

goals for education cannot be accomplished without Federal assistance in student loans.

I urge my colleagues in Congress to consider carefully the legislation before them and to consider the severe impact education cuts will have on working families and their ability to access higher education for themselves and their children.

Funding to vital education programs must be restored. Mr. Speaker, the only contingency we should be talking about when it comes to education, is that if we provide our schoolchildren with the tools they need and deserve, and support higher education, Americans will win.

PRESCRIPTION FOR A PROSPEROUS ECONOMY: LOWER THE TAX RATE, AND ELIMINATE CLINTON ELITISTS

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, how many of us remember what was going on 4 years ago? Four years ago the American people were told that we were in the worst recession in 50 years. Remember that? The worst recession in 50 years. The news media did not challenge that claim by candidate Clinton, but soon after the election, we found out all the new statistics, economic statistics, that were coming out were exactly the opposite. We were not in the worst recession in 50 years. In fact, the economy was heading up in the last half of that year, of that last election year of 1992.

We are now being told, 4 years later, that things are great. The stock market is booming. Inflation remains low. Things are not that great, Mr. Speaker. The American people know that. They can sense that, no matter how many times the news media is trying to tell them otherwise.

The growth rate actually went down dramatically from the time President Clinton was inaugurated until this year. Now we are told things are really picking up. Things are not picking up. There is an illusion that things are getting better, but the American people know better. The first item on President Clinton's agenda when he was inaugurated was passing the largest tax increase in American history. Candidate Clinton had promised a middle-class tax cut. Today, 3 years later, the American people understand something is wrong. Something is wrong. They are paying more, but they cannot put their finger on it.

That is because every time they go to the gas pump they are paying 5 cents more than they would otherwise. That is because many of our seniors, who are the hardest hit by the Clinton tax cut, know that they are paying more money on their Social Security, more taxes on their Social Security benefits. Our sen-

iors felt that tax increase, and a lot of the rest of us have felt the effects of that tax increase, but a lot of Clinton's rich pals, President Clinton's rich pals, did not feel that.

How many of us remember that some of the top contributors to President Clinton's campaign were tipped off by someone, no one knows who, that the tax increases that he would propose as President would be made retroactive? A few super rich contributors, like Mr. Eisner, who owns Disney Corporation, managed to basically do his selling and make his profits between the time President Clinton was elected and the time he was inaugurated. Apparently somebody had tipped him off that those tax increases would be retroactive. He saved himself a cool \$100 million, but the average American today is paying higher and higher taxes.

We understand that the American people today, as compared to 1992, the average American family actually is earning in take-home pay, take-home pay, over \$700 less than they did in 1992. No, Mr. and Mrs. America, you are not experiencing some kind of delusion. I know you have gone to the movie and you have seen "The American President," this multimillion dollar movie that Hollywood made to glorify the presidency. You have heard the news media telling you over and over and over again that things are getting better. But no, you are not suffering some delusion in thinking that something is wrong, that something has gone wrong with your standard of living and that you are not living as well.

When the Government takes more money from the people in the form of taxation, it puts a clamp on economic growth and it takes decision making away from them, and freedom away from them, and prosperity away from the people. We cannot create something out of nothing. Many liberals believe over the years that if the Government does something, if the Government pays money or if the Government taxes them, this is coming out of thin air. The fact is Government revenue, Federal revenue, unless it results from higher productivity of the American worker, unless it results from actually more investments, unless it results not from higher tax rates, but from more productivity and more production of wealth in our society, means that the American people are worse off. Today every American family faces the choice of either having a lower standard of living or having two people in the family work.

What we have found far too often is that when we examine the statistics, what is happening is that one member of the American family is working full time, and the only thing that happens is that that person's money is paying their Federal taxes. If we are to be a free society, if our people are to be prosperous and to live as they are supposed to, we must lower the tax rate and we must eliminate the Clinton elitists that would like to take more and more money out of our pockets.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION MUST INCLUDE FUNDING FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if the comic Letterman were to name the 10 most unlikely events this year, 1 of them might be that the Presidential primary in any part of the United States would be canceled for lack of funds. I am here to tell you that this morning's Post tells us that, and I am quoting, "Cuts may mean no presidential primary in D.C." The lack, Mr. Speaker, is for money in the form of a payment due the District of Columbia, which the Congress is holding up, in the amount of \$250 million or more. As a result, the District faces the possibility of a payless payday at the end of this month, and the end of its primary for May 7.

As Members may know, this money is being held up not because of matters germane to the District of Columbia, but because of a national fight over whether or not vouchers should be funded for private and religious schools. I am here to say this morning, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to debate vouchers, an important national issue, do it on your own time and on your own bill; do not take the Capitol of the United States down with you.

This body is fiddling while D.C. residents are burning. The body shut down the District of Columbia on one occasion. Now you want to cancel democracy in the Capital of the United States by not bringing forward the payment due the District in lieu of taxes? How low can we go? What will it take to wake us up?

Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add that though I am on the ballot in this primary, I do not mind if this primary is shuttled over, if my own primary is put over to another date, because I am unopposed, so I do not have anything personally to lose, although I must tell the Members that there are minor officials that are on this ballot that do have something to lose. Of course, the President is not opposed in his own party, either. But would not the shame of the country be to have a headline, and we know it would be one, to the effect "Election in Nation's Capitol Canceled Because Congress Holds Up the Appropriation?" Come, now.

The Washington Post this morning tells us that this is happening for good and sufficient reasons, lack of funds. "Although he has accelerated layoffs, canceled the planned purchase of new polling places, eliminated mailings to voters, and reduced the temporary staff hired to run elections, Fremaux * * *, that is the head of the election board, * * * said he is still far short. The only place to turn," his letter said, "is the elections themselves."

This is an agency known as one of the most efficient in the District of Columbia. They have already made sizable cuts. They are going down to \$369,000 in cuts. They have made \$239,000 very rapidly. But the rest requires, obviously, local legislation and the following of personnel rules.

We are today, at 2:15, to have the fourth cloture vote on the D.C. appropriation in the Senate of the United States, the fourth. Each time there has been a cloture vote on whether to pass our appropriation, it has gotten fewer votes than it got the last time. Somebody is playing games, here. But the folks who are suffering are not represented by anybody in this body except me, so I have to come before this body to say that the CR that is due out Friday simply must contain the District of Columbia, or you will have to suffer the consequences. You will have to suffer the embarrassment. My constituents and I have already suffered the pain.

Congress is fond of saying that it is acting in the District with less democracy than other jurisdictions because "It is the Capital of the United States, and it is our responsibility." When is the Congress going to perform like it recognized that it has a responsibility? The residents I represent are second per capita in taxes paid to the Federal Treasury, and yet have no voting representation in this body, and no representation whatsoever in the Senate. Put yourself in their position, when the money being held up is their money, not this body's money, money owed them for taxes.

If this is everybody's city, which is why the Congress says it exercises jurisdiction over it, then it is time for the Congress of the United States to act like it.

URGING SUPPORT FOR THE ROUKEMA HEALTH CARE REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week over 150 Democrats signed a letter of support for positive health care reform legislation sponsored by the Republican congresswoman, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, MARGE ROUKEMA. Her bill is similar to the Kennedy-Kassebaum legislation that has been introduced in the Senate, and has gained wide bipartisan support. In fact, Senator KASSEBAUM already has a commitment to bring up her bill in mid-April, and a number of health care organizations, providers, including the American Medical Association, have signed on and said that this is a good bill.

Essentially that we have now is bipartisan support, both Democrats and Republicans, both House and Senate Members, and the President of the

United States, President Clinton, who said that if this bill comes to his desk he will sign it.

The Roukema bill essentially would ensure that Americans will no longer have their health coverage denied or limited because of so-called preexisting conditions. The bill also helps people keep their health coverage if they get sick, lose their jobs, or change jobs. This is a bill that could pass the House of Representatives if the Republican leadership in this House would only let it come to the floor.

In fact, it is now my understanding that the House Republican leadership, under Speaker GINGRICH, is taking a different tack and plans on introducing health care legislation that includes controversial provisions to pander to various special interest groups. In other words, instead of letting the Roukema or Kennedy-Kassebaum bill come to the floor with everybody's support and have it signed by the President, they are now going to bring in another bill loaded with all kinds of special interests, special interest provisions; for example, increasing tax-free medical savings accounts, limiting malpractice awards, a number of things that are very controversial and that would prevent any kind of health insurance reform from passing this House and being signed into law.

I just wanted to mention one of the provisions that GINGRICH and the Republicans have talked about, and this is the Medical Savings Accounts, or MSA's. The Speaker tried to include MSA's when they are trying to cut Medicare last year, and now they are trying to insert this untested idea into the health care reform bill, which would provide a financial windfall for the Golden Rule Insurance Company, whose top executive has given Republican political committees excessive contributions in the past few years.

During the Medicare debate it was found that the MSA would cost Medicaid an additional \$3 billion. How can the Republican leadership believe they can try to pass this in health care reform? It is not a reform; it is actually catering to special interests. In the end it means health care costs will increase for the average working family.

Serious health care reform was attempted 3 years ago and failed because Congress tried to overhaul the whole system with one piece of legislation. I would maintain that the lesson from that experience is Congress needs to take a step-by-step approach to decrease the number of uninsured Americans. I think that is what we would accomplish in a small, modest way with the Roukema bill.

Again, however, the Republican leadership does not really want health care reform. If they did, then they would not be loading up a bill that benefits the special interests over the uninsured. If they wanted health care reform, why did they bring up this illustrious Contract With America last year?

Essentially what we are seeing here is the same old Republican leadership games. There is bipartisan support for the Kennedy-Kassebaum Senate bill. One hundred and thirty respected business groups, insurance groups, and health care providers have endorsed it. The House version, sponsored by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], a Republican, has bipartisan support and will reduce the number of uninsured by millions. It is a positive step that will help working families by increasing portability and eliminate preexisting conditions.

If the Republican leadership truly wanted health care reform, they should consider using the Roukema legislation as the vehicle for it. It is irresponsible to try to please all the special interests when Congress can be working together to reduce the number of uninsured Americans.

What I am simply saying, Mr. Speaker, is this: We know that the Roukema bill can pass and address the issue of preexisting conditions and portability. Let us bring it to the Committee on Commerce, let us bring it to the floor. Let us not load it up with all these other things that will make it impossible for it to pass. I think it is incumbent upon the Republican leadership to allow this bill to come out and be considered in a simple form, rather than this new grab-bag package that they are now proposing to introduce and bring before various congressional committees.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood up in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As the Sun rises to greet each day and gives light and warmth to every person, so may Your word of grace, O God, greet us each morning and guide us on our daily walk. We recognize that when we look only to ourselves and our own vision, we often falter and faint and we can lose our bearing and drift with the winds of time and the tides of the moment. Speak to us, O God, in the depths of our hearts, nurture our souls, enlighten our minds, and encourage us to use our hands in the works of justice and of peace. Amen.