

[Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CLINTONOMICS VERSUS REAGANOMICS

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, just before the August recess, the Wall Street Journal published an op-ed written by economist Alan Reynolds of the Hudson Institute.

That op-ed, entitled "Clintonomics doesn't measure up," urged presidential candidate Bob Dole to embrace a return to supply-side economics based on what was portrayed as anemic economic growth during the past 4 years.

Reynolds argued that key statistics showed economic performance was superior during the supply-side years of President Reagan than it has been since President Clinton was elected to office.

As I read the article, it became clear to me that Mr. Reynolds, a long-time advocate for supply-side policies, was not providing objective analysis of this situation.

Calling on the resources of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, I conducted extensive research into Reynolds' economic analysis and the statistics he used to make his case.

I was not surprised to find that the analysis was orchestrated in a manner that proved to be generous to the supply-side years and not so generous to the Clinton years.

First, Reynolds conveniently began his analysis in 1983, the third year of Reagan's presidency, rather than in 1981, the year in which the Reagan tax cut was actually enacted.

The huge budget deficits resulting from those tax reductions forced up interest rates in 1981 and plunged the economy into the deepest recession since the Great Depression.

Unemployment reached almost 11 percent nationally, and the strong recovery in the years that followed must be seen from that perspective: from that economic nadir, we had nowhere else to go but up.

In addition, Reynolds also excluded the Bush years from his analysis despite the fact that supply-side policies were continued throughout that era.

The Journal recently printed a letter I authored in response to that op-ed that included a more complete comparison of economic performance since 1992 and that during the full Reagan-Bush 12 years.

The analysis showed the economy has in fact performed better since 1993 than it had during the previous 12 years of supply-side economics.

Under Clinton, the economy has grown more rapidly, employment has risen at a faster rate, per capita in-

come has increased more quickly, and the deficit is smaller relative to the economy.

Gross domestic product growth has been 2.5 percent under annually since 1992, as opposed to 2.4 percent Reagan-Bush.

Employment grew at a rate of 2.6 percent each year since 1992, a full percentage point higher than in the years from 1981-1992.

And finally, the deficit has averaged 2.9 percent of the size of the economy under Clinton, while it averaged 4.3 percent under Reagan and Bush.

Last month's unemployment rate of 5.1 percent provides further evidence of just how healthy the national economy has become in recent times.

Mr. Speaker, I am not arguing that all areas of the Nation have experienced equal economic progress during the last 4 years.

There are areas such as the Hudson Valley and the Southern Tier in my State that continue to experience significant economic anxiety and widespread underemployment.

While there is much left to do to help get people to work, even these areas have experienced improvements in their local economies since 1992.

Mr. Speaker, we owe much of our economic progress to the success of the 1993 budget reduction law that was enacted by the Democratic Congress.

It has reduced the deficit by 60 percent, from \$290 billion in 1992 to an estimated \$117 billion this year.

The law has resulted in four straight years of deficit reduction for the first time in about 100 years.

And the deficit this year is expected to be at its smallest size relative to the economy since 1974.

In addition to the historic deficit reduction which has occurred, the law also significantly expanded the EITC program providing tax cuts to families earning less than \$28,000 annually.

According to the U.S. Department of Treasury, in my congressional district, an estimated 31,974 working families have received tax breaks averaging \$480 this year due to the expansion of the EITC.

By any measure then, whether it is economic performance, deficit reduction, or tax relief to working families, the 1993 budget law has been a great success.

Despite all of these positive statistics on economic performance that were included in my Wall Street Journal piece, I am disappointed to say that I was not successful in convincing GOP candidate Bob Dole that a return to supply-side economics would be unwise.

Last month, Dole released his \$550 billion tax plan with breaks targeted to only the wealthiest families in our Nation, and paid for by a magical economic growth dividend.

This morning, Senator Dole held meetings in the House of Representatives to peddle his supply-side economic plan to reluctant Republican Members of this body.

The American people must know that history speaks for itself on supply-side economics: the Dole plan will bankrupt our Nation, undermine economic growth, and increase worker unemployment.

It is time that we pay tribute to the 1993 budget law which has been a tremendous success in reviving the economy and creating good, decent-paying jobs for millions of Americans.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO H.C. "LADD" HITCH JR.

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

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is with a solemn heart that I rise today to share with my colleagues the passing of H.C. "Ladd" Hitch of Guymon, OK.

A pioneer cattleman and prominent Oklahoma Panhandle businessman, Ladd was truly a remarkable man who left an indelible mark on his community, his State, and his industry. He was the third-generation patriarch of a family that settled and prospered in what once was called our Nation's "No Man's Land." The fact that a thriving agricultural economy has developed on this once barren land is a testament to his family's frontier spirit.

The Hitch's settled in the Oklahoma Panhandle in 1884. Ladd was born in 1918 and by the time he reached adulthood, he and his family had revolutionized production agriculture in the region. As the Hitch legacy in the region grew, the family's visionary business practices never waned. They introduced one of the first irrigation systems in the Panhandle region. This innovation supplied the ability to produce an abundant feed supply and led to the establishment in 1953 of one of the Southwest's first large-scale cattle feedlot operations. Last year, the National Cattleman's Association listed Hitch Enterprises as the ninth largest cattle feeding operation in the country.

Mr. Hitch was one of the founding members of the Oklahoma Cattleman's Association, was the first recipient of the National Cattleman of the Year Award, was named "Feedlot Magazine's Commercial Feeder of the Year," and was selected as a "Stockman of the Century." His activities were not just limited to agriculture. During his life, he served as the chairman of the Board

of Regents of Oklahoma State University, was the former director of the University of Oklahoma Research Center, was a member of the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, and had been a trustee of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame.

As a cow calf operator from western Oklahoma, a former member of the Oklahoma State Legislature, and now a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I had the opportunity to deal with Ladd Hitch on many different issues both business and legislative. He was a man of integrity, drive, and vision. Ladd died on July 29, 1996, while attending the Oklahoma State Cattleman's Association in Oklahoma City at the National Cowboy Hall of Fame. The site of his death memorializes many of the greatest aspects of life. Ladd will be missed.

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TEEN DRUG USE SKYROCKETING UNDER CLINTON

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House once again, and I have been before the House before, to talk about the problem of drug and substance abuse and the problem with our young people in this country, and the problem of the drug epidemic across this Nation.

Tonight I want to again call to the attention of my colleagues these absolutely startling statistics that have come out within the last month about teen drug use skyrocketing, particularly in the years since 1992 to 1995, under this administration.

If we look at the overall drug use and abuse, particularly, again, among our teenagers, 12 to 17 years old, it is up 78 percent. Marijuana use, 1992 to 1995, is up 105 percent. LSD use, up 105 percent also. Cocaine use is up 166 percent.

Even in my area, a wonderful, calm, traditionally family-oriented area of central Florida, heroin use and abuse is skyrocketing, particularly among our young people. I am alarmed as a parent, I am alarmed as a father, and I am alarmed as an American about this trend.

It is easy to trace this trend. In the Clinton years, from 1992 to 1995, we saw the steps that led to this. First we saw the firing by the new President of two-thirds of the drug czar's staff. Then we saw the appointment of Jocyelyn Elders, the chief health officer for the Nation, who said: Just say maybe; just say maybe try it.

We saw the dismantling of our drug interdiction efforts to stop drugs, cocaine and heroin, at the borders and at their sources, almost a total dismantling proposed by this administration.

And then finally, a great insult, we saw the lowering of the standards in the highest office in this land, the White House. The White House, which is supposed to set the standards, in fact, lowered the standards, and we saw the records of people being employed that were so bad that they had to institute a drug-testing program at the insistence of the Secret Service.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. This is the situation. What do we do about it? This Congress, this new majority, and I, as a parent and an American, think we must act. This Congress is taking steps. Under the leadership of this new majority, we are restoring money to the drug czar's office. We are working with a new drug czar to see that that is an effective office.

We know that we must fight drugs on four fronts: by education, interdiction, enforcement, and treatment; that we cannot, as this administration has said and proposed and done, just treat the wounded in battle. That is what we are doing by putting all of our sources and resources in treatment only.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to restore those funds, and we are going to make a four-pronged approach. We are going to lick this problem, but it is going to take everyone from the White House to the courthouse, every parent, every concerned citizen, and every Member of Congress to join this effort, because we are losing a generation. We cannot afford to lose our young people in this war on drugs. We must band together. This Congress must act in a positive fashion. We must approach this in a bipartisan manner. Then we can take back our children, we can take back our streets, we can take back our neighborhoods.

We have 1.6 million Americans incarcerated in this land. Seventy percent of them are in jails and prisons because of drug use and abuse. This is the problem we have created. This is the problem we need to address. We must join together to start with our young people and bring this drug epidemic facing our Nation and our youth under control.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your cooperation in this effort, and that of my colleagues.

DOLE-INGRICH ECONOMIC PLAN CONTAINS TAX BREAKS MOSTLY FOR THE WEALTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The same folks who brought us the Government shutdown, the two Government shutdowns earlier this year and late last year, are back. Former Senator Dole and Speaker

INGRICH are bringing us a \$500 billion economic package, have proposed a \$500 billion economic plan tax break package, mostly for the wealthy, that will result in more cuts to Medicare, more cuts to student loans, more cuts to Medicaid, and more cuts to environmental programs.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at a bit of history as we discuss this Dole economic plan, and as we discuss the cuts in Medicare and what all of that means, and what that meant last year.

Last year the plan of the Speaker, the Gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], and Senator Dole was to give some \$245 billion in tax breaks mostly for the wealthy, and they planned to pay for this plan by making \$270 billion of cuts in Medicare and several billion, about \$180 billion cuts in Medicaid, several billion worth of cuts in student loans, and several billion of cuts in environmental protection.

This \$245 billion tax break mostly for the wealthy, which would result in the \$270 billion in Medicare cuts, was the beginning of the unraveling of the Medicare Program. Let me quote what Speaker GINGRICH said about Medicare, and let me quote what then-Senator Dole said about Medicare.

Last October Speaker GINGRICH, speaking to a group of insurance executives, all of whom would benefit greatly from this dismantling of the Medicare Program, said, "Now we didn't get rid of Medicare in round one, because we don't think that is politically smart. We don't think that is the right way to go through a transition. But we believe that Medicare is going to wither on the vine."

The same day, speaking to another group, a group called the American Conservation Union, then-Senator Dole, who was leading the fight for the Medicare cuts in the Senate, said, "I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, one of 12, because we knew it wouldn't work in 1965."

Since that time, the same people that tried to, on the one hand, say they are here to try to defend Medicare and save Medicare, are attacking Medicare under their breath, attacking Medicare behind closed doors in Republican caucuses, and occasionally letting it slip and attacking Medicare in public.

One prominent member of the Committee on Ways and Means called Medicare socialized medicine. The majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], said that in a free society Medicare would not exist, whatever that means. Other prominent Republicans have labeled Medicare a program of socialism, a program that does not make sense for people, a program that we simply do not need.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that this crowd, GINGRICH, Dole, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ARMEY, the leadership of the Republican Party, not mainstream Republicanism, which most people in this country that are Republicans I think are more likely to believe in, and not the mainstream Republicanism that supported Medicare