

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1997 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1996 amount, the 1997 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1997 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	\$82,442,966,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1997	87,820,371,000
House bill, fiscal year 1997	83,995,260,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1997	84,810,153,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1997	84,800,283,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	+2,357,317,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1997	-3,020,088,000
House bill, fiscal year 1997	+805,023,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1997	-9,870,000

JERRY LEWIS,
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,
JAMES T. WALSH,
DAVID L. HOBSON,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
RODNEY P.
FRELINGHUYSEN,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
LOUIS STOKES,
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
JIM CHAPMAN,
MARCY KAPTUR,
DAVID R. OBEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
CONRAD BURNS,
TED STEVENS,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
BEN NIGHTHORSE
CAMPBELL,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
J. ROBERT KERREY,
ROBERT C. BYRD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2464. An act to amend Public Law 103-93 to provide additional lands within the State of Utah for the Goshute Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2512. An act to provide for certain benefits of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River basin program to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2982. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Carbon Hill National Fish Hatchery to the State of Alabama;

H.R. 3120. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering; and

H.R. 3287. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Crawford National Fish Hatchery to the city of Crawford, Nebraska.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3068. An act to accept the request of the Prairie Island Indian Community to revoke their charter of incorporation issued under the Indian Reorganization Act;

H.R. 3159. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999 for the National Transportation Safety Board, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3378. An act to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to extend the demonstration program for direct billing of Medicare, Medicaid, and other third party payors;

H.R. 3539. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 3723. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect proprietary economic information, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3539) "An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. FORD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 39. An act to amend the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act to authorize appropriations, to provide for sustainable fisheries, and for other purposes.

NEW REPUBLICAN MAJORITY
CHANGES DIRECTION OF THE
NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to follow my colleague from California, and also appreciate your willingness to take your time. I know you probably are getting ready to get back to your district. I will not take my full hour. I am not going to tell you how much time I will take, but I think it will be significantly less than that.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you what it is like to think about what we have done in the last 2 years, because I have tremendous pride and satisfaction and gratitude that I have had the opportunity to serve in Congress and to be part of this new majority that really has attempted, and I think succeeded, in changing the direction that this country is headed.

I think we are starting to end 40 years of bloated government, inefficient government, ineffective government and starting to turn the power

and the money and the influence back home where it belongs. That is where we are attempting to empower people back home, because we have, one, faith in their ability to make the right decisions but, also, that they will make the decisions that are necessary for them in their own local communities.

When we set out on this journey almost a year ago today, we were running on a Contract With America; 8 reforms on the opening day of the session and 10 reforms in the first 100 days. I remember some in the editorial boards would say how could I be part of this "Contract With America," as if I had done something wrong. The more I thought about it, I thought what an absurdity. We are passing eight reforms. We are passing 10 major issues in the first 100 days; and it does not criticize President Clinton, it does not criticize then the majority in Congress, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is a positive plan for America.

So I wondered why they asked the question. I proceeded to respond by simply asking them: What do you think of the majority party's Contract With America, the 8 things they want to do on the opening day of Congress; the 10 things they want to do in the first 100 days? And I just enjoyed the silence. And I said is it not amazing that the minority party then, this Republican Party, knew what it wanted to do, said then it would do, and was proud of that effort?

When we got elected people said we used this contract to get elected but we would not seek to implement it because it might be too controversial and take on some of the special interests that had been entrenched so long in Washington and we might stir up some things. We clearly stirred up some things, but for the good of the Nation.

Mr. Rabin, for former Prime Minister of Israel said: Politicians are elected by adults to represent the children. This is about what kind of world they going to have.

Mr. Speaker, we set out to implement these eight reforms the first day of Congress. The first was a bill that, Mr. Speaker, you and I worked on closely: Getting Congress under all the laws that we impose on everyone else. We were exempted for OSHA, civil rights, fair labor practices, the 40-hour work week. We put ourselves under the same laws as everyone else. What a great way to start that Congress.

We also reduced the size of committees by a third, reducing the staff by a third. We reduced by \$220 million the size of our budget. So we started to set the example. We were going to ask government to do with less. We were going to start with our own Congress.

And so we saved in the last 2 years \$420 million. Our budget is actually \$220 million less than it was 2 years ago. So not only did we not add money for inflation, we actually are spending \$220 million less; and over 2 years saved the taxpayers almost a half a billion in expenditures.

We got rid of absurd perks like the ice bucket. I am embarrassed to suggest that we even had the ice buckets, but before the refrigerators we had ice, but after the refrigerators we had ice. We had 28 people in this Congress that would go around and drop off an ice bucket to everyone, even though we had ice in our refrigerators. We eliminated that kind of absurdity and others as well.

We privatized some of the operations of Congress, making it more efficient and effective and making it more logical. There were times when we needed to use an office for extreme times of mail going out, and other times there was not enough mail going out. Yet we hired enough people to maximize for when we had that kind of workload.

We got rid of proxy voting. Proxy voting was an interesting concept. It was a sheet of paper that the chairman had in his pocket and he would take the sheet out of his pocket and when an amendment was offered by his own party that he did not like, the chairman—I say “he” because until this year there was never a woman that was chair of a committee—and the chairman would take it out, and he would have the list of all of his committee members and he would vote for them.

That was called proxy voting. It was right on his list. So the chairman was so powerful that he could even thwart the will of his own party and the will of his members because he always had enough in his pocket to defeat the amendment. So we did that, and we proceeded after the opening day of the session to do things like voting for a balanced budget amendment.

The press got back into it. They said how could we be for what was really a positive plan for America. Those 8 reforms on opening day; the 10 reforms in the first 100 days; asking how we could be supportive of something that did not criticize Congress or the President. A positive plan. We said we would do it and we started to do it. And then they said, “Well, you used it to get elected but you are not going to implement it.”

Mr. Speaker, we voted for a balanced budget amendment. They said that was easy. Anyone could vote for an amendment. But you are not going to vote to balance the budget. And then we started to vote to balance the budget.

We dealt with tort reform and malpractice reform of some of these issues that the President vetoed, saving Medicare and so on. We proceeded to balance the Federal budget and make some tough decisions.

We have three primary objectives. We want to get our financial house in order and balance the Federal budget; we want to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, for future generations; and, we want to transform this caretaking social and corporate and agricultural welfare state into a caring opportunity society. That is what we wanted to do, and that is what we set out to do.

Now, why would we balance the budget? Because in the last 22 years our national debt has gone up 10 times, from \$480 billion to \$5.2 trillion. Not doubled, not tripled, not quadrupled; 10 times in 22 years in a time of relative peace.

And getting back to Mr. Rabin, he said we are elected to represent our children. Just think what we are doing by ignoring that. We have taken a debt that was \$480 billion and allowed it to grow to \$5.2 trillion, and guess who pays for it? Our kids. That is the problem of deficit spending. We are asking someone else to pay for what we get to enjoy and what we get to consume.

Now, we do not have a fetish with balancing the budget. In other words this is not the end-all and be-all. That is simply not it. But how do you build a strong structure on a foundation that is crumbling? Getting our financial house in order is the financial basis on which we built smart, sensible, caring programs.

So that is what we are about. We are about building smart, caring, sensible programs and getting rid of a whole host of programs that have been there for so long that they do not make sense. They are just kind of like that ice bucket that we got rid of. It is symbolic, but think of how stupid it was to have the ice bucket every day coming to our office when we have refrigeration in our office. Spending \$400,000 a year for those ice buckets times two, \$800,000 in the course of 2 years for something dumb.

Now, you can relate to getting rid of an ice bucket because it did not have a particularly good sounding name, but there are a host of programs that we have.

The point about the ice bucket is simply this: Most people can understand the waste that exists there. But then there are programs that we have in a variety of departments and agencies that are just as wasteful. They have good-sounding names. They may be in the Education Department or they may be in HUD, but they end up being very small programs that have no critical mass and most of the money gets gobbled up by the administration and gets consumed by the executive branch.

I am not blaming this Government, I am blaming the process, and I am actually critical of the fact that we failed to eliminate these programs for so long until now. We are getting rid of some programs with good-sounding names that simply have no critical mass and do not accomplish anything. So we are balancing the Federal budget to get our financial house in order so that we have a strong foundation to do smart, sensible programs.

We are trying to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare. Medicare is fascinating. We are told in this political environment we are never to talk about Medicare, because it is called the third rail. You talk about Medicare, people on the other side can demagog it, and then you get hurt and you lost

the election. Case closed. Unfortunately, with that kind of attitude, Medicare will continue to go deeper and deeper into the direction that it is headed which is literally bankruptcy.

□ 1100

How do I know that? Because we have one report from the administration that says, last year, that Medicare would go bankrupt in the year 2002. We then had them come back to us and then so what did we do? What did this Congress do? This Congress tried to save Medicare, to preserve and protect, basically to defend the system against bankruptcy. Medicare is health care for the elderly and for the disabled, and so what did we do? We devised a very important plan that saves this program. In the process, we did not cut, but allowed the program to increase.

This is the most important thing I think I need to say. We allowed Medicare to grow from about \$178 to \$289 billion, a 60-percent increase from last year now to the 6th year in the year 2002. We allowed it to grow 60 percent. Some said, you have a lot more seniors. It is true. On a per senior basis we allow it to grow 49 percent. From \$4,800, to \$7,100.

So on a per person basis we are allowing Medicare to grow significantly in terms of total dollars, 7 percent more each year, 60 percent total in the course of the difference between last year to the 7th year, and on a per person basis it is going from \$4,800 to \$7,100. So we put lots more money into the program. But we were able to save the program.

How did we save the program? We did not save it by increasing the copayment. We did not save it by increasing the deductible. And we did not save it by increasing the premium. Seniors were going to be asked to pay 31.5 percent of their premium. We did not ask that that increase and the taxpayers would continue to pay 68.5 percent. What did we do to save the program? We allowed the private sector to come in and compete on a fair basis with a fee-for-service system and offer better programs. If a senior wanted to, a senior could continue to get their traditional fee-for-service program with no increase in copayment, no increase in the deductible or the premium. But we allowed the private sector to come in, and the only way the private sector was allowed to come into the program under our legislation was if they offered eye care, if they offered dental care, if they offered maybe a rebate on the copayment, deductible. Some were going to pay the premium and some even said they could pay the Medigap in some parts of the country. There is so much money in Medicare that the private sector said they knew that they could offer better programs than the traditional Medicare system.

Then we could have seniors simply say, I like my Medicare system, but if I can get eye care and dental care under the new Medicare system and I

can get a rebate on the copayment or the premium and actually maybe even have my Medigap covered, I am going to go into that program.

A senior goes into that program. They get the eye care, the dental care. They get the rebate on their copayment and deductible. They have more money. They even get money for prescription drugs. Not a bad deal, the copayment and deductible and premium did not go up.

But let us say for some reason they did not like the new program. Maybe they did not like that HMO. Maybe they did not like the doctors. Maybe they did not like the attitude or the billing process. Maybe there was a reason they did not like it. For the next 24 months we allowed seniors to go back into their traditional fee-for-service program.

I suspect someone may have said, I am staying in my fee-for-service. I do not want to think about getting anything better. So they would never have gone into the program to start with. But say someone who is younger might have gone into the program. Then they did not like it, they could go back. Then they could get another program that they thought was better.

What was the big mistake that we had in our program. We made a big mistake. One big mistake. We saved \$270 billion. I thought, that is a mistake? But that is what the President said. He did not call it a savings. He called it a cut. So did my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Instead of allowing the program to grow at 10 percent a year we said it would grow at 7 percent a year. We put 60 percent more into the system. We gave a 49-percent increase per beneficiary. But we saved \$270 billion. That is, in my judgment, something we should be very, very proud of.

I am happy about the bill that the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], is bringing forward. There is more money in it for HOPWA, housing opportunities for people with AIDS. He had said on the floor of the House that we would try to address that problem. I understand there is more money for EPA that both sides could agree on and a program that I am very supportive of, national service. I look forward to getting this bill and debating it because at the same time we are still slowing the growth and saving significant sums.

Mr. Speaker, just to conclude my point about Medicare, we did not increase the copayment, the deductible, or the premium. We gave seniors choice just like we have as Federal employees and we saved \$270 billion. That \$270 billion, half of which, as the Speaker knows because he led this fight, of the \$270 billion, we put \$132 billion right back into Medicare, part A and the \$138 billion was available for Medicare, part B. We were looking to save the program.

As the Speaker knows, because he has been a leader in this field and has

spoken out so often, we know today that Medicare is losing \$22 million each day, \$22 million each day. We know that next year it will lose \$36 million each day and in the year after it will lose \$60 million each day unless we save this program by slowing its growth and taking the money that we slow, that \$270 million, that savings, and plow it right back into the program. That is what we are doing.

We did not increase the copayment, the deductible, or the premium and we saved Medicare until at least the year 2010. What to me was really surprising was how the President could call \$270 billion a cut. I illustrate it, whatever opportunity I get, in saying that if I told my daughter that she could buy a car for \$18,000 but I told her it had to be a full-sized car for \$18,000, she could not have bucket seats, she could not have power windows and she could not have a CD, she could not have those things. I did not want her to buy a smaller car with those things. It had to be a good, large car that I wanted her to own. So I said, consistent with my trying to teach you how to do your own thing, you will go buy your own car.

So I give her the \$18,000 or tell her it is available. She spends a week looking and comes back all excited and says, "Dad, I found the car of my dreams. I just love it, Dad, And, Dad, it has a sun roof and leather seats and it even has a CD." And I say to her, my daughter Jeramy, I say, "Jeramy, I told you you could not do those things. I told you not to get a car with all those extras. I told you to get a full-sized car." She says, "Dad, I did, I got a full-sized car but I got all those extras and here is \$2,000 back because I did not spend \$18,000, I only spent \$16,000." And it would have been just as absurd if I had done this: I am ashamed of you for getting all these extras in the car and doing it and cutting \$2,000. That would be absurd. That is no different than what the President did.

We did not cut Medicare. It grew 7 percent a year, 60 percent from the last year to the 7th year, 49 percent per beneficiary from \$4,800 to \$7,100, but we gave them no increase in copayment or deductible, no increase in the premium, but what did we do? We gave them choice, lots of choice. They will get better care, and we saved the program because we got \$270 billion of savings, not cuts, \$132 million of it to go into Medicare, part A and \$138 million to do and be available for Medicare, part B, which gets me to the third area of concern.

The third area of concern is simply that we are trying to change this caretaking society into a caring society. The way we do that is to make government smaller and to empower people. All of those in our own family that we love dearly, we try to teach them to grow the seeds. The people we love the most, the people we care about the most, we do not give them something. We teach them, we help them, we push them. We encourage them to grow as individuals.

I would certainly never say to my daughter, "you do not need an education," and I certainly would not say to her, "you do not need a job because I will be there." What a destructive thing to do. But that is what government does. We do not do it for welfare, for people who do not have education and the poor who have children. We do it for corporations. We have certain tax write-offs, which I call corporate loopholes, and others call it that as well. It is really, in my judgment, programs that make large corporations dependent on government, and they do not need to be. It is the reason why lobbyists become so important in this country, because if government was not so important, if it was not doing things for welfare, for businesses and agriculture, et cetera, and it was not so intrusive in your life, lobbyists would not be so important in our life.

We want to make government less intrusive. We want to make it smaller. And we simply want to end the welfare that is destroying individuals. It is destroying corporations, and it is destroying the farmer. We are trying to help each become independent. That is why we passed the freedom to farm bill. We are allowing farmers to farm, not telling them they do not have to farm and then they are given a subsidy. They can compete. They can maximize the return on their farm. We are getting the Government out of the way.

We are getting the government to be less supportive of things that are simply not necessary for corporations because we want them to compete without a lot of rules and regulations, except for health and safety and environmental reasons. In the process, we are trying to strengthen people. We are trying to help individuals grow the seeds and not give them the food.

That is why I am so supportive of our welfare reform bill. What a destructive thing to have four, not three, four generations of people on welfare. They are doing what their parents did and they are doing what their grandparents did. They are staying on welfare because they were never taught to dream. They were not given the kind of push they needed and they were not given the kind of care they needed.

We had job training programs that did not work because these were job training programs that said, you come in here and stay a bit of time. We teach you something and then you are out on your own. Our job training programs, our career bill is designed so differently. It is designed to say, we want to give you the day care, the job training, and we are going to follow you through work. Six months from now we are still going to be on your back. We are going to be pushing, encouraging you.

The State of Connecticut has welfare reform, and it is very caring legislation. It is the kind of reason why we passed our bill in Washington. The caring legislation is this. We have 2 tracks, those who we think are employable and those who are not. Maybe

they have mental challenges. Maybe they do not speak English well enough now so we have to teach them English. They have reasons why it may not be easy for them to get a job right away. But for the vast majority, we say, you are going to have to work. And Connecticut says, 21 months. And it does it this way: It helps people get the job. It allows them, this is really terrific, it does not penalize them for getting a job. They still can keep their entire welfare cash payment, they still keep their health care for the 21 months. So they get a job, they establish themselves for 2 years, they have this extra money coming in because they have their jobs plus they have the actual welfare benefits plus they get the health care benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I remember in a Committee on the Budget meeting one time you pointed out one reason why people do not get off welfare is because they lose their health care. I remember in the dialogue that we had on the Committee on the Budget, the point was made that people should be able to keep their health care when they are pushed off of welfare so that they are not tempted to stay on welfare. So we push them in that direction.

One bill that was controversial in this session was the minimum wage bill. I am so proud of how the Republican Party dealt with that issue because two-thirds of our party does not agree with that issue. They think that the minimum wage is too much of an intrusion on business. One-third supported it and a vast majority of people on the other side supported it. But we know that we had to do something else if we were going to pass the minimum wage, and that was to have some significant and meaningful tax cuts to small businesses who employ those who are considered the most unemployable, tax credits for those on welfare, tax credits for those who simply do not have the work experience to actually be yet credible to the employer.

They know they might have to spend a year or two to train that person because they are not well-educated and not well-trained and they need the training. It is a cost to the business. They actually are discouraged from doing it under the present system until we passed our tax cut bill, \$8 billion. Our tax cut bill took some of the things that we had in terms of our tax cuts when we were trying to pass the tax cut legislation earlier, which the President vetoed. Because the President did veto our 7-year balanced budget bill, he did veto our changes to Medicare with no increase in the copayment, the deductible, the premium and lots of choice and a savings of \$270 billion, put right back into Medicare. He vetoed it. He vetoed Medicaid reform. He vetoed welfare reform, but finally the third time he decided he could support it. That bill we passed was basically the same bill that we had given him the first two times.

□ 1115

So we have that bill, and he finally signed it.

Well, we want to help people off of dependency in government, corporations and agriculture; we want to give them the job training as it relates to individuals, we want to give them the day care, and we want to allow them to work in their business, still keeping some of their welfare benefits for a period of time in health care.

I am kind of drawing to a close, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to address this whole issue because we have had a lot of people criticizing this Congress, and for me, it is probably one of the most difficult things to contemplate. For the first time in the history of Congress, Congress is doing major heavy lifting. We are taking on some of the biggest and most powerful special interest groups to move this country to be more caring and less a caretaker. Those who want this Government to continue to be a caretaker are objecting to changes that we are making.

Now, we passed and slowed the growth of some of our entitlements, but one of the ways that we are going to balance the budget is to slow some runaway programs, and in the process of slowing these runaway programs, like the Earned Income Tax Credit, the school lunch program, the student loan program, Medicare, Medicaid, the student loan program actually is not running away. We are actually going along with exact numbers of loans that we did schedule to do; we are just continuing it.

But let us take the Earned Income Tax Credit. It is a payment made to people who do not make enough money, but are working to really support themselves, so instead of paying taxes to the Federal Government, they pay Social Security, but instead of paying other taxes, they actually get a cash payment from the Government that, if they do not pay enough taxes or any taxes, they do not just get a reduction in their tax, they actually get a payment from the Federal Government.

We allow that program to go from 19 billion to 25 billion, but our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that program, the Earned Income Tax Credit, tax credits for the working poor, that we are destroying the program, cutting the program. Only in Washington when you go from 19 million to 25 million do people call it a "cut."

I mean, it is absurd. It is a growing program and a very important program. We did decide that it should apply to income levels of \$28,000 or less, not income levels of \$36,000 or less.

The school lunch program: I will never forget watching the President visit a school, trying to frighten the students and also the American people that we were cutting the school lunch program. I got pretty upset that we would cut the school lunch program, thinking we had done it. When I got back, I could not wait to speak to some

of my colleagues who serve on the committees that would have done that, and this is what I found. What they were recommending and ultimately what we did until the President vetoed it: We allowed the school lunch program to grow from \$5.2 to \$6.8 billion. Only in Washington when you go from \$5.2 to \$6.8 billion do people call it a "cut." The President calls it a cut, I have constituents who think I cut it, but when the learned it grew from \$5.2 to \$6.8 billion, they find that that is very acceptable.

What did we do? The program is to grow at 5.2 percent more a year. We said, it should grow at 4.5 percent more a year, seven-tenths of a percent reduction in the growth. And what did we allow local communities to do? We cut the bureaucracy in Washington, which saved more than the money that we reduced in the growth. Then we gave to local communities and we allowed the State of Connecticut to say, for instance, that the school where my daughter goes to school and where her dad, who makes a good salary, and her mother, who makes a good salary, can find we do very well, my daughter's lunch is subsidized 17 cents by the Federal Government, every student in the country, 17 cents, rich or poor, wealthy communities and poor communities, 17 cents.

We allowed the State of Connecticut and every other State to say, we want the money that is going to the wealthy communities to continue for the poor kids in the wealthy communities, but not for the wealthy kids in the wealthy communities. We then allow them to take that money and put it into Bridgeport and Norwalk and Stamford, for instance, in my Fourth Congressional District, the district I represent, for kids who are poor in relatively poor communities.

Bridgeport is a working class, middle-income community, but it has a lot of poor people, and some kids do not get a breakfast, some kids do not get a dinner, they get that lunch. We do not want to take away that lunch. We want to give them a breakfast, and we want to give them a lunch and a dinner for those kids, and a kid in one of my suburban communities who is well-to-do should not be subsidized.

So we did not cut the school lunch program. We allowed it to grow from \$5.2 to \$6.8 billion.

The student loan program is the one that really gets me. \$24 billion last year; that is what we spent, \$36 billion in the seventh year. Those of you who are thinking mathematically know we increased it 50 percent. Only in Washington when you go from \$24 billion to \$36 billion would people call it a "cut." But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle call it a "cut," the President calls it a "cut." It is simply not true.

There is another word for when you say things are not true. It is not right for the President of the United States to go around the country and simply not say things that are not factually

incorrect, in fact, factually so incorrect that he knows that. He knows that the student loan program is going from \$24 to \$36 billion.

Now what we did do to save money is, we got rid of the direct student loan program. This was a government student program that, basically, we tied it down by getting rid of it? No, we clamped it down to 10 percent of all student loans. That is what we did, and this is a direct student loan program that the administration tried to tell us was cheaper than doing it through the banks.

The only problem was they had not factored in all the people that the government had to hire to manage the student loans. So when you had a local college give a direct student loan by-passing the bank, you would think it would save money. But then who had to administer that student loan? You got it, the Federal Government, and the Federal Government did it with twice as many people as the banks and at twice the cost.

So we just simply said, we have got to make sure we do not get too deep into that program because it is going to be so expensive that we are going to be spending more on administrative costs than we should. We saved billions of dollars by slowing and condensing that program. We did try and failed. We did try and failed to say that from graduation to the first 6 months, when you do not pay back the loan yet, your grace period, the taxpayers pay the interest on that loan. We said the students should.

I am proud of the fact that we asked students to play a role in this process. Six months after they graduate they start paying back their 10-year or 15-year loan. In a basic 10-year loan, for the average loan, we were asking the students to pay \$9 more a month. That is the price of a pizza. But where I live, it is the price of a movie and a small Coke. I have no problem saying to someone after they graduated from college or graduate school, 6 months after they graduate, they start to pay the loan back. It costs them \$9 more a month.

I have no problem saying you do not have to go to a movie maybe once a month. You may not be going to get that pizza, for the good of the country, so you do not have to pay a big debt later on.

We are trying to get our financial house in order. It ends with the two points: Medicaid has grown from \$89 to \$127 billion. Again, only in Washington when you go from \$89 to \$127 billion do people call it a "cut," but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle call it a "cut." It is a significant increase in spending, and then, as I have already pointed out, Medicare is growing from \$178 billion to \$289 billion, \$4,800 per senior to \$7,100 per senior.

Mr. Speaker, you have been very patient. I am drawing to a close. My biggest concern of all is that I have colleagues on this side of the aisle who

have done some very, very heavy lifting. They have put, in a sense, their political careers on the line for the good of the country.

We were told early on, when we got elected, the best way to get reelected is to avoid controversy, controversy is conceived as the enemy of the incumbent. We had a freshman class and a number of senior members and rank and file members of this conference that said, I do not want to be back if being back means we continue to allow the country to go bankrupt, if coming back means we ignore saving Medicare from bankruptcy, because, remember now, the President vetoed our Medicare plan.

He vetoed it last year when we thought the plan was going to go bankrupt by the year 2002. Now we know it is going to go bankrupt by the end of the year 2000. We know we are losing \$22 million a day in Medicare, we are losing \$36 billion next year, projected, and \$60 billion the year after that, every day.

Who is going to deal with that problem? Are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle going to do that kind of heavy lifting? How could they possibly when they demagogue? How can they possibly do that if they simply oppose getting our financial house in order and balancing the budget and taking on the tough decisions?

And so, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to end with the basic concept that the people we love the most, the people we care about the most, we try to teach them to grow the seed and to be better Americans. We try to free them up to compete in a very competitive environment. We try to help those who cannot help themselves, but not help those who can help themselves. Those that can help themselves need to be encouraged to be on their own, to work and to study and to grow as individuals.

This Congress has taken on heavy lifting, and I hope and pray, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, I will say it this way: Those who have done the heavy lifting, those who have dealt squarely with the problems, those who have not demagogued the issues, those who have tried to serve this country with courage, those are the people who should be reelected and returned here; and if those are the people who are defeated, think of what the message will be. Those who survive, who were doing the heavy lifting, will say: "I had better not do that again," and those who were critical of this heavy lifting, those who may demagogue the issue, are in there saying, "Well, I had better just continue what I am doing," and that unfortunately is what has happened for the last 20 years.

This is a crossroad in our country. I hope, I pray, that the true story will get out about the extraordinary job this Congress has done. We passed congressional accountability, we pass gift ban, we passed lobby disclosure, we

passed the line item veto, we passed not imposing expenditures on local governments and State governments, the so-called unfunded mandate, bill, we passed welfare reform. We have changed welfare as we know it; it happened under our watch because of what we did. We have passed major changes in health care. We have passed the telecom bill that will create 3 million jobs. We passed the Freedom to Farm bill. There are just so many other bills, the immigration bill that we hope to pass before we adjourn, and we have helped get our country's financial house in order.

I have never ever been more proud to be part of this institution.

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 Mrs. SCHROEDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 60 minutes, today

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SHAYS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes on September 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mrs. SCHROEDER) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MENENDEZ.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHAYS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BONO.

Mr. DINGELL.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1772. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain interests in the Waihee Marsh for Inclusion in the Oahu National Wildlife Refuge Complex;

H.R. 2909. An act to amend the Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge Act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior may acquire lands for purposes of that Act only by donation or exchange, or otherwise with the consent of the owner of the lands;

H.R. 3675. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3676. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the intent of Congress