

jobs and looking at how we try to implement a program that gets money to the State. States put in matching funds so we can create jobs around school construction and airports and roads and bridges and so forth.

So a modest set of proposals that can be implemented. I think we can all be proud of the families first agenda.

Mr. PALLONE. The other thing, when you were talking about the pensions, I heard a lot about the portability. In the same way we were talking about the health insurance portability in the families first agenda you have the pension portability. A lot of people came and said, "You know, I can't take my pension with me if I change my job." That I think is part of the families first agenda too, which is a great idea, because so many people today have many jobs over the course of their time they are working.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman mentioned all of the factors that really working women are not just concerned about, many of them are frantic about. In my district in Westchester County, this morning Secretary Reich spoke on the teleprompter, or whatever those big TV screens are called, to a large group of women that were there for a Working Woman Conference. They got together because these women are so frustrated.

It takes two to support a family today, both the husband and the wife are there working, and there are a whole lot of discussions about child care, how are they going to pay for child care, how are they going to send their kids to college? They are worried about everyday living. That is why the President's proposal for a \$10,000 tax credit was talked about today, because it is so important.

I am hoping that we can really work together to get some of these proposals in the families first agenda through this Congress, because they are not pie in the sky, they are practical proposals, creating partnerships between the public and the private sector to create more child care positions, to make pension reform a real part of our congressional agenda, to help women go out and start businesses.

We have been involved with the glass ceiling, and you know what happens when a woman hits that glass ceiling in a big corporation. She takes all the skills she has learned in the community as a mother, as a boss, and goes out and starts her own business. But a lot of these proposals in the families first agenda are real, they are doable, and we can get them done, if we really focus and work together.

So with President Clinton's leadership, working with those of us who have been fighting for women and families and children for a very long time, I think we can achieve our goals.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate that. I just want to thank the two of you for joining in this special order tonight. We sort of started out by saying how the GINGRICH Republican leadership

agenda was really out of touch with America's values and what people think we should be doing here in Congress. But, at the same time now, as Democrats we have our own agenda, the families first agenda. More and more what I found during the August break was that people understand that, and they think that is the way to go, modest proposals to move forward in a progressive way to help the average American.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3719, THE SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. SOLOMON (during special orders), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-773) on the resolution (H. Res. 516) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3719) to amend the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3308, THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SOLOMON (during special orders), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-774) on the resolution (H. Res. 517) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3308) to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the placement of United States forces under United Nations operational or tactical control, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIDE IN THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to use about 30 minutes, give or take, and then yield back time which then will be claimed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

With that, I would like to just thank you for serving as Speaker, as Acting Speaker, and to tell you that I was looking forward to addressing this Chamber tonight, particularly more so after hearing my colleagues who just preceded me. For a variety of reasons, I just strongly disagree with their attempt to really spin what this Congress has done.

Let me say from the outset I have never been more proud to be a Republican in this 104th Congress, to serve with so many other men and women

who believe deeply in doing some very important lifting for this country.

Preceding the 1994 election, Republicans who were in the minority made a determination that we wanted to present a very positive plan for the American people, and that this plan would be a statement of what we intended to do if in fact we became part of a new majority.

We decided that we would set forward this plan in a Capitol steps event, and not just invite incumbent Members of Congress, but those that were challenging incumbent Members of Congress. We also decided we wanted people to have a sense that if there was this new Congress, there would be a major shift in policy and direction, and that we would promise to do much like what might happen in Britain or Canada or Israel, that when you had a change in government, you really had a change in direction.

So we set out with what we called the Contract With America. It was a contract that we collectively, Republicans, both incumbents and those challenging, put together. When we started working on our Contract With America, there were things we took out because we could not sign if they were still in. So what remained of our contract was a piece of effort that really had the support of almost everyone, 390-plus Members and challengers who signed this Contract With America, and I was one of them.

I remember when I was being interviewed by one of the editorial boards before the 1994 election, I was asked how could I as a moderate Republican sign on to the Contract With America, as if somehow this contract was something that I would not be proud to be associated with.

So I thought about it a second, and I said to the people asking me the question, "What do you think of the Democrats' Contract With America? The 8 reforms they want on opening day, the 10 reforms they want in the first 100 days?"

I asked the question and waited for an answer, and I waited. And finally I said, "Isn't it interesting that the majority party," the then Democrats who were then the majority, "had no plan, didn't share what they wanted to do, no sense of direction?" And here you had a minority party that was not sure it would be in the majority, promising they would do certain things.

I said, "Isn't it also interesting that our Contract With America did not criticize President Clinton or the 103d Congress or the 102d Congress or the 101st Congress?" There was not any criticism of Democrats. It was just a positive plan of what we wanted to do.

The reforms in the first day of Congress, those eight reforms, getting Congress to live under all the laws that we imposed on the rest of the country, Congress had exempted itself from the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the age discrimination,

the family and medical leave, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Employee Polygraph Protection Act, the Worker Protection Act and so on. This Congress put Congress under all the laws we imposed on everyone else. So we are now under the 40-hour workweek. That was one of the reforms in our Contract With America. We also cut the number of committees, we cut the number of staff in the committees.

We did something that was really monumental, though I think it is hard to explain, we eliminated proxy voting.

□ 1930

Proxy voting was the process where a chairman would get a Member to sign a proxy that gave the chairman the right to cast his vote or her vote. And it was the reason why chairmen controlled the committees, because they had a fistful of proxies. And when we eliminated proxy voting, we brought democracy back to Congress. In fact, there were a lot of good Democrats who lost in previous elections, not because they were not trying to do the right thing, it is just they could not get beyond their chairman who had so many proxies in their pocket. They could not pass legislation that they themselves wanted to pass what the American people had asked for.

What this Congress is attempting to do, and we have succeeded in a whole host of areas, our first is we are trying to get our financial house in order and balance the Federal budget, not because balancing the budget is the most important thing or the end result. It is the foundation. So in that sense it is the most important because what is built on top of it has to have a strong foundation. So we have to balance the budget and get our financial house in order so that when we do programs, they will be on a strong financial footing.

The second thing we need to do is save our trust funds from bankruptcy, particularly Medicare. We learned last year that Medicare would go bankrupt in the year 2002. Now we are learning that Medicare may go bankrupt in the year 2000. It is going bankrupt because more money is going out of the fund than coming in because we are spending too much money. So we are looking to save Medicare.

We had a plan and the President vetoed it. And he vetoed it when we thought the fund was going bankrupt in the year 2002. Since his veto we now know it is going to go bankrupt basically in 19 to 20 months sooner. And our third effort is to transform our social, our caretaking society into a caring society, to transform our social and corporate and agricultural welfare state into a caring opportunity society. We want to end welfare not just for people who have been on it for years but for corporations and for those large farms in particular that have become addicted to government price supports, and so on. So that is what our effort is.

Now my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about the cruelty of

cutting the school lunch program, the student loan program, Medicaid and Medicare. First and foremost, I have to be direct, we are not cutting those programs. So the very premise on which my colleagues spoke is just wrong.

Now, one of the things they talked about was the earned income tax credit. This is a payment made to someone who works but does not make enough to pay taxes, so they get something back from other taxpayers. It is an earned income tax credit. They are working Americans who get something from the government. They said we were cutting that program. Yet the program is going to grow from 1995 to the year 2002 from \$19.9 to \$25 billion. Now, only in this place and where the virus is spreading, when you go from \$19.9 to \$25 billion do people call it a cut. This earned income tax credit is important and we want it to go for families. We want to help families have money when they are working poor.

The school lunch program is going to grow from \$5.1 billion to \$6.8 billion. Again, only in this place and where the virus is spreading, when you grow from \$5.1 billion to \$6.8 billion do people call it a cut.

Now, what we did do is the following. The school lunch program is going to grow at 5.5 percent more a year. It is going to grow at 5.2 percent more a year. We said it should grow at 4.5 percent more each year. So we are going to spend 4.5 percent more each year. But then what we did is we said 20 percent of it, State and local governments could reallocate. We got rid of all the Federal bureaucracy involved in the program, saving the money so the students could have it, not the bureaucracy. So we allowed the student loan program to grow at 4.5 percent more each year. That enables it to grow from \$5.1 billion to \$6.8 billion in the seventh year.

We allowed governments, local governments, to transform and the States to transform 20 percent of it, to transfer it and to transform it so that a child in a suburban area who comes with parents that make a decent income like myself would not have their daughter subsidized. Why should my daughter have 17 cents of her meals subsidized by the Federal Government when I make a nice salary as a Member of Congress and my wife teaches? So we were going to allow local communities to take that money and spend it in communities that need it more, like my cities of Bridgeport and Norwalk and Stanford for kids who come from parents who do not have much income.

So rather than taking and slowing the growth of this program and giving some children less increase than they would have gotten, they are going to get more because we are going to take it from those who make a lot of money and give it to those who need it.

The student loan program is another example of where my colleagues are just totally off base. Now, the student loan program, which was last year \$20

billion under our plan, would go to \$36 billion. That is a 50-percent increase in the student loan program. A 50-percent increase in the student loan program is not a cut. It is an increase. It is a 50 percent increase. So we are going to go from \$24 billion to \$36 billion. What did we propose? Republicans said that when the student graduates, they have 6 months in which they then pay the loan from that 6 months on. When they graduate for that first 6 months, that interest was paid by the taxpayer. We wanted the student to pay that interest from when they graduate to that first 6 months and amortize it over the course of a 10- or 15-year loan. That would have amounted for the average loan to \$9 more a month to a student with an average loan of about \$17,000, \$9 more a month now that they have been out of school for 6 months. \$9 more a month is the equivalent of, in my part of the country, the price of a movie theater and a small Coke or a piece of pizza. I have no problem telling the student for the good of the country that they can pay \$9 more a month after they have graduated and are now working.

But that notwithstanding, we still spend the same amount of money, \$24 billion to \$36 billion, a 50 percent increase in the student loan program.

Medicaid, we are told that we wanted to cut Medicaid and that this is health care for the poor and nursing care for the elderly. That grows from \$89 billion to \$127 billion under our plan. Only in Washington when you go from \$89 billion to \$127 billion do people call it a cut, but they just did. They just did. Previous to my addressing Congress, my colleagues said we were cutting the Medicaid program.

Medicaid is the program, however, that I want to talk about in more detail.

We spent last year \$178 billion, a lot of money. In the 7th year of our plan we will spend \$289 billion. That is a 60-percent increase in the amount of spending that we will make in the seventh year as opposed to what we did last year. Now, only in Washington when you go from \$178 billion to \$289 billion do people call it a cut.

Now, people then said, well, you need more money because you have more seniors. If you have more seniors, you need more money. We do have more seniors. On a per person basis per senior we spend \$4,800 on average per senior for Medicare. That is health care for the elderly and health care and other assistance for those who have disabilities.

In the seventh year we will spend \$7,100. That is a 49 percent increase per person from last year to the seventh year, or the year 2002. Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said we were mercilessly savaging Medicare. And yet it is going to grow 60 percent in total and 49 percent per person.

Now, what did we do with Medicare? We did not increase copayment to the senior. We did not increase the deductible. We did not increase the premium

except for the wealthiest of wealthy. The premium for those who are single, who are seniors who make over \$125,000, they will have to pay all of Medicare part B. And if you are married and you make over \$175,000, you have to pay all of Medicare part B. If you are married, \$175,000, you pay all of Medicare part B.

So we did not increase the copayment, did not increase the deductible, did not increase the premium. What we also did, though, is we gave seniors choice. Right now a Medicare recipient has one program, a traditional fee-for-service. We allow them to keep that program if they want, but we then bring in the private sector, various HMO's, allowing hospitals and doctors to compete with HMO's, allowing for medical savings accounts, allowing for all these different programs. And the only way that these new programs can participate is that they offer something better than Medicare, because they have to draw people away from the traditional fee-for-service program. How do they do that? They do it by doing something very logical.

There is so much money to be made in Medicare, so many people are making so much money that the private sector can come in and give you better service. They can give you eye care, dental care, a rebate on the copayment, the deductible or premium, and some have even in certain areas said we can give a rebate, actually may pay all of MediGap. So now we have a Medicare program that grows from 178 to 289 billion. We did not increase the copayment, did not increase the premium. We allow the private sector to come in to offer eye care, dental care, a rebate on the copayment or deductible or the premium and maybe even pay all of MediGap. What was our one mistake?

We made a mistake. At least that is what the President said. What was that mistake? We happened to save \$240 billion. Now, how were we able to do it? Instead of the program growing at 10 percent a year, we had it grow at 7 percent a year. How were we able to have the program grow at 7 percent a year? Because when we asked the private sector how much they would require to offer the same as the fee-for-service program, they said, if you put 3 percent more in the program, we can make money off the program and give you the traditional fee-for-service. We said, what happens if we give you 7 percent? They said, if you put 7 percent in the program, we can give better than the fee-for-service, we can give the eye care, the dental care, the rebate on the copayment or the deductible or the premium.

So now I am thinking about a program that does not increase the copayment, the deductible, the premium, gives seniors choices and saves \$240 billion. Yet the President said, that is a cut. Yet we are spending 60 percent more totally, 49 percent more per person. And I was trying to think of how I would describe this.

The only way I can describe it, and it seems somewhat ludicrous, but it is

really. I mean, I guess what I have to say is I never thought the President would veto the Medicare plan. Why would he do it when we did not increase the copayment or deductible or premium and gave seniors choice and saves \$240 billion? I do not understand why he would have done that. There is no explanation for it.

It is just about as stupid as if I had said to my daughter, which I will not do, but if I said to my daughter, honey, I want you to buy an automobile and I want it to be full size because I want you to be in a big car. And I only have \$16,000, and I want it to be a full size car. And I say that means you cannot, you can only get a cassette radio, you cannot get a CD and you will not be able to get a sun roof and leather seats. It is going to be a big size care and it is going to be stripped down. And give her this \$16,000, and she comes back all excited and she says, Dad, I got the car. And Dad, you will not believe it; it has a sunroof and it has a CD and it has got leather seats. And I say to her, Jeremy, I told you you could not do that. You were not supposed to do that. I get mad at her because she did it because I wanted here to get a full sized car. And she said, I bought that full sized car. And by the way, Dad, here is a thousand dollars back. It only cost me \$15,000.

Would it not have been stupid of me to say, you did something wrong? You got a better car with more things and you saved \$1,000 and I say you cut \$1,000? I think that is pretty stupid, but I do not think it is any different than what the President did. He basically vetoed a bill that had no increase in copayment, deductible or premium, gave seniors choice and saved the country, the taxpayers \$240 billion.

Now, when I look at this program and I look at what we have been doing, I am trying to think of what happened in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration when they had their own Congress. There was talk that we were forced into passing a minimum wage bill. Some on our side supported it. But it is not lost on any of us that they did not attempt to pass the minimum wage bill when they controlled the House and the Senate and Congress. But when we passed the minimum wage bill, we did something more. We provided \$8 billion of tax cuts for businesses that employed people who make the least amount of money, who in some cases need to be trained, who are on welfare. We are giving tax credits for small businesses so they can compete in a very competitive work environment.

We passed the welfare reform bill. That is a bill that the President said he wanted to pass and yet he could not pass it under a Democrat Congress. We passed it in this Chamber. He said it was too harsh. He said he did not like it and he signs the bill.

Now my colleagues on this side of the aisle have got to be careful when they talk about certain things they think are harsh and then sign onto them.

They cannot have it both ways. We passed 13 budgets this past year. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that some of them were harsh. I am not quite sure why they think that, but they were signed into law by the President. The President cannot sign them into law and then say they are too harsh, nor can my colleagues vote for it and then act like they did not vote for it.

What have we tried to do? We tried to get our financial house in order by cutting, truly cutting discretionary spending, making Government smaller.

1945

We want to return the power and the money and the influence, take it away from Washington, give it back to States and local governments, and the reason we want to do that is we think the Federal Government has a one-size-fits-all mentality. We think the Federal Government basically says, adds up all the people in the room, adds up their collective shoe size, divides the number of people and their collective shoe size, and says there is an 8½. I do not care if you wear a size 12, I do not care if you wear a size 6. Wear it. One size fits all no matter what part of the country you come from.

We believe that States and local governments can do it better. We also think that they can do it better without the Federal Government setting up a whole great deal of regulation and rules and a bureaucracy that siphons off 10, 20, 30 percent of what we choose to spend for the people who we are ultimately trying to help.

I look back and think of my 22 years in public life, and this summarizes what I think government ultimately should do because it is what we want to do for our own children.

I have a dad who passed away recently, but he used to come back from New York City because I was on the commuter line. My dad worked in New York from Darien, CT, and he would come home every night, and I was the last of four boys, and all my brothers were off in college and out of college, and we would read stories that he had read in the newspaper, and he would sometimes bring home an Ann Landers column that he thought was interesting, humorous, or instructive.

And Ann Landers said something that I think summarizes the feelings I have about what we are about in this 104th Congress. She wrote: In the final analysis it is not what you do for your children but what you have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings.

I believe a caring society has to teach people how to grow the seeds, how to farm the land, how to fish, not give them the food, not give them the fish. When we give them the food or the fish, that is a short-term effort; but when it goes from one generation to another generation, as it has both in terms of individual lives, in terms of corporate write-offs, in terms of agricultural subsidies, we make people dependent, we make them less efficient,

and frankly we have done something very cruel. There is nothing caring about constantly giving people the food without ultimately teaching them how to be independent.

And so what we would like to do for our own children and for our own families and the people we love, it seems to me ultimately we should do for those in our society who need the most help.

I believe this is the most caring Congress that I have ever, ever seen. I believe it is the most caring Congress because we are dealing with big issues; we are not sweeping things under the rugs as had been swept under the rugs for years and years and years under previous Congresses. We are trying to make our country self-sufficient, we are trying to make our constituents self-sufficient, we are trying to bring the money and the power and the influence back home where it belongs.

With that Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield back the balance of my time. If my colleague is here, I am not yet about to give it up, but I do not see him, but when I do I will yield it back, but just continue by saying that as a moderate Republican I take some real interest in the fact that this Congress that is deemed to be a conservative Congress is dealing with some very important issues, whether it is health care reform which we passed and the President signed into law, whether it is welfare reform, whether it was the tax cuts found in the minimum wage bill, whether it was the telecom bill that passed recently. We have a major agenda, some of which has been passed into law by President Clinton, others which have been vetoed. Sadly, he vetoed 2 welfare bills. Sadly, he vetoed our Medicare reform bill. Sadly, he vetoed our Medicaid bill, which was an attempt to allow State governments the opportunity to manage health care for the poor because, frankly, that is where you have seen the greatest reforms.

One of the things I am most proud about as a Republican is that 31, I think 32, of the 50 Governors happen to be Republicans. They represent 75 percent of all the American people, and the faith that I have in our plan to bring the money and the power and the influence from Washington to local communities, the satisfaction that I have, is the knowledge that we have had Governors, Republican Governors and Democrat Governors, who have made Medicare work on a State and local level, who are making welfare reform work on a State and local level.

The State of Connecticut has welfare reform, and one of the things we have done, which is a very caring aspect of this effort, is that in our welfare reform bill in the State of Connecticut, while we are pushing people off of welfare, when they work they are allowed to keep their welfare health care, and by their keeping their health care they are able to protect their families while they are working in a job that does not yet provide that. So our State is saving money as well by having welfare health

care be under managed care, and the logic was if the average man and woman in this country has managed care for health care, why should it not also apply for those who have it as seniors who would take it by choice, not by requirement, or those who have it as welfare recipients who pay no taxes, who are getting health care at the taxpayers' expense; why should they not have managed care, and why would they not have better health care, and the fact is they have better health care by it being managed.

IMPROVING EDUCATION IN OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, tonight I rise to talk about two very important issues; one, education, and how we move forward in this Congress and in Congresses to come as relates to education from a budgetary perspective. I would first like to bring to the House's attention a meeting that the Education Caucus held on July 31 of 1996. Right before we left for the August break we had a caucus meeting, and we talked about bringing businesses together to talk about how we can get businesses involved in improving education for our country because we feel that that, Mr. Speaker, is a relationship and a marriage that must be forged all across this country in order to improve the quality of education in this Nation. I am very happy that Senator WELLSTONE from the other body, who is the co-chair along with myself of this Education Caucus, cochaired this meeting with me, and we had several panelists who discussed various ways that the business community could help in improving education in this country.

One of the panelists, Mr. Speaker and Members, was Audrey Easaw from Giant Food. She was the project manager for Apples for Students Plus.

This is a very unique program that Giant Food market decided to institute in several States across the country, and we certainly urge other businesses across America to do the same, because when businesses actually take an interest in education in which they get dividends in the long run because, after all, these are the individuals that they will be employing to run their businesses. Giant Food market decided to embark upon a program where they actually go in and put computers in schools.

I mean you have heard the President and you have heard the Vice President talk about the need to put computers in every classroom across America to bring our kids into the 21st century and to also prepare them for the Superhighway, Information Highway.

Giant supermarket has already taken this challenge and accepted this chal-

lenge, and I am happy that, according to their testimony, Mr. Speaker, they are operating in four States, and what they choose to do is go into a school or go into a community, go into a State and actually put the computers, the software into the schools and help kids through the necessary tutorial programs where they train teachers and then help teachers train kids about computers and the necessary software.

One of the unique ways they raise money for this project is by taking a certain percentage of the gross receipts of individuals who are consumers who shop at their stores. So that also encourages people to shop and save their receipts and then give them to the school kids to turn them in at the next school day so that they can be credited at the end of the day for more and additional software.

So that is in fact, Mr. Speaker and Members, a program that I am very pleased about, and I want to put the testimony of Audrey Easaw into the RECORD.

They not only buy computers, but they also buy telescopes, microscopes, math equipment. TV's, VCR's, and other equipment that the school may need as relates to telecommunication and communications in general.

They have also established an adopt-a-school program, and I am talking about these programs, Mr. Speaker, because I want individuals to know what kind of impact businesses can have on schools, because there are many schools across America, quite frankly speaking, that just do not have the necessary dollars in order to improve the infrastructure, in order to improve the computer technology within the schools, and therefore businesses can merge or forge a relationship with schools and actually get a benefit as a result of it. They have an adopt-a-school program where they target over 10,000 businesses per year to challenge them to put matching funds from their employees. When their employees give money, then they challenge businesses to match those funds as well.

We have the opinion that government cannot do everything and cannot do it all, not only in education, but in any facet of our society. But when we have everybody pulling that wagon in the same direction, then we can get there a lot quicker.

So I would like to put the testimony of Miss Audrey Easaw in the RECORD, and next I want to talk about a Mr. Norman Manasa. He is from the National Education Project Inc. who testified before the caucus, the Education Caucus. They started and initiated a nationwide tutorial program serving medium-sized cities. They decided to go into medium-sized cities and actually build schools and have a tutorial program to educate kids in math, reading, science, and other subjects, and they do it very intense. They actually go into a school and have schools to open up hours and actually have tutors on staff to help train kids in the necessary subjects.