

But the Speaker of the House has decided to drag the Medicare system into the world of Newtspeak and is suggesting a program that would rethink Medicare from the ground up.

If I were going to cut \$200 billion out of Medicare I would have to rethink it from the ground up too because I would have destroyed it, and that is exactly what the Speaker suggested in a speech over the weekend. He said that Medicare is the opposite of how America works. And I suspect that is true, if you are a Republican American.

America does not work by having Golden Rule Insurance Co., be 1 of the 10 largest donors to GOPAC and then have the whole structure of the American Congress in its first 100 days deciding to revise the Medicare system for the convenience of certain insurance companies.

I would like to bring the discussion of Medicare back to earth because it is the finest system in the United States. It has less than a 3-percent overhead.

And the Speaker, in his speech, suggested we ought to give American seniors more choice. There is no program in the United States that gives its beneficiaries more choice than Medicare. If you are Medicare beneficiary you can go to any physician or any hospital in the United States if you can walk, ride, hitchhike, or have the bus fare to get there.

And there are hundreds of managed care plans which are available to Medicare beneficiaries. As we speak today there are three or four dozen applications for new Medicare managed care programs to be opened to seniors. There is no insurance policy in the country that gives greater choice.

Why are we discussing at this point the idea of turning Medicare into a voucher program? I submit it is political payback time, and it is a way to finance 200 or 300 billion dollars' worth of the cuts.

The first hearing we had in the Committee on Ways and Means was a proposal on the first day of Congress to take \$70 billion out of the Medicare Trust Fund. For what purpose? To finance tax cuts for the very 2 or 3 percent of the richest Americans in our country.

This is Newtspeak. This is not how America operates, giving money to the rich, and taking it out of the trust fund that supports a medical care delivery system for the most fragile, needy people in the United States.

Ladies and gentleman, Medicare is one of the wonders of our Government. Maybe many things do not work well and maybe many things are not efficient, but understand we have fewer than 4,500 bureaucrats serving 5 million people, and there is no insurance company in the country that comes close to that efficiency.

CHILD SUPPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, each year, over \$5 billion in child support goes uncollected. This is a national disgrace that is punishing our children and bankrupting our welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, I know personally just how important child support is because, in 1968, I was a single, working mother who never received a penny in child support. In order to provide my children with the health care and child care they needed, even though I was employed, I was forced to go on welfare to supplement my wages. Today, millions of American families rely on welfare for exactly the same reason.

Mr. Speaker, currently, almost 1,500 State and local agencies are charged with collecting child support. Consequently, less than \$1 for every \$10 owed in interstate child support is collected.

A comprehensive welfare reform plan must recognize that the failure to collect child support is not a State-by-State problem, it is a national crisis demanding a national solution.

Mr. Speaker, let us make sure that families—families like mine—are not forced to go on welfare because they have not been given the child support they need and deserve.

We must insist that child support be front and center in the welfare reform debate.

IMPROVE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the streets of America, as the Halls of Congress, have been filled with calls for young mothers to be more responsible, not to have children when they cannot take the responsibility for those children, to certainly cooperate and establish the paternity of the child's father. We hear this and we agree with this, but we really want to know, particularly in the contract, where are the demands for fathers to be responsible?

We must clearly say that both parents have an equal and unavoidable responsibility to provide for their children. The taxpayers want to provide for their own children, not for other people's children.

We have to insist that we have both parents responsible, because if we do not collect child support, we will have more people on Aid to Families with Dependent Children rather than less people.

Recently the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CLAY SHAW, has come forth and said yes, we will take up the issue of child support enforcement. He was

reacting to the strong suggestions by many people who have worked on this issue for years, particularly the Women's Caucus, to see that child support enforcement travels along with welfare reform and we look forward to seeing these provisions in print.

But we have to be very careful we do not just say do a block grant for child support enforcement. The very strength of child support enforcement these last few years is having a Federal approach. The way in which a young father or father can get away from the responsibilities to his children is merely to move, go across State lines and then it is almost impossible, unless you have a Federal directive to be able to get the individual to pay their support responsibilities to their children.

So I certainly hope child support enforcement travels along with welfare reform. I hope we can accomplish both, but to do this we must do it in the right way.

We have had a National Commission on Child Support Enforcement that has come forward with some marvelous suggestions about interstate tracking of where the father is working. So I would suggest to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] that he look at the Commission's recommendation about interstate child support enforcement. There are wonderful suggestions there. Suggestions that will work and have been put into bill form.

The work has been done. Let us put it into law as we do child support enforcement along with welfare reform.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S EXCELLENT LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, today I continue my endeavor to refresh and remind my Democratic colleagues of the excellent legislative record we have created over the past 40 years.

Last week, I began this series of floor speeches with the 84th Congress. Ike was President and the Democrats had just taken control of the House of Representatives.

The 84th Congress raised the minimum wage, ratified the Southeast Atlantic Treaty Organization, established peace with Austria, and freed Germany from allied occupation. The Democrat Party did this and more.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Democrats are often chastised as the party of intrusive government and personal dependency. Today, I will cite examples from 85th Congress and provide historical evidence that counters these misconceptions.

Between 1957 and 1958, our country was rebounding from fighting World War Two and the war in Korea.

The United States was able to do this while engaged in the cold war with our Communist adversaries. Also during

the 1950's, our Nation emerged as a world superpower and Congress joined the civil rights battle. The 85th Congress confidently and effectively addressed these pivotal national issues.

The threat from the Soviet Union was crystallized in 1957 when the U.S.S.R. launched the Sputnik satellite.

To address this menace from the sky, the Democratically controlled Congress established the National Aeronautic and Space Administration to direct the Nation's outer space program.

In 1958, Mr. Speaker, this Congress passed the National Defense Education Act. This act is probably the most important human investment program undertaken in our Nation's history.

Because without it, millions of Americans would not have been able to go to college.

In addition, this act improved the teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages to our children. It provided an educational foundation which enabled the United States to put the first man on the Moon in 1969.

However, the accomplishments of this Congress were not restricted to the heavens. The 85th Congress passed the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1957. This act created the Commission on Civil Rights and a new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, laying the foundation of the Federal involvement in protecting civil liberties and individual civil rights.

Building on the 84th Congress' passage of the Interstate Superhighway Program, the 85th Congress, passed both the Federal Highway Act and the National Transportation Act. These two acts expanded road building programs and provided loans to the Nation's failing railroads.

Both of these actions created opportunities for American businesses to expand and compete both here and abroad.

The Democratic party has always believed in investment—investment in human capital and in physical and financial infrastructure.

Over these 40 years the Democratic Party has demonstrated a strong commitment to providing the necessary resources to educate children, to defend constitutional rights and to expand our national transportation systems.

The return on these investments are clear and indisputable. Investments made 40 years ago continue to yield results today.

As a party we should not be fearful of committing these necessary resources and redirecting our efforts into helping every citizen of this country.

As we enter the 21st century, this commitment to human investment will ensure that every American is equipped to reap the benefits of national prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples from the 85th session of the U.S. Congress. Promoting our country,

preserving our national interests and protecting individual rights have always been part of the Democratic Party's legacy. As a Member of the Democratic Party, I strongly urge my colleagues to regularly remind themselves of the fundamental commitments that make us Democrats.

We must allow these commitments to guide us in our actions. I urge my colleagues to examine the historical records, to see what our party has achieved and to allow this vision to carry us into the future.

CHILD SUPPORT NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today is day 28 of the Contract With America. We have passed the quarter mark for the first 100 days. Until day 27, we heard nothing about child support being included in the contract.

In the past, we heard child support is important and would possibly be addressed at a later date. Why was child support not an original provision of the Contract With America? How could we possibly delay acting on such an important issue?

I was under the belief the contract was to benefit all Americans. If we are going to benefit all Americans we really have to have provisions which help our children because they are our future. I have carefully reviewed the Personal Responsibility Act and there are no child support provisions.

As I have stated before, welfare reform cannot be successful without child support. Child support is the cornerstone of welfare reform. Strong child support enforcement provisions are necessary.

When I reviewed the Personal Responsibility Act, my initial reaction was the legislation punished women and did not require men to face up to their responsibilities. Without taking action on child support, we would require young mothers to be responsible while we give fathers a free ride. This is the wrong message to send.

We have to send a message to the American people that we are serious about welfare reform. A tough child support system requires both parents to live up to their responsibilities.

On day 27, we heard the Republicans will include child support enforcement provision in the Personal Responsibility Act. We had to wait until day 27. Where were the child support provisions? What message was being sent to the American people? Was the message, Fathers do not really need to be responsible?

How could we have welfare reform without child support enforcement provisions? Child support is welfare pre-

vention. For every \$1 spent on administrative expenses, \$4 is collected in child support.

On day 27 we heard child support would be included in the Personal Responsibility Act. I am pleased the Republicans have finally recognized the importance of this issue. Today, 63 percent of absent parents contribute no child support. We can and need to do better than this.

The potential for child support collection is estimated at \$48 billion per year. Only \$14 billion is actually paid. This leaves an estimated collection gap of about \$34 billion. This gap needs to be closed. It was not until day 27 that it was decided to address the issue of closing this \$34 billion gap.

One in four children now live in single parent homes. Without better child support enforcement, too many of these children will not have the support they need and deserve. In 1992, 17.6 million children lived in single parent homes. We need to improve these statistics now.

My home State, Massachusetts, has been very successful with child support enforcement and would serve as a role model for the rest of the country. Massachusetts has increased its child support collection rate from 51 to 67 percent over a 3-year period. We must make an improvement on the Federal level.

On day 27 we heard child support enforcement was going to be included in the contract. It is day 28 and we do not know what type of child support provisions will be included.

A comprehensive child support strategy is necessary to help parents become less dependent on AFDC and stay in the work force. A comprehensive child support strategy needs stronger requirements for paternity establishment.

Out-of-wedlock births have increased at an outrageous rate. In 1991, approximately 30 percent of all children born were born to unwed mothers. These children need to be given a fighting chance. There is no such thing as an illegitimate baby.

It's day 28 of the contract. Let us work together to address the issue of child support enforcement. We need to work to establish awards in every case. We need to streamline the paternity process. We need full cooperation from the mother.

We need to ensure fair award levels. Awards are generally set too low. If awards were modified to current guidelines, an additional \$7.3 billion, 22 percent of the gap, could be saved.

We need to establish a national commission to study State guidelines and the desirability of uniform national guidelines.

We need to collect the awards that are owed. We need States to have a central registry and centralized collection and disbursement capability.