

that in this recent election in November when the Republicans took power in both houses, all of 38 percent of the American people came out to vote. Sixty-two percent of the people are so turned off by the political system they did not bother to vote. Most poor people in America, many working people in America do not vote. So what ends up happening is you have 38 percent of the people who vote, you have people who contribute huge amounts of money to the political system, they are able to finance candidates of their choice, so you have one whole group is invisible. If you do not vote and you are earning the minimum wage, who do you think is going to care about you? If somebody contributes, they buy a table for \$10,000 at the Republican fundraiser, that 10 people will have far more influence over the political process than 20,000 people in Louisiana who are working for minimum wage or farmers in Vermont who are trying to get by on \$10,000 a year.

So I would simply hope that we can revitalize the political process. If we increase voter turnout by 20 percent, this institution would be radically different. Mr. BECERRA.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

I think the gentleman from Vermont is hitting on a very important point. I think a lot of us take our time at 11:30 at night to be here to discuss this because obviously we are not just trying to talk to our colleagues but we are also trying to communicate to the American people. We have to make sure we let folks understand what is going on. This Contract that was a political contract lobbied and campaigned upon back in November, what did it mean, and what is happening with that because really when you take a look at what is being done, there really is an inconsistency with trying to be American and promote America, and what is being done in contracts that say things and when you read those find details of the contract, you find something different. The gentleman from Vermont raised an interesting point. We are talking right now over the last week or so about cuts to children's programs, school lunches, other nutrition programs, child care for kids. You have to say what is next. Then all of a sudden you find on the horizon that the next thing is not just on kids, but now it is on our young people that are getting ready to go to college with student loans and student grants where we are going to cut a lot of the moneys that we provide for our young people to afford a college education.

I have got to say one thing here. I have a 22-month-old daughter. I sat down with a financial planner, my wife and I about 3 months ago, 4 months ago, and we asked that financial planner what will it cost us to get our child through college when she grows up. We were told, well, it depends. Public school, you can probably count on

something approaching \$150,000. Private school, and I was very fortunate to go to Stanford University, they said Stanford University, you can expect to spend about \$400,000 for your child to get educated. What is next? Student loans. My goodness.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] very much.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], is recognized for 35 minutes as a designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my time right now to my good friend from Ohio to start us off this evening.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], for yielding this time. What we are going to be doing is discussing the welfare system in this country and why Republicans and some Democrats as well believe that the welfare has been so destructive in this country that we feel very strongly that we need to change the welfare system dramatically.

We have heard a lot of Democrats this week, and in fact since I have been a Member of Congress, be cute when they refer to the Contract With America, and they keep saying it is a Contract On America, which is ludicrous.

It is a Contract With America. This is a document that we all signed. After talking with people all across this country, and they said these are the things that we want. If we elect a majority of Republicans, these are the things we would like you to change when you get there.

Well, the people in my district saw fit to send me here, and one of the main things they wanted to change was the welfare system. They realized, I heard over and over again, that the welfare system is wrong. We spend far too much money on welfare, and most of that money is counterproductive. We are hurting more people than we are helping on welfare.

I was a school teacher in Cincinnati for a number of years in an inner city school. I worked for the recreation department in an inner city area, and I saw kids over and over and over again who came from homes where there was no father in the home.

The vast majority of these families did not have a father in the home. They had the government, in effect, as their father. The Federal Government sent a welfare check every month. No father in the home, no father figure. They expected the government to pay for them from basically from cradle to grave, and that is what we have to change.

We have got kids in homes all across this country who never see an adult in

the home go to work. We have to change that. The welfare system is broken.

What I think we are hearing on the other side of the aisle, what we have been hearing the past couple of days from particularly the liberal Democrats on the other side of the aisle is the last gasps of a dying philosophy, a philosophy that says the government is the way to go, the government owes everybody a living, people do not have to work, people do not have to be responsible for their own lives, American families are to support other people's kids.

Not only do they have to support their own kids, but the Federal Government takes a large portion of their money, sends it up here to Washington, it gets eaten up in this bureaucracy, this welfare bureaucracy.

Some of it gets sent back to the States, and much of that money is wasted, and it is counterproductive. We have to change that, and that is what we are here to talk about this evening.

I am very pleased that I am joined here by my good friend from Ohio [MARTIN HOKE], and a very good friend from Arizona [J.D. HAYWORTH], who are also going to contribute and talk in this colloquy.

Mr. HOKE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CHABOT. Absolutely.

Mr. HOKE. Does this sound familiar? Who said, "I will eliminate welfare as we know it today"? Does that sound familiar?

Mr. CHABOT. I believe it was our President who said that in the campaign a couple of years ago.

Mr. HOKE. A couple years ago, 1992, all summer 1992. Was this a sucker punch?

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. HOKE. Is that what was going on? Now, in the 103d Congress I do not recall any welfare reform bill whatsoever ever coming to the floor of this Congress.

Mr. CHABOT. That is exactly right. Of course, that is the same President who told us he was going to give us a middle-class tax cut and then did just the opposite and raised taxes on the American people. That is one reason that the American people said enough and changed Congress and sent folks like us here to change Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If my friends from Ohio would yield, and I recognize my friend from Kentucky controls the time, and as I have been checking in other quarters, a certain school from Kentucky controls the basketball game tonight.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Good

Mr. HAYWORTH. Between the University of Kentucky and Arizona State. Much to his delight, much to my chagrin. But it really brings forth a description of both that basketball tournament and I believe it is safe to say what has transpired here in the halls of the Congress, and that is March madness that is really without parallel. I

could not help but notice my friends on the other side during the course of their 35-minute special order enlist the help of one of their aides, and I am not here to demean that aide in any ways, but I thought it was very interesting, a scroll that was festooned about his person, I suppose in documentation of the working poor, and I would salute the working poor, indeed we are holding them up and championing their efforts. I listened with interest to the gentlelady from Ohio, but I could not help but notice the similarity of that gentleman working to provide that visual aid, if you will.

□ 2330

And instead of really offering stirring testimony to the working poor, it really resembled someone wearing a bed sheet as a ghost as if this were Halloween, and I could not help notice the parallels because this is what it has come down to, a debate from the other side largely devoid of fact, filled with sentiment, much of it heartfelt, but also much of it, I would say, calculated, designed, to scare everyone in America; first the elderly, then the working poor, and now the children.

Children have been used in this debate as pawns in the political process, teachers requesting that students write letters not born of any heartfelt philosophical viewpoint on the part of the young students, but born of an indoctrination of a failed liberal state.

Again I want to say we are not here to demonize those who are down on their luck. We are not here to discourage the working poor. Quite the contrary. We salute their efforts, but what we are here to do in this 104th Congress is to change for the better a failed system, perhaps noble in its intent, but somehow glaringly ignoble because it deprives the very people it purports to help, it deprives them of their dignity, it deprives them of the opportunity to work, and it robs from them not only their rights as individuals, but their responsibilities in a free society.

Mr. HOKE. I wonder if I could ask you to yield some time here because I thought the gentleman from Vermont began the remarks of the earlier special order with what was a pretty honest beginning, and that was to say that we have not spent enough time actually debating the underlying issue here, and the underlying issue has to do with causation, and, by the way, I think I should point out with respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Vermont, whom I have a lot of respect for, he has pointed out a number of times that he is an Independent and the only Independent in the Congress, but I think it is probably only fair and instructive to state that he votes with the Democrats almost all of the time. His committee seniority is with the Democrats, he sits with the Democrats on the committees that he is on, and, as the mayor of Burlington, he was not an Independent, he was a socialist. So I do not know if that means that the Democrats are not liberal enough for

him, but I think that—I mean just in the interests of fairness I think those things ought to be pointed out. But I think he was right to ask the question, “Why aren’t we talking more about the root causes,” and what he would say is that the root causes of the behaviors, and the behaviors he is talking about I think are illegitimacy, developmental problems in school, the chances of being on welfare as a welfare child becoming a welfare mother herself, a welfare child becoming a male on welfare himself. Those behaviors, he clearly stated, are the result of poverty.

What I would like to do is explore that just a little bit because DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, Democratic Senator from New York, has written extensively on this, and he wrote in 1964, quote, poverty is the principal reason why these young men fail to meet those physical and mental standards. He was saying poverty is the problem; in 1964 he said that. Then in 1989, in his book “Towards a Post-Industrial Society,” he wrote, “Why did I write that this was the result, these behaviors were the result, of poverty in 1965? Why did I write that? Why did I not write that poverty was the result of this; ignorance?”

As Dr. Johnson observed, I do not know how to describe my understanding of social structure a quarter of a century ago except to say that it was not especially formed. He went on to say, “What I had not adequately grasped was the degree to which these unequal distributions of property were, in fact, themselves dependent upon a still more powerful act, the behavior of individuals in communities. In other words, I had not,”—DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN—“I had not myself understood that it is the behaviors that have fundamental impact on the results as opposed to the result, poverty, being the agent that causes the behaviors,” and that goes precisely to what the gentleman from Vermont was talking about, and it truly does inform the differences in the debate and the differences in how you can come up with an in-government-we-trust solution, which is what we have gotten from the other side as opposed to in individual responsibility in the private sector, in neighborhoods, in communities we trust, in G-d we trust attitude that we are trying to reform welfare on this side.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. The bottom line is that the War on Poverty has not taken care of poverty. I ask, “Isn’t it true we have more poverty now than when we started?”

Mr. CHABOT. That is exactly what has happened.

As my colleagues know, it really started getting out of control during the so-called Great Society, the Lyndon Johnson years in the sixties, and it has grown worse, and worse, and worse, and illegitimacy has grown in tremendous numbers since that time as have welfare payments. They have both been pretty consistently going up, and you

know the real tragedy of the way the current system works now is basically our government, under the way welfare works, it makes a deal with welfare mothers all over this country. I says:

“We’ll send you a check every month. We’ll get you food stamps, free housing, free cash money. You got to do two things though to get this money. No. 1, you got to not work. You’re not allowed to work. And the other thing: You can’t get married to anybody who works.”

Mr. Speaker, that is just a prescription for tragedy, and that is what happened in this country, and that is what we are going to change starting tomorrow.

Mr. HOKE. Can you imagine saying to your daughter as she is reaching the age of maturity, 19, 20, 21, 22, getting ready to leave home; you say, “Well, honey, I want you to know that we will always be here for you. We’re always going to be behind you 100 percent, and we’re going to support you financially. We’re going to be there, you can count on us, but there are two conditions. No. 1 is you’ve got to agree—it’s wonderful you have kids; that’s great. But you got to agree you won’t get married. And No. 2, you got to agree you won’t go to work, and we’ll continue to support you.”

That is what we do as a Federal Government. We are saying to your son, “Son, listen. You know I’m always going to be there for you, but I want you to know one thing. You can go out and father as many children by as many different women as you want; that’s great. But just don’t marry them, don’t get married, and I don’t want you to work either. As long as you do those things, we’ll continue to support you.”

It is insane, it is perverse. What a perverse norm. What a sick and twisted form of compassion that is. None of us would do that as parents, and yet that is exactly what the Federal Government is doing. How could you possibly expect anything but the kind of results that we are getting?

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Absolutely, and you know the other side keeps saying Contract on America instead of what we actually signed was a Contract With America, and I would like to say right now the Contract With America is not a Republican contract, it is an American contract that the Republicans signed onto to do the will of the American people.

And let me say if there is a Contract on America, it has been the last 30 years of a welfare system that has destroyed individuals and families.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And the incredible observation that we hear from the other side—our good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] says it is the yeah-buts. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], my friend, had another description earlier on this. It boggles the mind, and I believe it is summed up in Marvin Olasky’s new book entitled,

"The Tragedy of American Compassion," and, Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to have this time here tonight for a little straight talk among friends and to realize that we are poised to change this system for the better.

□ 2340

Mr. HAYWORTH. I wish we could say that in every circumstance in every human endeavor things will change for the better, but I think that would be both practically and intellectually dishonest. We harbor no delusions that this is a perfect plan. But we have seen the height of imperfection and the notion of tragedy born of the last 30 years of so-called compassion.

To spend in excess of \$5 trillion, and understand we are just approaching that in terms of our national debt, and that in itself is a tragedy, but to spend in excess of \$5 trillion on programs noble in their intent, since we should always assume the best of those with whom we disagree, but to have them fail so completely.

As has often been noted during the course of this debate, if you were going to declare war on the American family, on responsibility, on our very fabric as a society, you could not have done better than the so-called war on poverty, because it, in essence, changed the scope of how we react as a society; and it took away the notion that for every right there is a responsibility.

Indeed, it seems that now the defenders of the old order would say, "I am, therefore I am entitled," instead of, "I understand as an American that I have rights and those rights are coupled with responsibilities and my rights stretch only as far as the rights of another, and it is my responsibility not to infringe on another's rights."

Instead, now we have a situation where the working poor and those who are not classified in the working poor, those who are fortunate enough to prosper in this society, many who come to this Nation from other shores legally to live the American dream, find themselves paying and paying and paying into this system.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. HAYWORTH, I just want to add to that. Another tragedy, and you have just led up to that, is that the average family, the working family, we hear the working class and the working family, the working family today is paying on an average 40 percent of their income in State and local and Federal taxes, 40-plus. If you add in the hidden taxes, it is probably reaching close to 50 percent, utility taxes, gasoline taxes. That is a tragedy.

We wonder why mothers and fathers are both having to work. Because they have to pay their Federal bill. That is a burden that cannot go on. And that is why we are trying to fix this system so that we can have good, wholesome, strong, prosperous families all across this Nation.

Mr. CHABOT. That is an excellent point.

The thing that really gets me is when you think of the average middle-class families out there where sometimes one parent, sometimes both parents are working, they are trying to raise their kids, they are obeying the laws, they are paying their taxes and so much of their money comes up here to Washington or in some instances goes to the State capitals. But it goes to government. And then in our welfare system we then send those dollars back to people who basically are not supporting their own kids.

And as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] had said, so many of these fathers are going around fathering kids and are just assuming somebody else is going to take care of their kids. Because that is the way it works, quite frankly. Let us fact it. They are fathering kids now, and they are not supporting those kids, and we are doing it. The taxpayers, the middle-class people out there, are paying higher taxes so they cannot take care of their families to the degree they want to because they are sending their money up here to Washington.

I was watching a program a couple of weeks ago, it was 48 Hours, on welfare reform. I found an excellent segment on there. They had a young woman, single mother in a wheelchair. This woman was working two jobs to support her own kids, and she was saying, "I would not go on welfare. I am going to work as hard as I can. I am going to support my own kids."

But the thing that she was complaining about was that so much of her money was taken in taxes and given to other people who would not support their own kids.

That is not fair. That is what is wrong with the system. That is why we have got to fix it. And we begin to do that tomorrow when we finally vote for welfare reform.

Mr. HOKE. I thought one of the most moving speeches I have heard here recently was from our good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] earlier this evening. I do not know if you all heard it, but he spoke about his own father. He spoke about the absolute necessity of fathers in our lives.

I thought of my father, who created an example. He created on a daily basis an example of integrity and character. And when I did not measure up to it, he made sure that I knew it, and he made sure that I was accountable, not always in ways that I particularly appreciated at the time but I do sure appreciate today.

It did occur to me that there is absolutely no substitute for that. There is no substitute whatsoever on Earth. The government cannot be the substitute. There is no substitute.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is absolutely right.

And what we have done is we have taken an uncle, Uncle Sam, and not even plugged him as a surrogate father.

Instead, we have made him Big Brother in Orwellian fashion, in 1994 instead of 1984.

And now, 1995, we have a significant segment of a once-proud political party engaged in Orwellian newspeak and the tactics of fear, saying that opportunity is somehow perverse, saying that work and responsibility, while giving a rhetorical tip of the cap to those virtues but maintaining that it is the government that is the sole generator of same, and I do not believe that we have seen for those, and I know you have run across people like this.

I think one of the throw-away lines we encounter from time to time is, "There is not a dime's worth of difference between the two major parties." I would beg to differ a great deal.

But the irony will be we will see a number of fair-minded Democrats come with us because, as we have seen on other items in this Contract, when you get away from the smoke and mirrors, when you get away from the Orwellian newspeak, when you get away from the tragedy of a once-proud party now bereft of new ideas, indeed one publication on the Hill said of the Deal plan that the leadership of the other side grudgingly accepted that as an alternative.

Mr. HOKE. I have to share something with you.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Sure.

Mr. HOKE. Name that tune. Name that speaker. Because if we are going to bash the Democrats, and maybe there is something that we can learn here, "The lessons of history confirmed by the evidence immediately before me show conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit."

Who spoke those words?

□ 2350

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. HOKE. Franklin D. Roosevelt. The father of the modern Democratic Party spoke those words. John Kennedy spoke not dissimilar words in his inaugural address. He inspired me, inspired I know many of my colleagues. And yet somehow that has gone so, so incredibly awry.

I want to share, if I can, one other item, maybe to lighten the mood a little. This is from P.J. O'Rourke, that I think you might enjoy. He says in his preface to the *Mystery of Government*, "I have only one firm belief about the American political system, and that is this:"

You have to remember P.J. O'Rourke. I feel a very special kinship with P.J., because we are both sort of refugees from the sixties in disguise. I know we do not talk about this very much, but I know there are many on this side of the aisle who also have been reclaimed from the sixties as well.

But he says:

I have only one firm belief about the American political system, and that is this: God is a Republican and Santa Claus is a Democrat.

God is an elderly or, at any rate, middle-aged male, a stern fellow, patriarchal rather than paternal and a great believer in rules and regulations. He holds men strictly accountable for their actions. He has little apparent concern for the material well-being of the disadvantaged. He is politically connected, socially powerful and holds the mortgage on literally everything in the world. God is difficult. God is unsentimental. It is very hard to get into God's heavenly country club.

Santa Claus is another matter. He's cute. He's nonthreatening. He's always cheerful. And he loves animals. He may know who's been naughty and who's been nice, but he never does anything about it. He'd give everyone everything they want without thought of a quid pro quo. He works hard for charities, and he's famously generous to the poor. Santa Claus is preferable to God in every way but one: There is no such thing as Santa Claus.

Thank you, P.J. O'Rourke.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. You know, there is one thing though that I have noticed in the debate the last few days that I do not think our friends on the other side of the aisle are too willing to give, and that is a tax break to the middle class of this country.

Mr. HAYWORTH. What I find amazing, and we do not want to move too quickly, because I think that we have almost numbed the American people, I hope at the end of these 100 days, when we enact these sweeping changes, I know the reaction of the liberal media in this town and the folks who make up this culture, almost diametrically opposed to the reforms we bring, they will try to stifle a yawn and say, "Well, so what?" We can predict that reaction.

But the American people, and this is the key, as my friend from Kentucky points out, the American people recognize that their work helps generate the wealth that they have a stake in that wealth by their very labor, and that they are entitled to keep more of their hard-earned money, and send less of it to Washington, D.C.

My friend from Ohio, from Cincinnati, said it so well, as there is a myopia, or a tunnel vision when it comes to this topic. So many times I have heard other friends, and maybe we just disagree, talk about the money they will quote-unquote "lose" in certain projects, but they fail to understand this: It is not the government's money. The President may have proposed it in the largest tax increase in American history. It may have won by one vote in this Chamber, in the 103d Congress, by one vote in the Chamber in the 103d Congress. It may have been foisted upon the American people in the name of so-called deficit reduction, even though those numbers we know are subject to sleight of hand, or shall we say a charitable interpretation by the White House.

But the fact is, the money does not belong to the Federal Government. It belongs to those who labor those hours,

who earn that money, and who give in unparalleled fashion freely, voluntarily, into our tax system, obeying our tax code in so many ways. And it is not the Federal Government's money. It is just interesting to see that interpretation that would be so statused in its approach that it would begin and end with the Federal Government.

To the contrary, we say. It begins with the individual and it end with the individual, and responsibility rests with the individual, working together in corporate fashion, for education, for spiritual enlightenment, and, yes, for government, based on a society of law, and for civil order.

And it is an all-encompassing picture that recognizes the sanctity and the primacy of the individual and the freedom and the liberty he or she enjoys in this Nation, in this constitutional Republic. We place our faith not only in God, but ultimately in the American people to decide what is best for themselves.

Mr. CHABOT. I have heard this, and I think your points are absolutely correct, J.D., and I know we are almost out of time, so we probably need to wrap it up.

I guess a couple points I want to make. One thing is I have heard the term mean-spirited so many times the last couple of days from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that if I hear it one more time I think I am going to scream. But I think there is no question in my mind that there could be nothing more mean-spirited to the kids of this country than the welfare system that we have got now. It destroys lives; it will continue to do so until we change it. We are ready finally to change it.

The school lunch program, they still keep saying, I heard it tonight, that we are going to cut the school lunch program. We are increasing the funding to the school lunch programs all across this country. What we are doing is we are cutting out the bureaucrats here in Washington, and we are sending the money directly to the States. Let the school teachers and the local school boards and the parents decide how they want to spend their own money. Not our money, their money.

Finally, I think the bottom line, and I have only been here 2 months, but what I have seen from my colleagues such as the gentlemen that are here this evening, the difference I think between this side and the folks on the other side of the aisle, is the bottom line is the folks on the other side over there think that Washington knows best, that the decisions ought to be made up here where we are tonight. We ought to decide how the American people's money should be spent, that Washington knows better than the people all over this country.

I do not believe that. I think the decisions should be made and those families, the moms and dads ought to decide how they want to spend money for their kids, not the bureaucrats up here

in Washington. Despite all the rhetoric I have heard, calling us mean spirited, we do not care about kids, for God's sake, I have kids myself, a 5-year-old son and 13-year-old daughter, probably in bed right now so they cannot hear me talking, hopefully, because they have school tomorrow, but I think the American people can see through all this rhetoric.

Mr. HAYWORTH. What is more mean spirited than leaving an ever-increasing debt and burden and responsibility like that on the younger generation and on generations yet unborn? The time to change it is now. The steps are being taken in these first 100 days. We take another major step tomorrow with welfare reform.

Mr. HOKE. STEVE, I absolutely agree with you. I think the American people, I have absolute utter confidence in their ability to discern. They cast their ballots last November. They asked that we keep our word, we keep our promises. We are doing everything we can to do that.

Frankly, I think we are right where we ought to be, we are on the right path. We have to keep our shoulder to the wheel and keep pushing and keep telling the truth, because it is obvious there is a massive disinformation campaign going on. We have got to cut through that.

But you know what? We do not have to do all of that work. We have to do a lot of the work, but the public is not going to be fooled. The people will find out. They will find out on their own. They care enough to discern it, to require the information, and to find it, and I am very confident about that.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. I think it goes back to what I said earlier, that we are keeping a contract that we signed, that the American people gave to us. We found out what they wanted, and we said we are going to do it, and we are. We are going to keep our word and we are going to do it. And we are going to reform the welfare system and make it work for people that have real needs.

Mr. CHABOT. I think the American people are a whole lot smarter than the people on the other side of the aisle give them credit for.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MFUME, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.