we did in 1995, we have billions of dollars coming into the Treasury instead of going out. The average was 16 years. We changed that. So for them to say that they were responsible for the economy today is laughable.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is so right. Again, with my homemade charts here, I have another chart showing that exact point the gentleman is making, which is that Washington has been getting bigger raises than working families have gotten.

I do not want to bore people to death with a lot of numbers, but whether we start in 1993, we go to 1994, this is the rate at which money coming into

Washington has gone up. This is the rate at which people's pocketbooks, if you will, their earnings, have gone up. In every case, it is that red line, which is the money coming into Washington, that has been going up faster than money back home.

To say it another way, if we look at these two little lines, this is the rate at which Washington has been getting raises versus the rate at which the rest of America has been getting raises. So the gentleman is exactly right, the thing that is ''balancing the books'' up here has been hard-earned taxpayer dollars coming into Washington, as opposed to fiscal restraint.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. The overall point I am trying to make is that Alan Greenspan, because of our tax relief, of us ''balancing the budget,'' do Members remember when the President said, I can do it in 7 years, in 2 years, in 3 years? It is an arbitrary number. When we finally pinned the President down, three of his budgets increased the deficits by over $260 billion, with a forecast to $200 billion forever.

What we did is say no, a balanced budget is important. For them to say that they are fiscally responsible, I would ask Members, look at every bill on the Floor. The other side of the aisle will always want to increase the spending. They will say, we are cutting, we are cutting, except for one area, in defense. That is their cash cow. They also want to raise taxes to pay for it.

My last statement I would like to make, I would like Members to look up www.dsausa.org, on the Web page. That stands for the Democrat Socialists of America. This is on the Web page, this is not the gentleman from California (Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM). In there is the Progressive Caucus.

In the socialist contract, they want government health care. What did they do when they had the leadership of the White House, the House and Senate? They want to cut defense in this Web page by 50 percent. What does the President do? He has cut it in half. They want to cut it 50 percent more. They want government control of education, private property; they want union control over small business; they want to increase socialized spending the highest ever. They want to raise taxes to the highest progressive tax ever, in this 12-point agenda. How do they pay for it? By increased taxes and cutting the military.

That is not what other forefathers meant when they talked about fiscal responsibility. We cannot do it by having government do it. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a minute here going over the present budgets, if we can.

Mr. SANFORD. Before the gentleman does so, if the gentleman will yield for one more second, again, I want to follow up on the point of the gentleman from California.

Consistently, the way the rhetoric works around Washington, we would think that Republicans are trying to slash and burn and basically eliminate the city and eliminate all Federal functions. That is what I think is very interesting about this chart.

If we look at this line, would the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) tell me whether the line goes up or down? It is a one-way line, and that is going up. All Federal spending in Washington, D.C. has not been cut in real dollars or in nominal dollars. On the whole it has been going up. In 1994 it was $1.4 trillion. In fiscal year 1999, it is $1.7 trillion. The Republicans have not been cutting, eliminating. In fact, things have been going up in Washington.

Mr. COBURN. Actually, the gentleman makes my point. We have not done as good a job as we should have. We should have restrained spending more.

Let me spend a few minutes talking about the budget proposal of President Clinton and what has happened in 1999, and what has been projected. Then I want the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) to kind of talk on these budget items.

The other thing we hear, and I hope we get some time to spend on it, is Medicare. I know a lot about Medicare because I interact with Medicare every day as a physician. I know the ins and outs of it. I know what is good about it and what is bad about it.

The one thing I want the American public to know is the Congress, regardless of its politics, regardless of the rhetoric, nobody in Washington wants to do anything except enhance the viability of Medicare.

What I want to do is go through the budget for 1999, which we are operating under right now. By the end of this year, the fiscal surplus on social security, the amount of money taken in versus the amount of money taken out, is expected to be $127 billion.

If the government would have exercised fiscal discipline, we would have saved $126 billion. That is where this red line is. But we did not. Last year in the omnibus appropriations bill this Congress, over the threat of a government shutdown, spent $15 billion above what the budget caps had said we would spend in 1997, an agreement that the President agreed to and the Congress agreed to. They did not keep it.

What happens? Instead of a $127 billion surplus, it became $111. Now the President wants to spend another $1 billion on foreign aid. That takes us down to $110 billion in terms of social security.

We have a chance to have a real surplus this year because the revenues coming to the Federal Government, as the gentleman from South Carolina said, are rising. Why are they rising? It is called bracket creep. As people make more money, they move into a higher tax bracket, so therefore, the government takes more of our money. They reward us for working harder and earning more by taking a lot of that money away. What happens is the revenues to the Federal Government grow.

If we take the President's budget, the Congressional Budget Office estimates there will be $138 billion more in social security coming in than is paid out. Our idea is to not spend any of that on anything but social security, to solve the problems associated with Medicare and social security; to not spend any of it, to save 100 percent of it.

If we reject what the Republican budget plan is, the Congressional Budget Office anticipates right now that we will spend at least $5 billion of that $138 billion, bringing us down to only taking $5 billion out of the social security trust fund. We will only have $133 billion.

If we take what the President has proposed under his budget proposal, we will take another $20 billion of that and spend it. Remember, we all agreed in 1997 that we are not going to spend above the caps. We already have $35 billion proposed spending above the caps.

Finally, if we take the President's plan of saving 62 percent of the social security fund and spending 38 percent on new spending, what we get down to is actually, by all his plans, down to somewhere around 57 or 58 percent he wants to save.

If something is wrong, it is wrong all the time. If it is wrong to take the social security trust fund, and what that means is lowering the standard of living for our children and grandchildren, and placing a tremendous increased burden on them from a tax standpoint, it is wrong now, it was wrong before, as we have seen from the gentleman from South Carolina's chart, and it is wrong for the future.

There is no way we will ever solve this problem until we start being honest about what the word ''surplus'' means, until we start being honest about the social security trust fund, and we start being honest about the problems coming up with Medicare.

Nobody is proposing that we spend this money on anything except social security. It is true that we will reduce external debt with that, but the total debt will not go up if we do not spend this money, so it is important that we have the restraint on spending.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to read a couple of quotes.

In his 1998 State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, ''Tonight I propose that we reserve 100 percent of the surplus, every penny of any surplus, until we have taken all the necessary measures to strengthen social security for the 21st century.''

This year the President lowered the bar. This year he said, ''I propose that we commit 62 percent of the budget surplus for the next 15 years to social security.''

We took the President at his word. In the budget that we will debate tomorrow, the House Republican-passed

budget will take 100 percent. That means that every single penny, for the first time I think perhaps in my lifetime, every penny of social security taxes will only go for social security.

What we will do with money that is not needed to pay those benefits is we will actually pay off some of the debt that is owed to the public.

□ 2215

The debt will still probably go up slightly.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question because the assumption in the partisan nature of this place is, if we say that money in there is a real surplus, then automatically money is going to go out of Washington to give a tax cut to the rich.

Does the gentleman know anybody in Washington in any area that is proposing to do that?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, in fact what we will do is make a determination of where we need to use that money. If it is shoring up Medicare, we will use it for shoring up Medicare.

But I will remind the gentleman and the American people that we had a commission that gave great recommendations on Medicare and how to save it, and the President rejected his own commission on what to do.

I think the gentleman has some things that are very important for us in discussing that in his charts.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. But first, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to establish that our priorities are very clear in our budget. First and foremost, we need to solve that problem. If the gentleman will put that chart up with the blue and the red bars which demonstrates where we are headed with the Social Security Trust Fund, it demonstrates why it is so important that we begin as soon as we can to say that every penny of Social Security taxes will go only for Social Security. We are going to do that this year. That is the most important thing.

Now if we find out come later in the year that there is more revenue available, then we should allow some of the families to keep some of what they earn. I happen to believe that if we do start talking about tax relief as this process goes forward, I believe that the first and foremost tax we ought to solve is this marriage penalty tax.

Every year about 21 million American families pay a penalty for being married. They pay extra taxes to the tune of an average of about $1,200 per family just because they are married. That is my own personal opinion. That has nothing to do with the rich versus the poor. That has nothing to do, in my opinion, with right versus wrong.

But the gentleman asked about Social Security and Medicare. I might just point out we were talking earlier, and the gentleman from South Carolina I think will appreciate this particular chart and this quote. One of the things we believe long-term, I believe, is allowing individuals to take at least a portion of their FICA taxes and be able to invest for themselves in personalized retirement accounts and take advantage of what Einstein described as the most powerful force on earth, the magic of compound interest.

But I want to make it clear, the President has a slightly different scheme. What he wants to do is take taxpayer money and invest it directly in the stock market.

One of the people who has probably had more influence on fiscal policy, at least as it relates to the Federal Reserve and interest rates and all the things that have helped keep this economy strong, is a gentleman by the name of Alan Greenspan. I want to just read this quote and what he said about the President's scheme of investing taxpayer money without the permission of retirees directly in the stock market.

He said, and I quote, ''Investing a portion of the Social Security Trust Fund assets in equities, as the administration and others have proposed, would arguably put at risk the efficiency of our capital markets and thus our economy. Even with Herculean efforts, I doubt if it would be feasible to insulate the trust funds from the political pressures.'' That is what Alan Greenspan said.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, everybody up here knows that that would happen, that political pressure would decide what and how that money was invested.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear, we look at this as a possibility in the future of allowing people to invest for themselves, where on the other side the administration is saying, ''Well, we will invest it for you.'' With that we see all the political pressures and really the tremendous number of potential conflicts of interest.

I mean what would the government do if they were one of the largest investors in Microsoft, for example? Could they pursue the antitrust suit that they are doing right now, or any antitrust suit?

In fact, it is estimated that if we went ahead with the scheme that the President was talking about, that within 10 years the Federal Government could own as much as 25 percent of all the stocks on the New York Stock Exchange, and we become more than the 800-pound gorilla. It is more like the 5,000-pound gorilla on Wall Street.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will yield, I would just pick up where the gentleman from Minnesota leaves off now.

I think Alan Greenspan very correctly pointed out the dangers in collective investment. It sounds good, it sounds alluring, and that is, let us send all the money to Washington, let the experts take care of it.

But there are real dangers that come with that idea. This other idea, again we are talking about a gradual shift in that direction. It would take time. It is going to take a lot of debate in this place. But the idea of allowing people to invest a portion of their payroll tax in their own personal account does take advantage of this powerful compound interest and takes advantage of it in, I think, a special way that was highlighted in the Washington Post today.

In the Metro section of today's Washington Post, there is an article entitled, the ''Munificence of an Unusual Millionaire''. If I may, I would like to read just the first couple of paragraphs of this article.

> Karl H. Hagen lived modestly and alone for much of his life, in his family's decaying farmhouse in Suitland. For 36 years, he worked for the Potomac Electric Power Co., painting signs and fences and doing other maintenance jobs.
>
> He did indulge in a few passions, however, including travel, watercolor painting, reading, ballroom dancing, and investing in stocks and bonds.
>
> The latter paid off in a big way.
>
> Hagen, whose clothes came from thrift shops and who looked to acquaintances as though he might be homeless, managed to amass a fortune of about $3 million. When he died of a stroke last Thursday at the age of 89, he left his estate to three institutions that had earned his admiration: . . . Johns Hopkins University, the National Air and Space Museum and National Geographic Society.

I think that that says a lot about this simple thing of compound interest so well highlighted in today's Washington Post on the front page of the Metro section.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, what we are going to hear tomorrow, too, I think that is important in terms of Medicare, is that they want to take 15 percent of Social Security money and shift it over to Medicare. That may or may not be a good idea, but if we are going to preserve Social Security, the one way to do it is not to spend Social Security money on Medicare, because all we are going to do is undermine Social Security even further.

President Clinton's own chairman, Senator BREAUX, had this quote from the Wall Street Journal on March 12. ''I think what we have on the table is a classic Clinton New Democrat reform, but there are entrenched people within the White House who do not want any change.''

The fact is, if we are going to save Medicare, it is going to have to have some change. Politicians generally worry about changing something as important as Medicare. It takes real courage to solve the Medicare problem. But we have to change it if we are going to solve it. We can not solve it, and we can do the same thing to our children on Medicare as we have done on Social Security, and that is steal the money from somewhere else and then raise their taxes in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I just yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) on that point. I think he has a

chart that talks about the amount of money that can be saved if we fiscally restrain spending.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out a couple of charts, because there is going to be, I suspect, a rather heated debate tomorrow and for the next several weeks about who is doing a better job of saving Medicare and Social Security.

I think the numbers do speak for themselves. This is a chart, and again, these are not our numbers. These numbers actually are generated by the Congressional Budget Office. But it shows that over the next 10 years we are going to save $1.8 trillion for Medicare. The Clinton plan, which is rather complicated and difficult to explain, will save about $1.65 trillion over that period. There is a big difference.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, the difference is $150 billion.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Exactly. Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of money even around here.

Mr. COBURN. Right.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, let me point out, though, what some of the Congressional Budget Office people and what the Office of Management and Budget also said. They did not actually use the term ''irresponsible''. I want to show this article which appeared in the Washington Post last week, and they were both very, very critical of the Clinton plan. Basically, they described it as sort of a smoke and mirrors type plan.

Frankly, even the chairman and many of the Democrats who either served on or were very involved in the Medicare Commission essentially came to the same conclusion, that what the President was really proposing was nothing. He was proposing taking more general fund revenues to try and supplement Medicare, when really what we need with Medicare is not necessarily just more money. We need real reforms. We need to get under the hood, as Ross Perot used to say, and really fix this thing.

By doing what the President was doing, it was called irresponsible because it really, in some respects, only makes the problem worse over the long-term.

So I think we are going to have a good and healthy and heated debate about Medicare, but it is important to see what some experts have said. It is not just us. As I say, it is the Congressional Budget Office. It is OMB. It is columnist David Broder.

He wrote a column last week. It appeared in Sunday's Washington Post. The headline was ''Medicare: Another Clinton failure?''

As we look through his plan, and it is described in detail here, and if people would like a copy, we can certainly make certain they can get a copy of it, but there have been many people who have studied the Clinton plan and they say this is a joke, and unfortunately it is kind of a sad joke for American seniors.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I do with my seniors who are on Medicare, I have actually asked them this at home when the President started talking about a drug benefit, we are talking about here we go again, politicians adding a benefit to a program that we cannot afford now. When we ask the seniors, ''Do you want to increase the benefits associated with Medicare, and the way we are going to pay it is we are taking it away from your grandchildren,'' they uniformly say no.

But they also will say, ''If you will spend wiser in Washington, maybe you can do more for me, because I am struggling.'' But they do not want their children and their grandchildren to have to pay for it.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for being here tonight. My purpose is not partisanship. My purpose is to make sure the American public knows that there are some of us here that are going to honestly talk about what the numbers are, honestly talk about being critical of both Republicans and Democrats in the past in terms of the mistakes that have been made that have been politically expedient.

I want to close this tonight with a statement that Martin Luther King said in his last speech in the Washington Cathedral not long before he was assassinated. What he said was is that ''Vanity asked the question, is it popular? And cowardice asked the question, is it expedient? But conscience asked the question, is it right?''

The gentleman related to something, right versus wrong. For too long Washington has been asking the wrong question. What they have been saying is, is it popular, and is it expedient for my political career, versus is it right for our country, right for the future generation and the following?

I hope the Congress will have the courage to do what is right rather than what is expedient and what is popular. That is what we are sent up here to do.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF WOMEN OF COLOR

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for organizing the special order that was supposed to be on women's history, although it had been altered.

I would just like to offer my remarks for this evening. Let me also add that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has certainly put her stamp on history through her outstanding work here in the House of Representatives and being the first African American woman to be elected to her district.

It is fitting indeed that we honor the achievements of women of color, who for too long were neglected in our Nation's history. In recent years, it has been exciting to watch school children learn about African American women of strength, courage, and dignity who shaped the course of history.

We can point with pride to women like Harriet Tubman who secretly guided over 300 slaves to freedom on the ''Underground Railroad.'' She spent time working in my home State of New Jersey at Cape May between 1849 and 1852.

We honor the legacy of Sojourner Truth, who was freed from slavery by the New York State Emancipation Act of 1827, became famous in her lifetime as a preacher and abolitionist and lecturer. When war broke out, she raised money to buy gifts for the soldiers and went into Army camps and distributed them by herself.

We recall the contributions of Mary McLeod Bethune, who built Bethune-Cookman College in Florida and founded the National Council of Negro Women. She was the first black woman to receive a major appointment in the Federal Government.

□ 2230

She served as an adviser to President Franklin Roosevelt and to President Truman.

There have been so many remarkable women of color that it is impossible to pay tribute to all of them tonight. We have all had the opportunity to meet women who were personal heroines in our own lives, and I would like to pay tribute to three women who have had the greatest impact on my early life, African American women who have made a direct contribution to my growth and development. And these three women, other than my late mother and grandmother, have had a tremendous impact on my development.

The first one I would like to mention is Mrs. Madeline Williams, who was an adviser of the NAACP Youth Councils and College Chapter of the Oranges and Maplewood in New Jersey. When I was invited to join the NAACP as a college student she provided the opportunity for young people to become involved in civic activities and public service. She helped me develop an interest in civil rights at a time in history when we were all moved to become involved. I remain grateful to her for giving me the opportunity to become involved in civil rights and government affairs.

Another great woman who exerted an enormous positive influence on my life was Mrs. Mary Burch, founder of a group called The Leaguers, which helped young people from the inner city to become more involved in their activities in their cities.

Belonging to the Leaguers opened up a whole new world for young people like myself, a world from which we otherwise would have been excluded. Never before had we been able to have