

Spending all the money on treatment like Clinton wants us to do is, in fact, like treating only the wounded in a battle. We have to fight this with education, interdiction, enforcement, and treatment; all four. The leadership must start in this Congress, and it must start at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue or we will see these results continue.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable. It is not acceptable in my community. I ask for assistance to help us make a positive change.

#### DOLE TAX BREAKS FOR THE RICH NOT FULLY EXPLAINED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANCOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, former Senator Bob Dole has unveiled his new economic plan to the American people. He has outlined a \$550 billion tax break, mostly for the wealthy, but he had not told us how he is going to pay for that \$550 billion tax break.

One of Bob Dole's advisers said, "He has no plans to describe specifically what Federal programs he will cut until after the election."

Former Senator Dole, Citizen Dole, is going around the country speaking to organizations promising each of them: I will not cut your programs. In fact, maybe I will increase your programs, one group after another.

Yesterday, talking to some people about crime, he said: You want more prisons? I will double the amount of appropriations for Federal prisons.

So at the same time Senator Dole has said he will increase military spending to the tune of perhaps \$30 or \$40 or \$50 billion a year over the next 5 years, he wants to build star wars. He wants to give this major tax break, increase military spending, increase money for prisons, increase this, increase that, but he will not tell us how he is going to pay for these hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks that he says he will give the American people.

I think it is important then, Mr. Speaker, to look at where in fact this money will come from. I think we only have to turn the calendar back about 1 year to figure out where Senator Dole will get the \$550 billion to pay for the tax break, some couple hundred billion over 4 or 5 years, to pay for military spending increases; the tens of billions to pay for more prison construction; the other billions of dollars that Senator Dole has promised.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to look back 1 year, turn the calendar back 1 year to figure out how he is going to pay for it. All of us remember about 14 months ago Speaker GINGRICH unveiled the Republican plan to give a \$200-and-some billion tax break mostly for the rich, and to pay for it with \$270 billion

in Medicare cuts, a tax break mostly for the rich paid for by \$270 billion in Medicare cuts.

At the same time in this legislation were major cuts in student loans for middle-class families, major cuts for environmental protection, to pay for inspectors, to pay for enforcement, to pay for environmental cleanup. All of that was in order to pay for the tax break to go mostly to the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it got so bad, as we recall, several months ago that Speaker GINGRICH and Senator Dole shut the Government down because President Clinton vetoed their tax break, mostly for the wealthy paid for with Medicare cuts. President Clinton said: I will not give that kind of a tax break mostly to the rich. I will not give the rich a tax break paid by Medicaid and Medicare and student loan cuts and cuts in environmental protection. It simply did not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, the President was right. Those of us who stuck by the President on this side of the aisle were right, and clearly that is what the American people reiterated over and over and over again. We do not give tax breaks for the rich and cut Medicare and cut Medicaid and cut student loans and cut environmental protection to pay for them.

The same folks who brought us the Government shutdown, the same folks who tried last year for a major cut in Medicare are back this year. Last year the tax break was about \$250 billion for the wealthy. This year the Dole tax cut is twice that, and he is not telling us how he is going to pay for it. So it is clear the way that Senator Dole is going to pay for this major tax break is to go right at the heart of Medicare and right at the heart of Medicaid and right at the heart of student loans and also right at the heart of environmental protection. That is clearly not what the American people want.

Mr. Speaker, the American people last fall, early this winter, blamed Speaker GINGRICH and Senator Dole for the Government shutdown because they did not want to see these major cuts in Medicaid and Medicare and student loans and the environment. Here we go again. Senator Dole wants to give tax breaks of twice that size, but Senator Dole has learned something from his mistake because this year in this campaign, at least before the election, he will not tell us that that in fact is what is going to happen; that it is going to be cuts in Medicare, cuts in Medicaid, cuts in student loans, and cuts in environmental protection.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we understand Senator Dole's and Speaker GINGRICH's attitude toward the Government program that has probably been the best program Government has ever put together, and that has been the Medicare Program. Thirty years ago in 1965, when Lyndon Johnson signed Medicare, only 46 percent of America's elderly had health care insurance; only

46 percent 30 years ago. Today, 99 percent of America's elderly have health care insurance.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare has worked, but we would not know it from listening to Speaker GINGRICH and Senator Dole. Senator Dole and Mr. GINGRICH have made it clear that they oppose these programs. They want to give tax breaks for the wealthy and pay for it with Medicare cuts.

#### AGAIN, CLINTON IS PROPOSING SOCIALIZED HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it, so goes the saying, a careful reminder to all of us that history teaches us valuable lessons and that, if we learn from the past, we can avoid repeating the mistakes in the future.

Yet despite this very warning, President Clinton and congressional Democrats are plotting a course plagued by controversy and opposition.

The past few weeks have been strikingly reminiscent of President Clinton's first try at a nationalized Government-run health care system. The newspaper headlines of late are uncomfortably familiar. In fact, it is *deja vu* all over again. Recently in Florida, my home State, President Clinton announced the formation of a comprehensive commission charged with reviewing the health care system and making recommendations on how to improve the quality of care provided to patients and how to put in place more consumer protections. Does that sound familiar?

Then he endorsed the notion of mandating what types of benefits health plans should provide and cover. Perhaps that sounds familiar.

He then endorsed the notion that the Federal Government should get in the middle of the contract negotiations between private health care plans and private physicians. Of course that sounds familiar.

The President is clearly headed down a road we have all traveled together before. Under the guise of consumer protection, he is very boldly unveiling the many pieces of his plan that was very familiar and soundly rejected by Congress and the American people only 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we remember President Clinton's Health Security Act. This was an aggressive plan developed by him behind closed doors by his experts. His experts, of course, knew what was best for the American people.

We remember after months of secret discussion the experts had developed the ultimate answer to the rising health care costs. And of course, we remember, despite polls indicating that what the American people wanted most from health care reform was portability of coverage and protection for

preexisting conditions, which Republicans passed. The President instead proposed a complex federally controlled health care system complete with guarantees, comprehensive coverage, Federal price controls and other proscriptive rules regarding how employers and health care providers should all behave in the marketplace. This of course would mean waiting lines for all Americans, one-size-fits-all, dictated by bureaucrats.

Remarkably, the President again is talking about commissions, entitlements, and government mandates which of course can only lead to price controls.

First, entitlements. Mr. Speaker, Congress passed some very important legislation recently which gives the portability and preexisting conditions that we needed. And while the President proudly signed this piece of legislation, his campaign was eager to propose an additional initiative under which children and young adults would all be mandated with comprehensive health care by the government.

While all agree that children are a most valuable resource, the President's proposal is merely the first installment towards a nationalized socialized health care system under which the government pays for all and provides health care to all Americans.

A proposal has already been submitted to Congress to mandate that employers provide coverage to workers between the ages of 55 and 65, just prior to eligibility for Medicare. From here, it would only take a few steps to create an entitlement for the rest of the population. We should not be surprised that Senator KENNEDY argues that socialized national health care system is the ultimate goal.

Again, although the notion of federally mandated benefits was rejected during the Clinton health care reform debate, the President has already endorsed mandating a minimum length of stays in hospitals. Mandating the length of stay for illnesses such as flu. Mr. Speaker, what is next? Mandating the length of stay for cosmetic surgery?

Following the years of double-digit increases in health care spending, the cost of health care spending has finally begun to decline. Health plan premiums paid by large employers increased, on average, by a record-low 1.5 percent last year, while the premiums of certain types of managed care plans actually declined.

So here we are. We cannot guarantee that everybody gets all the benefits and all the coverages without putting in some kind of price controls. And that, of course, Mr. Speaker, is what President Clinton will propose next. Price controls, as we all know, just do not work. Quality of care will suffer as investment research and innovation declines. Jobs will be lost. Services will be rationed, and choices will decline. Eventually the government will have to take over the entire health care de-

livery system. Just think, government mandated, operated, and controlled health care with government doctors and nurses.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has deliberately begun to reconstruct our health care system. It is *deja vu* all over again.

#### VIOLENCE IN THE HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am here today, first of all, to say that over the weekend I was very pleased to hear the Speaker say he had no problem with reporting to the floor the bill that I have been pushing for a very long time. That is a bill that takes the Brady bill and says, if you are also found guilty of domestic violence abuse, you should be denied the purchase of a gun. I think all of us understand how terribly critical that is.

This bill passed unanimously in the other body, the Senate. Unanimously. Not one vote against it. The President has promised he would sign this bill if we could get it to him. He restated that promise on the train as he was coming to the convention. So, I would hope that this body would at least get that bill up there, now that the speaker has said he had no problem with it. He is the last remaining roadblock in getting that forward.

So I hope everybody joins me in sending a letter or speaking to the Speaker and getting it here before we go home. If you know the history of violence in the home, there is a tremendous number of incidents every single year where a weapon brings this to a terrible conclusion.

Furthermore, the taxpayer funds most of the damage done by those weapons because people end up in the emergency wards in America. Very often 80 percent of those costs are funded by the taxpayer. This is one of the real drivers of high health care insurance or high health care costs in this country, the fact that we have not gotten weapons brought down under control.

Mr. Speaker, while the Brady bill was originally terribly controversial, people now, I think, are in total agreement it should not be rolled back. It is proven and has stopped all sorts of people with criminal records from getting a gun. I think every American feels that criminals should not be able to go buy a gun, so that makes sense.

Our biggest problem is many States have not lifted domestic violence convictions to the level of a felony. They consider them a misdemeanor. Other States have allowed people, even though it is considered a felony, to plead guilty to a lesser crime. Therefore, when they do the checks for whether or not you should be able to buy the gun, an awful lot of people who

have been convicted of domestic violence problems are able to escape.

Again, when we look at the record, there is absolutely no reason that we should allow this to happen. So I really hope that everybody joins with me and we get that done before going home.

Mr. Speaker, we heard yesterday from both candidates a lot of discussion about crime and what they were going to do. I do not think we are ever going to solve totally the crime in the street and the violence in the society until we crack the culture of violence in the home.

□ 1300

Imagine if you are afraid to be out on the street, if you are afraid to walk down the street; that is terrible, and we have to do everything we can so that Americans do not become prisoners in their home and afraid to go outdoors. But think how much worse it is, Mr. Speaker, if you are also afraid to go home because you get beat up at home, too.

I think that we have been too casual about this for much too long a time. And we have begun to make some real progress with the Violence Against Women Act, with the Brady bill, with the antiassault weapon ban, and now that we have Speaker GINGRICH saying this could go forward, I hope it does, because we need to keep making that kind of progress.

If a child sees every dispute in the home solved with violence, I cannot think of anyone who can put together a good enough conflict resolution course that they can teach in the school a couple hours a week that would change and overpower what the child learned in the home. Examples are so much more powerful.

So here is something we could do before we go home that could make a real difference. It would also save a tremendous amount of money on health care because of the costs that we see every year in our emergency rooms. I am not quite sure what we are doing here. I mean last week we hardly had any votes. September 30 is coming. That means the whole government gets shut down again.

I see us doing all sorts of namby-pamby things. Why do we not do some of these things that apparently we now have agreement?

The other thing I hope that we would be able to do after the Speaker's appearance on television this week is get the report out. He said he did not have problems with that. I would hope that we could get that done before we go home, to have issues that have been floating around this House for 2 years, that is settled, I think needs to be settled before we go home.

#### PREVENT GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANCOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS]