

most welfare recipients want is an opportunity to work—not a welfare check!

This bill, Mr. Speaker, does nothing to empower people. It does nothing to address those very important secondary impediments to welfare mothers going to work, the need for day care for their children so they can go to work, and the need for health care for their children.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the bill fails to invest the resources in job training and education necessary to equip welfare mothers to compete for the jobs that are available.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only thing this bill guarantees to our children, is that once their parents have used their allotted benefits—that's it! There is no other safety net for these families or their children.

So no matter what happens to the Nation's economy or the economy of your State, no matter what happens with your personal circumstances, regardless of your efforts to secure employment, that is it—no more benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would abolish the entitlement status of those essential programs that protect our children from hunger and homelessness.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that no longer are poor children guaranteed that they will grow up with a roof over their head and food in their mouths.

In fact what our children are guaranteed, Mr. Speaker, is that their basic health and nutrition needs will now be subject to individual State priorities and each new Congress views about their mothers and their willingness to work.

What we have done in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to decide that welfare and single mothers and their children are the root of all evil in this society and if we are to ever balance the budget we must get these pariahs off the rolls.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that 70 percent of all welfare recipients are off welfare in 2 years and only 12 percent of all welfare recipients stay on welfare more than 5 years. So why this body would base welfare policy on the 12 percent of people who have not, will not or cannot get off welfare is beyond me.

This bill would require, or as we like to say in Washington—mandate—that States deny AFDC permanently to families where the children were born after this bill's passage to unmarried mothers younger than 18. States would also have the option to deny assistance to children born to unmarried mothers younger than 21.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow States to eliminate all cash benefits to families who have received aid for 2 years and—permanently—bar such families from any future aid if the parent had participated in the work program for at least 1 year. After 5 years, States would be required/or mandated to terminate permanently the family from cash assistance.

The State even if it wanted to continue cash payments would be directed by Washington to deny this benefit.

In both of these cases, Mr. Speaker, the Contract on Americans would allow children and families to be left without any cash help or a public service job even when the parent was willing to work but unable to find private sector employment.

An even more ominous provision in this assault on America's children, Mr. Speaker, would take the savings generated by denying assistance to unmarried teens and their children, and use those same funds to build orphanages for those children or group homes for those children and their teen parents rendered destitute by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is open season on poor American children and the people sent here to protect them are running roughshod over them with careless indifference or conscious disregard.

My district, Mr. Speaker, has 61,000 children living below the poverty line. I am not interested in orphanages and group homes, I am interested in jobs that will employ the parents of these children.

What is required, Mr. Speaker, is an honest appraisal, free of finger pointing, free of race baiting, free of vitriolic attacks on lobbyless women and children, and most important, Mr. Speaker, a real commitment to creating jobs.

□ 1520

An even more ominous provision in this assault on America's children is that it would take the savings generated by denying assistance to the unmarried teens and their children. As we debate this issue coming up next week on the floor of the House, let's take a hard look at the Personal Responsibility Act and hold it responsible.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FROM TODAY UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT AND ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM TODAY UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 30) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 30

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 16, 1995, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, February 16, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon, or at such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, on Wednesday,

February 22, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly exciting to see what has been happening in this town since January 4. It seems for the past 40 or so years we have had an institution in Congress that was not responsive to the needs of Americans across the country; that did not seem to care about what was going on in the lives of middle class Americans, from Maine to California, from Florida to Washington State. In fact, things had gotten so bad that just a few months back only 18 percent of Americans thought Congress was doing a good job.

Today, only a month and a half after the 104th Congress convened on January 4th, almost 50 percent of Americans now believe Congress is doing a good job and we are on the right track. And for good reason. Look what has happened.

Of course, there are things we have not addressed yet. There are problems we have not had time to work out. But let us look at what we have done in just a few short weeks.

We have undertaken real institutional reform, reform that all Americans are in favor of, even the most simple basic reform that Congresses in the past have ignored. They have not listened to what Americans have wanted.

We started with the Shays Act. The first day it was passed, and it is an act that makes Congress abide by the same rules and regulations that they force on individuals, on families, on businesses, on States, on the rest of America. I cannot tell you how many times I heard people across my district and across the country pound their fist into their hands, angry, saying why can they pass laws, and then conveniently exempt themselves from it? What makes Congress and the Members of Congress feel so arrogant that they somehow believe that they are above the law? Why does Congress not do what the overwhelming majority of the American people want them to do. Is this not a representative democracy?

Well, the 104th Congress answered the call quickly, and before we were out the first day, we passed the Shays Act, which pushed forward a very simple proposition, and that is Congress abides by the same laws that the rest of us have to abide by. That was a great first day.

But if that was the only thing we had done the first day, it would have been an unqualified success. But we went further. We also cut staff by one-third. Committee staff was cut by one-third. And we did more than that. We cut congressional staff. Members now were restricted by the number of staff they had working in their offices and back in their individual districts.

We have recently passed regulations that will cut franking by one-third. It is a reform that Americans have called for, for years, and it is a reform that the 104th Congress answered.

We also finally put term limits on committee chairmen. So many people were disgusted with what they saw in the last few Congresses, by the power amassed by the Dan Rostenkowskis of the House, and the people said enough is enough. And once again the 104th Congress answered the people's call and put term limits on committee chairmanships.

But they went a step further. They even put term limits on the Speaker of the House, something that is absolutely unprecedented.

You hear so much from the other side of the aisle, trying to build up these monsters and trying to vilify Members of the 104th Congress. Some have even suggested that our Speaker is setting up this strong Sam Rayburn style speakership, as if he is power hungry. The fact of the matter is Sam Rayburn would have never agreed to put term limits on himself. We have leadership that is moving forward, we have got Members on both sides of the aisle that are moving forward toward institutional reform. And I for one say it is about time.

I know, because this time last year, I was not a Congressman, I was not a State senator, I was not in the State legislature, I was not a county commissioner or a city councilman. I was a citizen. I was a citizen who decided I was sick and tired of what was going on in Washington, DC, and I wanted to be part of a real and dramatic change.

As the election returns came in November 8, 1994, it became clear to every body across the country that there were a lot of citizens like myself that had gotten off the couch. They did not have special interests behind them; they did not have power brokers behind them; they did not have powerful party leadership behind them. They only had simple ideas behind them. They only had reform on their side. And in 1994 when all Americans got up off the couch and said enough is enough, the ideals that we put forward in our campaign was enough. People called for reform, we got elected, we came to this

Congress, and we have put forward great reform.

We also passed a limitation on tax increases. We have to have a three-fifths supermajority now to pass any tax increases on middle class citizens across this country. Let me tell you something: That is incredibly important, when you consider that in 1993 the 103d Congress ignored their constituents and ignored Americans from coast to coast and passed the largest tax increase in the history of this country by one vote.

We now require a supermajority, and because of it, the taxpayers have received what I call a taxpayer protection plan, to make sure that Congress stops stealing money from citizens across the country to feed their own special interest pork-barrel projects. And that was a great step forward, when you consider that the average American spends 50 percent of his or her time working to pay off taxes, fees and regulations imposed on them by Government.

Think about that. When you go to work on Monday morning, you are going to work for the Government to pay off taxes, fees and regulations. When you go to work Tuesday morning, you are still working for the Government.

□ 1530

When you go to work Wednesday morning, you are still working to pay off taxes, fees and regulations put on you by the Government. It is not until you come back from lunch on Wednesday afternoon that you actually start putting money into your own pocket, into your own savings account for what you need to get by.

Let's put it another way. None of us will be working for ourselves until July 1. We will be working to pay off taxes, fees and regulation put on us by the Government until July 1. That means we all have more months to work to pay off taxes, fees and regulations put on us by the Government. Before we are able to put aside 1 cent for ourselves, before we are able to put aside money to pay off our cars, or to pay off our mortgage, or to put money aside for our children's educational plans or, heaven forbid, until we can put aside any money for retirement.

Our tax system is a system that punishes productivity. It is a system that tells individuals and businesses and families, "The harder you work, the more you're going to be punished."

We finally put in a taxpayers' protection plan. Our leader now is talking about a flat tax that will tax all Americans evenly and fairly at the same percentage rate to make sure that you are not punished, that you do not pay at a higher percentage if you dare to be productive, if you dare to invest, if you dare to do things that this country was founded upon.

We are finally moving toward encouraging hard work and productivity and personal sacrifice. I say it is about

time, and I am honored to be a part of that process. Again, it is something that we have already passed in this 104th Congress.

We passed a line-item veto. That is something that President Ronald Reagan had been calling for for years. That is something that the American people have been calling for for years. Look at the polls in the USA Today and in Time and Newsweek and these other magazines. They all say an overwhelming majority of Americans have supported a line-item veto so the President can look through these huge budgets filled with pork and be responsible and cut out line items of wasteful spending. It is about time.

Again, it is something Americans have wanted this Congress to do for a long time, and yet it is something that was ignored until the 104th Congress came to town and we have passed it.

Some people have said, "Well, a line-item veto is great, I was for it when Ronald Reagan was President, I was for it when George Bush was President. But now that Bill Clinton is President, I don't know if I'm for the line-item veto anymore or not."

Let me tell you something. It does not matter who the President is. It finally brings accountability to the process.

For too long we have had people on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue pointing at each other. We have had people from the White House blaming the Congress, saying, "Hey, they've never sent us a balanced budget." The same thing was argued the other way around.

Finally the buck stops at the White House, and we have something in place where the President will finally not be able to blame Congress or blame anybody else if these pork-barrel projects go through. He simply takes out his pen, lines through the appropriation, and we have accountability in the budget process, and we have it because the 104th Congress also passed it.

We have a balanced budget amendment that is passed from this House and is now over in the Senate. That is another thing that Americans have been for for years and another thing that Congress has ignored.

I have got to tell you when you start lining up all these things that Americans have been for and you start realizing that Congresses in the years past have covered their ears and shut their eyes and pretended that Americans did not count, that they were above the law, that they were above public opinion, that they were above being in a representative democracy, a constitutional republic, you can now see why the revolution took place.

People demanded accountability. Republicans and Democrats and Independents demanded accountability. The Republican Party has come to town and with the help of people on both sides of the aisle and Independents across the country, we have passed these reforms

through. But this is not simply a Republican revolution.

In my district, 60 percent of the people who voted in the 1994 election were Democrats. Sixty percent. I am a Republican. Yet I received 62 percent of the total vote. That is overwhelming. It is overwhelming because it shows that the issues that unite Americans are not about whether you are Republican or Democrat or conservative or liberal or independent. It is about accountability. It is about listening to Americans and voting your conscience and voting the way Americans want you to vote, the way that our Founding Fathers wanted us to vote. We have done it. We did it today on H.R. 7. We have taken a crucial step forward in once again making our shores safe and our military strong.

There is no doubt we have had the strongest military in the history of the world. But unfortunately we have continued cutbacks. Many believe now that we are close to having a hollow force. Beyond that, there has been another danger. There has been a danger of shifting control from U.S. military men and women, from our generals and admirals and our Commander in Chief to the U.N.

Just think about it. Think about the fact that we have men and women who may go into combat, and when they go into combat, they will not be fighting under American generals or American admirals.

Is there a problem with having them under the U.N. flag? Is there a problem with our service men and women serving under foreign leaders? Yeah, there is.

Our troops fight to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. There is a real problem when the Constitution is bypassed in military exercises. I want to point out what happened in Haiti a few months back.

We had a President who wanted to push for an invasion of Haiti, but he could not get it passed through Congress. He could not garner the sufficient support in this constitutionally elected body to have support to send men and women, mothers and fathers to Haiti into a conflict where they could die.

Our Founding Fathers knew how important it was that our President could not sent Americans into war without approval of this Congress. But what did the President of the United States do when he could not do it through constitutional channels, through the Congress? He went to the United Nations. There is a real problem with that as far as I am concerned. It usurps essential powers that were given to this Congress over 200 years ago by the Founders of this great Republic.

You need to go through a democratically elected body if you are going to put Americans' lives at risk. H.R. 7 finally steps up to the plate and puts an end to some of this madness. It is a first step down a road where we will fi-

nally consolidate power where it needs to be, and, that is, with American generals, admirals and our Commander in Chief.

But there is more than the U.N. We have the Mexico problem. It does not matter where you stand on Mexico, you have got to look and see what the President did, and it has to cause you a great deal of concern. Because just like in Haiti, when he could not get approval in Congress, he wanted to push this Mexican bailout plan, this loan guarantee. He said he was going to get it approved in Congress. He could not get it approved in Congress, so what did he do? He bypassed Congress again, as if we do not matter, as if the 250 million or so Americans that this institution represents are somehow irrelevant. Instead he turned and used a fund that was set up to keep the dollar strong across the world.

□ 1540

But he did not use it for the dollar. He used it to prop up the peso. It certainly violated the spirit, if not the actual letter of the law, and I would encourage the President of the United States to read his Constitution and once again bring these matters to an elected body so they can be debated and discussed the way they need to, before they are implemented.

H.R. 7 also helps answer a big lie that has been spread, and let me tell you what the big lie is. The big lie has been spread over the past 5 years that somehow this country is safer today than it was before the collapse of the Soviet empire. Even though it sounds great, even though we hear about the demise of the Evil Empire and that somehow is supposed to make us feel that we are in a safer world today, the facts point out something very different.

The fact of the matter is there are still nuclear missiles in Russia, they are still pointed our way, but there is a big difference between now and 5 years ago. Now we have madmen like Zhirinovskiy, a neo-Nazi ascending to power in the former Soviet Union. He is a man who is so unstable that he threatened to nuke Germany after he ascended to power because they would not let him in their country.

We have got economic and political and military and social chaos in the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union. We cannot afford to let down our defenses because Boris Yeltsin may be in power today, but all indications show that a very powerful totalitarian force could easily overtake the former Soviet Union again and launch us into another cold war.

It is constitutionally our first responsibility as a Government, as a Federal Government, to protect the men and women and children in this country from foreign attack. And that is what H.R. 7 does.

Another fact that concerns all of us, or should concern all of us, is the growth of China. In the 1980's, China was the second fastest growing economy in all of Asia, a region that is

booming economically. In fact, last year China's economic growth grew at a staggering 19-percent clip, and make no mistake of it, China is using this new-found economic prowess to develop, build, and export weapons technology to Third World countries. We have got to keep our guard up.

And we have got to keep our guard up because a recent Foreign Affairs article, which I do not subscribe to everything I read in Foreign Affairs, that is for sure, but a recent Foreign Affairs article stated that in 5 years over 20 countries are going to have intermediate missile range capability, and they are not going to be the select nuclear club that we used to have: the United States, England, France, China, India; it is going to expand and all of a sudden we might find 5 years down the road that people like Saddam Hussein and Qadhafi and our North Korean leaders will have this weapons technology and the ability to launch those weapons across continents.

Let me tell you something. The world is more dangerous today than it was 5 years ago, and anybody who tells you anything different is either ignorant of the facts that are out there to be read and studied or else they are glossing over the truth for their own political reasons.

We live in a dangerous world, and H.R. 7 was the first step to answer the call of all Americans across this country who said do not let our forces become hollow like they were in the late 1970's.

We are rebuilding this country because our children's lives are at stake. We have welfare reform coming up, something that all Americans or a majority of Americans have supported for a long time. And more importantly, we are not only talking about these basic reforms in the Contract With America, we are talking about moving beyond those reforms and restructuring the way this government works.

But I want to ask before we talk about our next step, let us examine what we have done in 50 days. Let me read through this again because it is absolutely incredible. In 50 days or less we have made Congress accountable by making them abide by the same laws that all Americans have to abide by. We have cut committee staff by one-third. We have cut congressional staff. We have cut franking by one-third. We have put term limits on committee chairmen, we have put term limits on the Speaker of the House. Actually the Speaker put term limits on himself and adopted that.

We have passed three-fifths tax limitation. I call it the taxpayer protection plan. I do not care what you call it; what it does is it guarantees this Federal Government is not going to be reaching in your pocket for the next 2 years, and when we pass the rest of the three-fifths balanced budget amendment next year we will be protected for years to come.

We have passed line-item veto, we have passed a balanced budget amendment, and we have passed H.R. 7, an act that will once again keep our military strong and guarantee us that we will be able to answer the challenges that are facing us in this extremely dangerous world.

This past week Members of the freshman class stepped forward, some have called us new Federalists and they have called us new Federalists because we have read the Federalist Papers. We have read the writings of James Madison, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay and other Founding Fathers, and we are committed to return this government to be the type of government our Founding Fathers intended it to be.

I am moved by the words of James Madison who over 200 years ago as he was framing this Constitution wrote, "We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government." Did you hear that? "We have staked the entire future of American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, and sustain ourselves, according to the Ten Commandments of God." That was James Madison, a man who helped frame the Constitution. And it was Thomas Jefferson who wrote the government that governs least governs best.

And our own tenth amendment, our own tenth amendment, the poor, forgotten tenth amendment says all powers not specifically given to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the people. Think about that. Read through your Constitution, I urge all of you. I carry a Constitution. Get a hand copy of the Constitution. If you do not have it call my office, again Congressman JOE SCARBOROUGH. We will get you a copy of the Constitution. Read through it and read the 10th amendment and circle it and look through that Constitution and see what the Federal power is empowered to do and what it is not empowered to do. And if you force your representative to live by the words of the 10th amendment, to live by the constraints of the 10th amendment, then this Federal Government will once again be accountable.

We have started down that path. We need to continue. We need to be constitutionally accountable, and that is what the new Federalists, that is what freshmen reformers have been intending to do this past week when we announced bold proposals to move this Congress forward towards a 10th amendment vision.

I would like to recognize for a few minutes a man who helped lead a very critical portion of the new Federalists agenda, and that is the Honorable SAM BROWNBACK from Kansas. SAM.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me for a moment. I would just like to talk to Members, the Chamber and those

listening about what we did this past week. It was on Wednesday we came forward with a proposal announcing task forces that would develop the proposals to eliminate 4 Cabinet-level agencies, the agencies of Commerce, Education, Energy, and HUD.

□ 1550

And the proposals are that we would look at these agencies and we would ask the questions: Do they perform essential functions? And if not, can they be eliminated? Can we get many of these solutions and these issues back to the people? Can we give these things back to the people, back to local units of government? Can we consolidate some of these functions? Can we eliminate others? And getting back to what the Founding Fathers had envisioned for our Nation.

It is interesting to me to note Alice Rivlin, the current Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in a 1992 book, said she does not think the Federal Government ought to be involved in education. It should not be involved in economic development. It should not be involved in some of these centralized planning functions that are taking place. And that is what we are talking about here.

You know, most of these Cabinet agencies, three of the four, were created since 1965. Housing and Urban Development was created in 1965. Energy and Education were created in the late 1970's. They were created at a time when we had a crisis. In the urban areas in the mid-1960's, we had a crisis in urban America.

What was our solution in that time period? Our solution was let us build a government bureaucracy. We built one. In the late 1970's we said we have a crisis in energy. What is the solution? Let us build a government bureaucracy. We have a crisis in education. What was the solution? Let us build a government bureaucracy.

So we focused centrally in Washington for all the solutions to these problems, and we put our energy and our focus and our efforts and intensity here when the problem was out there, and our urban cities were decaying in New York and in Washington, DC, as the city, not the capital, and in Los Angeles and in our classrooms is where the problem was. It was not we needed more bureaucracy. It is we needed more help in the classroom, and we needed to liberate and free people.

In housing areas, the problem was not the need for a centralized planning agency. The need was for more housing in communities and to free people up to be able to deal with the problems they had in their communities.

We say these experiments have not worked, that centralized planning, whether in the former Soviet Union or in the United States of America, does not work in a large, diverse nation like the United States.

We think that these agencies, that four things will guide our purposes in developing the proposals to eliminate

these four agencies. No. 1 will be to privatize. Wherever we can privatize functions and get them out to the private sector, we will do that in the efficiency of the private sector.

Second will be localize. Anytime we can send these issues to the States or local units of government to handle, closer to the people, closer to the people, that is what we will do.

We will consolidate. Where two agencies grew that we will have one in the future so we can consolidate a number of these functions and that we can eliminate whatever functions are outmoded, outdated, or antiquated, that those would be eliminated.

So at the end of the day that we empower people, we empower communities, we empower the States to be able to really deal with these issues, and we think that is where actual solutions will occur. That is where homes are built. They are built across this Nation. They are not built in bureaucracies in Washington. Kids are taught in classrooms across this Nation. They are not taught in a bureaucracy in Washington. Energy is dealt with in the marketplace and by individual decisions, by 250 million Americans. They are not dealt with by a bureaucracy in Washington.

We will free and liberate people. We will be realigning the relationship of the Federal Government to the people, and it will be a very powerful thing for growth and for actually dealing with our problems, for actually accomplishing solutions to our problems, and it is desperately needed.

You quote one of the early Federalists. I quote Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was quoted a saying that moments for great innovation in history are few and far between. We stand at one of those moments of great innovation in the history of this country, of the ability to realign the relationship of the Federal Government to the people, of making the Federal Government the servant once again and not the master of the people. We are supposed to be able to help and encourage, not to direct, command, and control, and that is what we seek to do, and we will be a better country, and we will be a growth country. It will be a better society. It will be a government for the people, not commander of the people. And that is what we seek to do. We will be developing our plans and proposals, bringing those out sometime in the springtime.

I would encourage the American people to contact their Congressmen if they are interested and encouraged about that. It has been interesting to me, the early feedback we have received has not been you cannot do that; it has been, "Well, would you look at the other agencies? What about the Department of Labor? What about some of the other agencies?" I think that is very encouraging to open the floodgate of ideas and liberation for the people in this country and get the Federal Government back to its core

functions that it should do rather than all the far-flung areas.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. You mentioned something very interesting. You kept talking about these different agencies and you kept saying it does not work. I never heard you say it is about ideology or some right-wing radical philosophy. I did not hear that at all.

It reminds me of when I wanted to get involved with this. It was not about any deep-seated philosophy or any philosophical ax I had to grind. It was about what works and what does not work.

I have got a 7-year-old boy that is in public schools, and I am very concerned about what type of educational system he is going to be growing up in. You look at the statistics of what has happened since the Department of Education was established in 1979, and every single statistic points to a decay in educational standards across this country. The Department of Education has been an absolute and total abject failure.

You know, they only provide 8 percent of funding to local schools, and yet they dump on them 55 percent of their paperwork. And people talk about, well, what is the problem with having this bureaucracy; gee, it is a great symbolic gesture. It is robbing money from my child, from your children, and from children all across the country.

A perfect example I read on the front of USA Today about a week ago the Department of Education has cut funding by \$100 million for the upkeep of public schools to make them safe across the country, by \$100 million, and yet at the same time, they are increasing funding on their own infrastructure, their own bureaucracy down the road by \$20 million.

So let us get this straight, they take your money and my money and our constituent's money, tax money, they send it up to Washington, they put a brokerage fee on it. Of course, everybody takes their little chunk of the pie out of the brokerage fee, and then they claim to send it back to the States.

But now it has gotten so bad they say, "We are not even sending the \$100 million to the States for upkeep of schools to make them safe. Instead, we are cutting that out, and we are going to spend \$20 million of those dollars fixing up our bureaucracy in Washington, DC."

Now, that is a sham. That does not work, and it is about what does not work.

You know, Peggy Noonan, who was Ronald Reagan's speech writer, talked about an encounter she had with the President in the early seventies when he was then Governor of California, and she asked the President, she said, "How could you be a conservative?" because she had just gotten out of college, and she was a liberal. I do not know if you would call Peggy Noonan a hippie. I do not know if she is ever capable of being a hippie. Peggy Noonan

said, "Mr. Reagan, how can you be a conservative? Why aren't you a liberal?" And Ronald Reagan said, "Because it doesn't work." And that is the truth. It does not work.

This is not about ideology. It is about what works.

Mr. BROWNBAC. If the gentleman will yield further, and that is absolutely what it is. It is not about the ideology or the left or right or center or the middle or whatever the case might be. What this is about is what has failed.

I do not think that we can stand here and at all say to the American people, "Look, we have not tried this. We have not tried centralized planning from Washington on these areas." We have. We have tried it up to 30 years in HUD. We tried it for 15 years in these other agencies. It has not worked. It does not work.

The American people want to be liberated, and I will tell you what will happen when that does occur. If we say, as far as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, look, we are not going to do this in Washington anymore. We have got some funds we are going to block grant to the States, local units of government. We want it generally used for housing, "but you figure out your problems." There will be thousands of different solutions that will come forward because we have millions of different people and thousands of different ideas and how we solve it; Topeka, KS, is different than they solve it in New York City or Austin, TX. It is just we are different people in a different nation, a diverse nation, and will come up with different solutions, because one size does not fit all in America, and the same will work in education. People were saying, well, if we do not have somebody in Washington looking out for our children, well, what is going to happen to them in education. I think what will happen to them in education is things will get better, because parents care more for their children than somebody running a government agency does, and people on a local school board know those families much more than somebody working in a government office building in Washington.

One final point, and then I will yield back the rest of the time.

□ 1600

The final point is that there are a number of good people that work in government, and that is what Jack Kemp said at our press conference, who was the former Secretary of HUD, who is also on board in supporting us. We have former cabinet secretaries of all these agencies working with us to dismantle all these agencies. They run them. They know they do not work.

Jack was saying, "Well, these are good people; there's just too many of them, and we shouldn't be doing this. It should be happening out in the communities and the individuals," and that is what we are about, having people doing these things to where the an-

swers really occur and not just command and control out of Washington.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. You know, again you talked about Jack Kemp and saying that they are good people. I have been asked the question of what is going to happen to all these good workers, especially in the education field because that is what I do. That is a task force I am heading up, the education task force.

I was also struck by Jack Kemp's comments, and I thought, and again getting back to the fact this is not ideological, this is not a battle over ideology. It is a battle over what works and what does not work.

Well, Mr. Kemp's comments remind me of the Alice Rivlin book you cite, and I read the book and I know you have, and I certainly hope the President of the United States reads Ms. Rivlin's book and follows her suggestions because they are great suggestions. But Ms. Rivlin talked about the drain, the talent drain, the brain drain, that this huge bureaucracy has caused, that from 1932 to 1980, when we had this explosion of growth in the government, not only does that suck up all the money across the country to Washington, it also sucked up all the talent we have, extremely talented people working in Washington, DC.

So what happens when we downsize these agencies, when we do away with these bureaucracies that are preventing them even from showing their true talents, stifling them, that are handcuffing them? What happens? They go home, and they enrich their communities, and they enrich the neighborhoods from whence they came. Washington, DC, does not need another bureaucrat, but that bureaucrat in Washington, DC will be a productive member of the community, and that is something Alice Rivlin wrote about in her book. She said, "So much of the talent is now concentrated in Washington, we need to spread it across the country, just like we need to spread the money back across the country and send it back to the people, send it back to the communities, because our Founding Fathers intended us to be a Nation of communities and not a Nation of bureaucracies."

And I am just struck. Let us talk about some of the people briefly that are supporting this. The gentleman mentioned Jack Kemp. We have mentioned Alice Rivlin. I know Leon Panetta once endorsed abolishing some of these agencies.

Who are some of the others?

Mr. BROWNBAC. Secretary Mossbacher that used to run the Department of Commerce was there at the press conference endorsing this. Don Hodel, who used to run the Department of Energy I talked to today is strongly supporting us. Henson Moore that used to be the secretary in command at the Department on Energy, I visited with him today and working with him on this particular project as

well. Those are people both at HUD and Energy. At Education, Dr. Bennett and Lamar Alexander have publicly endorsed doing away with the Department of Education as a way we can create better education and innovation across the country. They both have publicly endorsed this as well in that field.

So, you have got secretaries in Commerce, in HUD, in Energy, in Education, all saying "Look, folks. We tried it. We tried it hard. We tried it with billions and trillions of dollars. Centralized planing in the Soviet Union, former Soviet Union or the United States, doesn't work. You got to get it back home, and this is the way you do it."

And we are just starting, and I hope the American people lean in toward this concept and help us move this on forward to get the government back out to the people.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If I could, and I know the gentleman needs to be going on, but could you just tell me if your experience coming to Washington, DC was the same as mine because I know we were both citizens and removed from this process, but were you not filled with the sense of awe when you came up here and saw freshmen, and sophomores, and so-called old bulls that all want to move in this direction of reform and bringing power back to the States? I never in a million years expected to find so many allies in this cause to downsize the Federal Government, and it just amazes me that we have done more in 50 days than the past Congresses have been able to do in the past 50 years as far as institutional reform, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWNBAC. That is obviously the case, and that is what I am getting as well, and we had at that same press conference the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], all of which acted as if their soul was having a chorus of angels singing to it, but they were ecstatic that here were people willing to stand up and say, "Enough is enough. We tried it. It doesn't work. It's time to try something else."

And then they were all saying that, and that is what I continue to get from people all across the Government and across the Nation. Look, we have tried it, and we have really tried it. It is time to move on, and let us try something different that we think really can work and can be liberating to the people across the country, and you are seeing it take place from this freshman reform group, 73 of us coming in strong at this time, many of us elected on the type of agenda I was, reduce the Federal Government, reform the Congress, return to the basic values that built

the country, those being the watch words for us.

And I cannot help but think the original Federalists are saying, "It's about time."

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. It is about time, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBAC] for his leadership in this area because it is long overdue, and I hope this Congress will move forward, and more than that I hope that the American people that stood up and said, "Enough is enough," on November 8 will continue to take a proactive role and say, "We're not going to sit back anymore; we are going to change this Government," and they will continue to use whatever means possible, whether it is the fax machine, or talk radio, or mail, or e-mail, or the town hall meetings that we are all doing. I hope they will continue to use that and put external pressure on this institution and their own Representative to say enough is enough.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. I wanted to jump in the conversation for a moment because you are hitting on, I think, a nerve out in America. What I found when I went home, the average citizen, not the political pundit, not the editorial writer, the citizen I saw at the south Florida fair came up to me and said, "Keep doing what you're doing. Make Government more accountable." They had their little children with them, and the detailed stories of trying to get information out of the school board or trying to call Tallahassee for information about their student's performance, their child's performance. It was unavailable.

So what I am hearing from the citizenry out there:

It's not about being a Republican or Democrat. It is about being American, about making a Government work.

I served with you both on the restructuring, if you will, of some of these agencies; I am on the Energy Committee, the subcommittee, working on reform. It is ironic in one of the committees the other day I am reading the material about the Energy Department and how they have a clean coal study, and this clean coal study is to allow us to use a variety of fossil fuels to diversify away from just gas, and oil, petroleum, to use coal. Well, clean coal, we are spending millions of dollars on technology to make it available and efficient. At the same time in my district in Florida Carol Browner, who is at EPA, has canceled the program to build a clean coal facility in Okeechobee, so you have one agency making rules saying, "We want to have this technology," and one agency of the same branch of the Government appointed by the same President of the United States and saying, "No, but we don't want to do that."

So the dilemma here for all of us as new Representatives, as freshmen of the 104th Congress, is to figure out how

we break down the difficulty that every American faces when they approach Government.

I did not know this job when I came was about running interference for constituents and problems that they were having with agencies regarding laws that we have created. That was not the job that I ran for, to really be a clerk, if you will, of taking their complaints, and running to an agency and saying, "The law that was passed in the 103d, 102d, 101st Congress is now having this onerous burden on business, on the human race."

□ 1610

That is what it has become. So the effort amongst us as freshmen and sophomores and all the Members of the 104th Congress is really about making Government more efficient.

I want to make one other comment, because the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] did such a tremendous job in explaining the issue that is so important on national security. I think probably one of the most passionate speeches I heard on this floor was Mr. DELLUMS from California, about ideas, about making America work, about making our interest, our national interest a priority to this Congress. So I thank the gentleman from Florida, because I think he has capsulized what the debate on national security was about. That is what we are here for in the 104th Congress.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. You bring up Mr. DELLUMS. You talked about your surprises when coming to Congress. I am going to tell you one of my surprises coming to Congress. I had campaigned, I am from northwest Florida, we believe in a very strong national defense down there, and RON DELLUMS has been perceived as a super liberal. And somebody during the campaign, quite frankly I heard a lot of questions about it. People said what is the deal with this RON DELLUMS guy? When I came up and started talking to people on the Committee on National Security, I would be talking about him, and I was amazed that these hawks that were always on the opposite side of RON DELLUMS it seemed like on every issue, spoke in the most glowing terms of Mr. DELLUMS because he is a very articulate speaker, he has very deep convictions, and he says what he means.

That is what I was alluding to before, we can have disagreements on issues, we can disagree on the best way to have welfare reform, we can have disagreements on what is the best way to protect our shores. As long as we keep the debate at the level that Mr. DELLUMS always keeps the debate and other Members on our side of the aisle always keep the debate, we will be fine. Because in the end it is not about an ideological argument. It is not about who is going to win, whether Bill Buckley or Mike Kinsley or whoever is on whatever side of what issue as a commentator. They can do that on TV and they can yell at each other and get

high ratings. But we have to hold ourselves to a higher standard. We need to be interested in what works.

Let me tell you, the reforms we have undertaken in the first 50 days have worked, and have put this country back on track for the first time in a very long time. I am hearing that where I am going, and you have alluded to the fact that you are hearing about that where you are going. Are all the constituents you talk to, are they all in one accord about that?

Mr. FOLEY. I don't know if they agree philosophically on everything we are doing, but they agree there is a serious problem. On welfare, they know there is a problem. They know it is not working. They know if you spent \$5 trillion and the poverty level is higher than it was when the war on poverty was enacted, they know there is a significant difficulty.

You were talking about education with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK]. In Tallahassee, as the gentleman knows, we have a 17-story building designed by I.M. Pei, the internationally renowned architect. That building is as out of character with the landscape of Tallahassee as anything I have seen. It is not about ideas, it is people in that building who have never taught a classroom. That is a fundamental problem with the Department of Education in our State, that people are processing papers about our children. But the results never change for our children. The hands-on experience of the classroom will never get any better if we run it from our capitals of Tallahassee and Washington.

What I am hearing from people again is the fact that they feel that this is the greatest Nation on Earth, but they want to have pride in the people they have sent here. They do not want us yelling across the aisle and screaming at a Democrat. As Mr. DELLUMS said, it is about ideas. I will challenge you on your ideas, on your convictions, on what matters for this Government, but I will not challenge you personally.

What I am hearing when people call when we have been on C-SPAN and have been talking about the very issue of the day, they are delighted we are responding to what is their opinion. Mr. SCARBOROUGH, as you know, we have been accused with the contract of propaganda, of Republican stream-rolling everybody on ideas.

The premises of the contract, the 10 points of the contract were designed from surveys throughout America of what people were asking for, about term limits, about a balanced budget. These are not ideas we sat around at Republican party headquarters and thought up ourselves. This is the American public saying these are the changes we want. We are acting. We are working on an agenda. There is considerable reason for disagreement on some of the premises, but we are working in a collegial body that makes this body so effective and efficient.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Reclaiming the time, anybody who has seen the Department of Education in Tallahassee, as I know you have, knows that that is enough of a bureaucracy for our children in the State of Florida, and I have got to tell you it is a duplication of services, not only in Florida, but all across the country.

It is the same thing with a lot of other departments. We do not need two departments of education to teach our children. We need to free up tax dollars for individuals across this country that educate their children and once again give them choice and give them freedom to have their children taught in the way that they want to have them be taught. And if we listen to the ideas of Madison and Jefferson and the Founders of this great Republic, and if we once again look at the 10th amendment that once again says all powers not specifically given to the Federal Government in the Constitution are reserved to States and citizens, if we follow that path, we will once again become the type of nation we were intended to be, and that is a nation of communities, a nation of families, and a nation of individuals who once again take control of their own lives and can decide the way they want their community to be run, the way they want their family to be protected and taught, and the way they want their own life to be run.

It is a very constitutional premise, and I for one am honored and feel very privileged to be part of this process and to be part of the 104th Congress that actually dares to debate the great issues of the day. If we continue to do this, the second 50 days of our 100-day plan, and of the next 2 years, then this country will see change like it has never seen change before, and citizens across this country, men and women, will be empowered, and once again will have confidence in their country and believe that their elected leaders came here for a reason, and that reason was to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

A DISCUSSION OF THE CRIME PROBLEM IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to request the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for giving me an opportunity to proceed ahead.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Pensacola [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] for his brilliant testimony before the House and his compassion with which he has brought his efforts from the great State of Florida to this body.

But I want to spend a moment of the discussion on crime. We have had a great deal of debate over the last week and a half on an issue that plagues America, and that is the crime in our country. A murder is committed in the United States every 21 minutes, a rape every 5 minutes, a robbery every 46 seconds, an aggravated assault every 29 seconds, a burglary every 10 seconds, and a larceny theft every 4 seconds.

That is a sad commentary on our country. That is a sad part of America's heritage that we must change.

On average, violent offenders are released from prison, receive a sentence and serve an average of 7.8 years, but they only serve 3.1. More than 40 percent of murderers released from State prisons are arrested for a felony or serious misdemeanor within 3 years. A 40-percent recidivism rate. More than 20 percent are arrested for violent crimes within 3 years, and 1 in 15 is arrested for another homicide. At least 30 percent of murders are committed by people on probation, parole, or bail.

Another sad commentary is violent crimes by juveniles. Of those arrested for violent crimes between 1987 and 1992, 29 percent were under the age of 19. Between 1985 and 1991, the number of 15-year-olds arrested for murder jumped 217 percent. We had the sad tragedy in Florida of a British tourist being killed. The perpetrator, alleged perpetrator, of that crime had been arrested 53 times. Fifty-three times he had been arrested. Sadly enough, the person was 13 years old that is accused of committing the murders on those British tourists.

□ 1620

How are we going to change the statistics in our country? How are we going to ensure that our young people are safe on our street? How can we look at our families and our communities across America and give them some assurance that they can walk to the mall in their local communities, that they can take the dog out for a walk? That they can feel comfortable going to their car in a parking garage in an office structure throughout our cities? How can we be as certain of that safety for America?

We have enacted some very, very strong issues this week on the floor:

H.R. 3, Victim Restitution Act. I told you on the floor of what happened to me when my home was broken into years ago, and the young fellow, the juvenile, had been arrested 17 times, 17 separate occasions. The father came to the courtroom and said, "Your honor, we're trying, our son's a good boy." And each time the judge would allow probation for the child who had robbed 17 homes.

On this particular occasion, the judge looked down from the bench, the father started that same excuse, the judge looked down and said,

Let me make you a deal, sir. Mr. Foley has lost \$3,000 because of your son and he can't seem to remember where the merchandise is