the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAESLER. Madam Speaker, recently, on Wednesday, July 19, a freshman Republican Member of Congress made the following quote in an interview regarding Koresh and the Waco hearings. "The only law they clearly established," talking about Koresh, "broke that I can see, so far, is he had sex with consenting minors." He said, "Do you send tanks and Government troops into large sections of Kentucky and Tennessee and other places where such things as this occur?"

This statement shows, I think, the extent to which some members of the majority party will go in order to justify the narrow world view about David Koresh. Instead of condemning him for what he was, this Member attacked the good people of Kentucky and Tennessee.

Something is clearly wrong with this picture, and this Member, as others, just does not get it. Defending religious freedom is not the same as defending religious fanaticism. Somebody ought to tell him the difference.

On behalf of the good people of Kentucky and Tennessee, I think this Member owes us an apology.

ABC GOT IT WRONG ON REPETITIVE MOTION STATISTICS

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, I have come to the floor to correct a few things ABC's report on ergonomics last night would have led the American people to believe.

Madam Speaker, ABC says that 60 percent of workplace illness occurs from repetitive motion. Why would they give out that number? Why would they not say that the Bureau of Labor Statistics says that only 7 percent of the workplace illnesses occur because of repetitive strain?

Why would ABC not have said, The National Safety Council does not agree with either one? They say that only 4 percent of the workplace illnesses come from repetitive strain. It is a perfect example of what is wrong in this town.

Where did ABC get 60 percent? They got it from Joe Dear. Why did Joe Dear say 60 percent? So he could do what they have been doing for 40 years: Run down to this Congress and say, "Look at all these problems. I need more money. I need more people. I need to grow my agency."

MEDICARE PATIENTS NEED TRUE CHOICES

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, the Congress is about to embark on

major changes in Medicare. These reforms we will be considering will offer patients less choice, not more, unless we take action to ensure that their choices are protected.

Many of the so-called reform plans include efforts to increase the use of managed care for Medicare patients. A study released last week found that three-fourths of Americans age 50 and over said they would not join a Medicare managed care plan without the freedom to choose their doctor; 82 percent believe that the freedom to choose out-of-network physicians or specialists would be "very important" or "critically important" to their decisions about whether to join a Medicare managed care plan.

The message is simple. Choice is essential to older Americans. A point-of-service option provides true choice by allowing Medicare patients to go outside of a network when they need services. This option should be built into every health plan involving Medicare patients.

Madam Speaker, \$270 billion in cuts in Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the rich is wrong. It is equally wrong to force America's elderly into managed care and take away their choice of physician.

HOLD THE LINE. COMPETITION JUST DOES NOT RING TRUE

(Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, hold the line. Competition just does not ring true.

Madam Speaker, does competition mean a monolithic, one-sided monopoly? The manager's amendment to H.R. 1555, the Communications Act of 1995, will do just that. The bill that came out of committee passed with bipartisan support and had some level of approval from all industry representatives. What happened?

The provisions in the manager's amendment are so vague, it will be difficult for State regulators, and everyone else, to determine what constitutes competition. As the U.S. Congress deregulates telecommunications, we must assure that some fair standard exists for gauging competition and create a blueprint for the future of a competitive communications industry.

As a former state utility commissioner, I have seen firsthand how true competition can benefit the consumer. This is why I have some reservations about the manager's amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the manager's amendment. Let us go back to the original bill that the committee passed. We owe it to our constituents, the customers for all of these services, to make sure that rates are fair and wide open to competition.

IRS RIPPING OFF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, thousands of Americans receive faulty notices from the IRS. The IRS says, "Your taxes are delinquent, pay them up." When the IRS was asked if the 1993 tax law allowed deferrals, they said, "The law is being reviewed." When IRS was asked how many taxpayers got notices they said, "A small number."

Now documents reveal that 43,000 Americans got faulty notices in the first month. The IRS said, "Small problem. These things happen."

Shame, Congress. Shame, for allowing the IRS to rip off and trample the rights of the American taxpayers.

By the way, the old saying, "Easy for you, difficult for me," does not apply to the IRS.

REPUBLICANS ARE KEEPING THEIR PROMISES

(Mr. WHITFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, yesterday we were treated to a tremendous display of partisan rhetoric on the floor of this House.

Madam Speaker, most of yesterday, liberals took to the floor and accused Republicans of being extremists, meanspirited, and shameful. The experiment in big government that was started in the 1960's has failed. It is over. We will not keep pouring hard-earned tax dollars of the American people down a huge sinkhole of debt just to support a bloated, ineffective government.

Madam Speaker, the American people want a balanced budget, they want to eliminate duplicative and wasteful programs, and they want, in short, to transform government to be effective and provide the needs that the American people demand.

Madam Speaker, we are going to keep our promise on this side of the aisle to reduce the size and cost of government and to create effective programs that work.

PHILADEPHIA'S EXAMPLE

(Mr. SANFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANFORD. Madam Speaker, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight held a field hearing in early July in Cleveland. Amongst those who gave testimony were the mayor of Philadelphia, Edward Rendell.

Madam Speaker, I was fascinated by his story because 3½ years ago Philadelphia stood at the brink of financial disaster. They were a quarter of a billion dollars in debt. Their bonds had been rated junk. Vendors as lowly as toilet paper suppliers said, "No more. We are not dealing with Philadelphia.

They had lost 30 percent of their tax base. Taxes had gone up 19 times over the last 11 years. Yet today, Madam Speaker, the city enjoys a \$29 million surplus. They have investment-grade bonds. For the first time since World War II, they have had a tax cut.

How did they do it? One, they created an entrepreneurial environment wherein government was to view customers as king, and in this case, the taxpayer was to be king. Two, they were to spend government dollars as if they were their own.

Madam Speaker, if Philadelphia can do that, I think America and the Fed-

eral Government can do that.

MEDICARE: NO COMMON SENSE IN **CONGRESS**

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, the American people are gradually learning the truth about the Republican Medicare program. As the Wall Street Journal reported 3 days ago, raising Medicare premiums and copayments on seniors is becoming a likely possibility.

Republicans are finding that forcing seniors into HMO's may not provide the short-term cost savings they were hoping for, but the Democrats knew all along that the health care reform and Medicare reform should not be treated as a short-term budget exercise.

As you will recall, Madam Speaker, the Republicans only started talking about Medicare after their Contract With America rhetoric forced them to, by accident. Then they discovered the impending crisis in medical care, which President Clinton talked about all last year.

Madam Speaker, cutting \$270 billion is not the way to save Medicare. It is becoming obvious to seniors that including \$270 billion in cuts to their benefits and \$245 billion in tax cuts in the same budget bill is poor public policy and really a raw deal. This Republican majority Congress wants to balance our budget on the backs of seniors, and today they are cutting programs for our youth.

This Congress wants to cut our oldest and youngest, forsake our elders and cut our future. To paraphrase my friend from Ohio, "Beam me up." There is no common sense here in Congress.

REPUBLICANS ARE SAVING **MEDICARE**

(Mr. TORKILDSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORKÍLDSEN. Madam Speaker, it is unanimous. The President and his trustees agree, and both parties in both

Houses agree: Medicare is going broke. If the Congress chooses to do nothing, the status quo will destroy the Medicare system. But we can fight to improve the system, Madam Speaker, so that current and future generations will have access to health care.

This past week, I visited several senior centers in my district. The Americans I spoke with understood that change in the current system is necessary. Our seniors are trapped in a system designed for the 1960's, not the 1990's and beyond.

Madam Špeaker, the facts are straightforward. Under the Housepassed budget, spending on Medicare will increase from \$4,800 per recipient now to over \$6,700 per recipient over the next 7 years. Doing nothing means Congress is abdicating its responsibil-

Madam Speaker, every person and every idea is needed to resolve the Medicare crisis. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join together. If Medicare goes broke in 2002, it is going to affect all of us, regardless of party affiliation or age. Let us work, preserve and protect Medicare.

APOLOGY DUE THE PEOPLE OF KENTUCKY AND TENNESSEE

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, a while ago one of the Members who spoke here used the term "extremist, mean-spirited, and shameful." Let me tell my friends that one of the most extremist, mean-spirited, and shameful remarks occurred in an interview by a Member of this body the other day in the Journal Gazette when he said, "The only law they clearly established Koresh broke that I can see is that he had sex with a consenting minor," a little girl 10-year-old. "Do you send tanks and government troops into large sections of Kentucky and Tennessee, and other places where such things occur? Since he viewed he was married, which then comes to the polygamy question, in other words, we are sending tanks in to enforce polygamy laws.

By way of a strained explanation, he said, "I implied something I don't believe. It was a wrong choice of words.'

May I say to the Speaker of this House, the people of Kentucky and Tennessee deserve an apology from someone who speaks for this body.

THE ISTOOK-McINTOSH-EHRLICH **AMENDMENT**

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Madam Speaker, here is a little guiz. What do the following examples have in common: One, the National Council of Senior Citizens

received \$68 million from the Federal Government between 1993 and 1994. That is 96 percent of its operating budget. Between 1992 and 1994, the NCSC gave \$405,000 to 134 congressional candidates.

Two, the Child Welfare League of America received \$260,000 in Federal funding in 1 year. It then ran an ad in the Washington Times against the House welfare reform bill.

Three, the AFL-CIO in the 1993-94 year received more than \$2 million in Federal money. It operates "Stand Up," a program designed to defeat the 104th Congress' agenda, and runs a TV campaign targeting Members of Congress.

What do these examples have in common? A, your tax money was used; B, you had no say in which group received your money; C, these groups actively and aggressively lobbied Congress; D, all of the above.

Believe it or not, Madam Speaker, the answer is D. That is wrong and I urge that the Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich grant reform amendment be passed.

STAMP OUT THE REPUBLICAN WAR ON WOMEN

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, this August 26, we have this wonderful stamp coming out, celebrating women having had the right to vote for 75 years. In November 1996, you are going to watch women use that vote. They are also going to be using this stamp, I think, to try and stamp out the Republican war on women.

I think women are not only angry about the actions against them in this Congress, they are angry about the attitudes that the Republicans have had against them in this Congress as seen by the vote yesterday in the other body.

□ 1020

That is all very, very sad, and it is very difficult today to celebrate the only victory, the only victory women have had this entire time, and that was saving a 25-year-old program started by Richard Nixon and George Bush that last time got two-thirds of this body and this time barely snuck through. That is outrageous.

Our foremothers would want us to fight back, and we will.

SUPPORT THE LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION BILL

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, let us be clear about one thing. If you want to hurt your children, if you want to hurt your grandchildren, if you want to punish the future generations that have