

prevention grants. We put an end to playing games with promises of 100,000 new police. Let us be clear—the 1994 crime bill never fully funded 100,000 new police. In six years, the money runs out and our communities are stuck with the bill. This year we reformed that law, so local municipalities have the flexibility to spend that money however it suits their crime-fighting needs—new police, crime prevention programs, new equipment, community policing, even a patrol car if that is the best way to fight crime. Those communities that have received initial grants will be funded under the current program.

Our new crime bill goes even further. We provide incentive for States to ensure that violent criminals are incarcerated and we're requiring criminals convicted in Federal court to make restitution to their victims.

This new Republican Congress promised a back-to-basics approach in Washington, and we have been keeping that promise. We cut our budget, and slashed committee staff on our first day. We passed a bill requiring Congress to live under the same laws that every small business lives under.

The House passed a balanced budget amendment to force Congress to live within its means. This is more than an accounting device to make some bureaucrats in Washington feel good. It is about our children and grandchildren and their futures, and about putting an end to the immoral practice of piling the national debt on our future generations. I hope the Senate follows the House's lead and passes the balanced budget amendment.

For more than a decade, Republican Presidents have asked Democrat Congresses to grant them a line-item veto to control wasteful spending and outrageous pork projects. The Democrat-controlled Congresses never gave Presidents Reagan or Bush this tool. Just a few weeks ago, the Republican-controlled Congress extended this power to a Democrat President.

We also passed the unfunded mandates proposal. That will prohibit the Federal Government from passing on the costs for each program to local and State Governments without Washington, DC, participating in the program at all.

Last week, also restored some common sense to our national security and international relations policies. We passed a bill restricting the use of U.S. soldiers in U.N. missions. And we're requiring that U.S. soldiers be deployed to support missions only in our national interests. We have so few defense resources, we must ensure that we use them wisely. Our most precious national security resource—our men and women in uniform—must have the tools and training to be ready for any conflict.

What has been most impressive about all these successes has been our ability to attract significant bipartisan support. These have not been razor-thin partisan fights that we have seen in

past Congresses. The reason? We have passed these policies as supported by the American people and by a bipartisan Congress. We are not just passing bills, we are trying to get communities and families the tools to make their lives a little safer and the children a little less saddled with national debt. We are making government smaller, less costly and less intrusive.

In the first 50 days of this Congress we have met that challenge, and we are looking forward to the future to finishing this, to get the contract finished in the next 50 days.

MORE ON THE DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH CARE COSTS OF THE SELF-EMPLOYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MOLINARI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, I come here tonight to talk for a few minutes about the action that this body took tonight in passing the deduction for health care costs, insurance costs for the self-employed. It was something that many Members on our side of the aisle wanted to discuss, and there was not literally time for all of us who wanted to debate this important issue to talk and to express to our constituents our support for this important measure.

First of all, this was a tax fairness issue. Most people who work for major corporations get their health care insurance paid for, and that corporation deducts that from the bottom line. It comes out of the profits before they pay taxes. But the self-employed did not get that benefit. We have had it in the past, but it expired at the beginning of 1994. And here we are, in 1995, renewing a tax benefit for the small people in this country, for the self-employed in this country. And we are not doing it until February 1995.

Certainly, what we did here tonight was right. By the very vote, the overwhelming vote that it got from this body, it was correct. And I hope that the other body will soon follow suit and pass that tax deduction for health care costs and make it permanent. But we are not very taxpayer-friendly when we wait until February to pass a tax benefit for the little people in America for the year before.

I come from a rural part of Illinois, and many of my constituents have to file their tax returns by March. Farmers file their tax returns by March. Unfortunately, many of them have had their appointments, have come in and done their tax work and now today we are going to find they have a new tax deduction which they can take. That is what I mean when I say what we did here was not very taxpayer-friendly.

But I am pleased that this deduction, which will cost the Treasury, is being paid for by reduction in other Government expenses.

What we do to help small business helps support the very backbone of this country. Small business creates more jobs than all the big industries in America, and what we did today to make health care more affordable is the type of health care reform we need in this country, paid for by the private sector, health care reform that is not Government controlled.

Madam Speaker, I cannot tell my colleagues how pleased I am that this passed with such an overwhelming bipartisan vote on both sides of the aisle.

THE SELF-EMPLOYED DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH CARE COSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Madam Speaker, to my colleagues, I would like to say, let me acknowledge this evening my recognition and appreciation for the Houston Livestock and Rodeo Show, an entity in the city of Houston and the county of Harris in the State of Texas that has worked so hard to provide opportunities for inner-city youth and youth throughout our community by providing not only entertainment with real cowboys but also scholarships for greater opportunity. And they seek to provide those scholarships to a wide diversity of individuals in our city and in our county and in our State.

But as well tonight I want to speak just a moment about the vote that I took this evening. Tonight I voted for working Americans from all backgrounds. Specifically I voted to extend permanently the current 25-percent health insurance deduction for the self-employed. However, in addition, I voted for more hard-working Americans, employees whose employers do not subsidize their health care, having a deduction beginning now in 1996. This deduction would be phased in. In 1996, the deduction would be 15 percent of the employee's health insurance premiums and by 2000, the deduction would increase to 25 percent of the premium just like the deduction for self-employed individuals. The McDermott-Gibbons substitute was clearly the better deal for the needs of working Americans, the self-employed, and for employees with no health insurance. We fixed what was broken, a good deal. However, what the McDermott-Gibbons legislation did not do was give a raw deal to a valuable goal to allow minorities to access fairly ownership of radio and television broadcast stations and to increase minority ownership of cable television systems as well.

Certainly, the Republicans know what controlling the media is all about, while they will blast the talk shows with the misrepresentation that

their bill helped Americans with health care, false. It leaves out secretaries and clerks and other workers without health insurance, and it does so by breaking the backs of hard-working minority entrepreneurs who, since 1978 and with the FCC's section 1071, have moved from less than one-half percent minority radio and TV broadcast ownership to now about 3 percent.

Why slam all of our desires for good health care with the divisive dismantling of the mere empowerment of minority purchases of broadcast media? Let us reform FCC section 1071. I want to do that. I am a taxpayer, and I support taxpayer reform.

However, let us not stop the access to the first amendment of hard-working business persons never before given such a chance. This is simply a back door attempt, poised to further undermine racial cooperation in this country. If it was not, we would not have heard the Republicans raising the high platitudes of color blindness and the raising of Hispanic and African-American self-employed persons as a reason for their support of busting a program that would allow minorities for the first time to own radio and TV stations. The money to pay for the health insurance deductions for the self-employed and hard-working employees, as I voted for, is already there. Without the talk show fodder already being prepared for tomorrow, "we won the first blow to show those minorities that we live in a color-blind society." Well, the headline will already be stated and will read tomorrow, and should really be reading, "The Republicans do it again. Real working Americans, secretaries, clerks, and others left with no health insurance deductions and, yes, minorities again sent into media darkness, again, another blow to the first amendment."

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 46 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to convene tonight's special order to discuss dramatic improvements in how the Federal Government does business. These improvements have come thanks to the Clinton administration and the 103d Congress' efforts to reinvent government. The American people's faith in government is at a historic low. Recent surveys show that only 17 percent of Americans believe in the ability of their government. Outcries for change in both the 1992 and 1994 elections speak for themselves. But stump speeches denouncing government have successfully obscured the fact that government is changing. It is getting smaller, more efficient and more user friendly.

For the past 2 years, we have been working to implement the rec-

ommendations of Vice President GORE's National Performance Review. Implementation of these major reforms involves hard and patient work in the nuts and bolts of government management.

It is not flashy or eye-catching, but it is getting results.

Tonight my colleagues and I will offer real-life examples of how government for the first time in a generation is actually working better with less people and fewer resources than it did the year before. As I mentioned earlier, the restructuring was first announced by Vice President GORE in a report of the National Performance Review from redtape to results, creating a government that works better and costs less.

□ 2230

This ongoing initiative has four main themes: customer service, procurement reform, eliminating obsolete programs, and reducing the Federal workforce.

Think back for a minute to a memorable sporting event, the Super Bowl or the World Cup. Think about the size of the stadium, like the Rose Bowl, one of America's largest, filled to capacity. That is the net number of people, over 100,000 to date, that the Clinton administration has taken off the Federal payroll, 100,000 people whose salaries and benefits the taxpayers no longer have to pay.

Madam Speaker, 2 years from now, that number will grow to 272,000, enough people to fill nearly three Rose Bowls. This year, Penn State won the Rose Bowl, but Vice President GORE deserves the national championship for leading this downsizing effort.

Today the number of employees of the Federal Government is at the lowest level since the Kennedy administration. Because of this action taken by President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress, there are fewer Federal employees than under the so-called Republican fiscal conservatives: Presidents Nixon, Ford, Bush, and even the Gipper. This, Mr. Speaker, is an amazing accomplishment.

I just want to show it on this chart. This was in 1963, the Kennedy years; it has gone up, and for the first time it is going down, and we have reduced government by over 100,000 employees.

Due to other initiatives in reinventing government. Employees still working for the Federal Government are able to interact with the public in a more intelligent and friendly manner. I will give one example from my district in New York City.

For years, the Veterans Administration has carried a terrible reputation among veterans. Notorious even within the VA was the New York regional office. Before Clinton and GORE, an application for veterans benefits would be handled by at least 12 employees working in 4 separate operations.

However, if a veteran actually showed up in person, they would not meet with any of the 12 people who handle the application. Instead, he or she would meet with a benefits coun-

selor, employee No. 13, but the benefits counselor would not have access to all the necessary information. The counselor would have to go to yet another unit of the office on a different floor and get the file from another clerk, employee No. 14. That is the way it used to work.

Today the application is handled by a single team responsible for processing, filing, and dealing with the veteran face to face. When a veteran comes in, he or she deals with someone who knows their file, their history, and can tell the veteran exactly what is going on. This change has brought a tremendous increase in customer satisfaction for the veterans.

We have reduced the Federal workforce, and we are doing more with less. But taxpayers should be most excited about procurement reform. I know that the word "procurement" can put a lot of people to sleep, but there are more than 200 billion reasons for taxpayers to stay awake and be very concerned about procurement. That is because the Federal Government spends over \$200 billion on procurement every year. That is \$800 for every American spent on goods and services.

There is no more important area in which to control spending and better manage our limited resources. The Federal Government's record on procurement before 1993 was terrible. We all remember stories about the \$600 hammer or the \$2000 toilet seat, but one you may not have heard occurred during Operation Desert Storm in 1991.

During the Gulf war, the Air Force needed 6,000 standard, commercial Motorola radios for the troops, like this one. They wanted to order them so they could communicate with each other. But even in that emergency, the Government could not just buy commercial products at competitive prices.

Under the regulations at the time, Motorola would have had to supply records of what it cost to make these, and documents, proving they had never charged anyone less for them. For quite a while, the U.S. Government could not purchase these radios.

It is hard to believe, but finally, Japan had to buy the radios from Motorola and give them to the Air Force. That is how bad it was.

Last year's procurement reform legislation solved this problem by eliminating requirements that the Pentagon obtain cost and pricing data for commercially available items. In other words, if they are commercially available, you can buy them and cut out the redtape.

I am certain that this historic law will simplify and streamline the Federal procurement process, while ensuring fairness, accountability, and integrity.

Let me give you another example about how procurement reform is making the Government work more intelligently and effectively. For a long