

We have allowed violent criminals to be released to prey on society and called it compassion or rehabilitation.

We have imprisoned the innocent and let the guilty go free and called it justice.

Indeed America is in much need of prayer.

And in my concluding minute, let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that the RU-486 pill, about to emerge on the American market, has been called by Thomas Grenchik, director of the archdiocesan Pro-Life Office as a child-pesticide. He says Clinton has another anticipated victory in his campaign to kill the pre-born.

"At the President's direction," Mr. Grenchik says, "the Food and Drug Administration has strong-armed the use of RU-486 from its European owner and, as promised, will ramrod the approval of this child-pesticide at all costs."

It goes on to describe this panel of experts on July 19, way out of town in Gaithersburg with a 6-0 vote, two abstaining, on unleashing this child-pesticide.

RU-486, also known by its generic name mifepristone, is taken first and causes the uterine lining to break down and slough off. Then misoprostol, a prostaglandin that stimulates uterine contractions, is taken 2 days later, a complicated procedure requiring several medical visits, precise drug doses, and monitoring.

In an editorial in "L'Osservatore Romano," the Vatican newspaper, it was condemned as an abortion pill, "the pill of Cain, the monster that cynically kills one's brother"; and in this editorial, a moral theologian writes that the pill's anticipated approval in the United States is an important victory for what it termed, and this is in Rome, the "abortion party" led by the Population Council and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

So the battle goes on, Mr. Speaker, and let us hope that people go into this with their eyes open and that we do not have a delayed time bomb of the thalidomide problem here. Yes, as Reverend Joe Wright says, America is certainly a Nation in need of prayer.

As Billy Graham said in our beautiful Rotunda when he received, unanimously from both the Senate and the House, the Congressional Gold Medal, America is a Nation on the brink of self-destruction.

ACTIONS TO MARKET ABORTION PILL ARE DENOUNCED

The archdiocesan pro-life director denounced this week's government actions that would soon put the abortion-inducing pill RU-486 on the American market.

Thomas Grenchik, director of the archdiocesan Pro-Life Office, said that President Clinton "has another anticipated victory in his campaign to kill" the unborn. "At the president's direction, the Food and Drug Administration has strong-armed the use of RU-486 from its European owner and, as promised, will ramrod the approval of this child-pesticide at all costs."

A panel of scientific experts recommended July 19 that the FDA here in Washington

allow the controversial abortion-inducing pill to be marketed in the United States.

Following a public hearing in Gaithersburg, the FDA's Reproductive Health Drugs Advisory Committee voted 6-0 that the benefits of the RU-486/misoprostol regimen for terminating early pregnancies outweigh its risks. Two members of the panel abstained.

RU-486, also known by its generic name mifepristone, is taken first and causes the uterine lining to break down and slough off. Misoprostol, a prostaglandin that stimulates uterine contractions, is taken two days later. The procedure requires several medical visits, precise drug dosage and monitoring.

An editorial in the July 22 issue of L'Osservatore Romano, the Vatican newspaper, condemned the abortion pill as "the pill of Cain, the monster that cynically kills one's brother."

The editorial, signed by Father Gino Concetti, a moral theologian, said the pill's anticipated approval in the United States was an important victory for what it termed the "abortion party" led by the Population Council and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

At the hearing, the Population Council, a New-York based research organization that holds the U.S. patent rights to RU-486, presented clinical data from two French trials involving 2,480 women and preliminary safety data from U.S. trials involving 2,100 women.

More than 30 individuals also testified during the open portion of the meeting.

The French data showed the medical abortion procedure to be 95 percent effective. However, panelists also heard that women participating in the clinical trials experienced painful contractions of the uterus as well as nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, pelvic pain and spasm, and headache.

In some cases where the chemical combination failed to produce an abortion, women then had surgical abortions; others completed their pregnancies and delivered babies with deformities.

According to an FDA statement after the panel decision, "a very small percentage of patients in the clinical trials required hospitalizations, surgical treatment or transfusions."

Dr. Mark Louviere, a Waterloo, Iowa, emergency room physician who said he is a supporter of legalized abortion, told FDA panelists that he treated a participant in the Planned Parenthood of Iowa trial who lost more than half of her blood volume and nearly died.

"I am concerned that all of the true complications of RU-486 are not being reported to both the media and to the FDA," he said, adding that he also fears the use of RU-486 "by physicians without appropriate follow-up."

"The FDA approval process is moving at an unheard-of pace to approve this deadly drug combination, leaving many concerns about safety unresolved," said Wanda Franz, a developmental psychologist at West Virginia University and president of the National Right to Life Committee, in a statement from the group's Washington office.

"Respect for human life and women's health, not developing human 'pesticides,' should be at the center of the FDA's concern when advancing new drugs," said Judie Brown, president of the American Life League, in a statement from the organization's headquarters in Stafford, VA.

RU-486 was developed by the French company Roussel Uclaf, and has been taken by more than 200,000 European women since 1989. In 1994, Roussel Uclaf signed over U.S. rights to the Population Council, which filed the FDA application in March.

In deciding on drug applications, the federal agency usually has followed the recommendations of its advisory committees. If RU-486 is approved by the FDA, the drug would be sold by Advances in Health Technology, a company set up for that purpose last year, and could be available in the United States next year.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. GOSS (during the special order of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-735) on the resolution (H. Res. 500) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of a certain resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A DIFFERENT VISION OF AMERICA

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk tonight about a different vision of America, a vision that we are not really seeing from the Washington bureaucracy, but one that this Congress is trying to form and trying to achieve and move our Nation towards.

We have asked ourselves some fundamental questions: What kind of America do we want? Do we want an America where illegal drug use is up? Do we want an America where taxes are up and wages are down? Do we want an America where welfare traps families and despairs generation after generation? And do we want an America where illegal immigration is up? And do we want one where a White House has more scandals than Hollywood has disaster films?

Look at that vision of America. That is somehow what many of the Washington bureaucrats see and administer today.

Think about another kind of America. Would we like one that has stronger and safer families through a real fight against crime and illegal drugs? Do we want an America where there are more opportunities through lower taxes, higher wages, better jobs and more free time? Do we want an American where illegal immigration is down and English is truly our common and unifying language? Do we want an America where welfare is replaced by work? And do we want an America where the White House is the moral leader of the country, not just the political issues.

These are the things that we are going to talk about tonight, and I have

with me our esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. CURT WELDON.

Mr. WELDON, if you have any comments, let me yield to you.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am pleased to join with him this evening in a portion of his special order. As he knows, I will be taking a special order following this to discuss our defense bill that will be on the floor this week. But I thought it very important to highlight the key areas the gentleman has raised that are really, I think, going to frame the debate as we move into the final 3 months of the election cycle into September and October and talk about what is the status of this country today in five key areas and what is the vision for the future and which party and which candidate can offer the best vision for America.

I start out by saying to the gentleman and my friend, I ran for office and got involved in public life because of drug use in my hometown and my county. I come from a town that was one of our most distressed communities in Pennsylvania. I was born and raised, the youngest of nine children, there, was active in the community a number of ways, including the volunteer fire company and the Red Cross and the Boy Scout troop, and was upset because our town had become the national headquarters of one of the five largest motorcycle gangs in America.

That gang controlled all the drug trafficking along the east coast of this country. They had 65 members living there, and the national president lives there and because we were just a small town, we had no resources of coping with the problem of drug abuse.

We have continuously seen since that point in time, approximately 20 years ago, a declining use of drugs in America. During the era of Ronald Reagan and George Bush, we saw a marked decrease in the use of drugs in this country.

The gentleman has some factual information that he might want to insert in the RECORD. My understanding is that in the past 3 years the use of drugs in this country has in fact reversed, and we are now seeing an increase in the amount of drug use by 14-year-olds. Is that correct?

Mr. KINGSTON. You have made a very good point. For 11 straight years, until 1992, illegal drug use fell in all categories of drugs except, for some reason, heroin, but everything else had fallen.

□ 2100

Now, since 1992, when a lot of these drug education programs and a lot of the interdiction programs and enforcement programs were cut, under the Clinton administration drug use has gone back up to the extent now that, just to give some numbers, marijuana use among teenagers has dropped, excuse me, has since 1992 increased 137 percent amongst 12- and 13-year-olds.

Now, for 14- to 15-year-olds there has been a 200 percent increase.

Of the graduating class of 1995, statistically half of the will have experienced some sort of illegal drug, and a drug like LSD which we really had not been talking about at all in recent years is now back strong on the streets and LSD use has increased 62 percent since 1992.

One of the things that we have been fighting is the fact that the President had slashed the funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy by 80 percent. I am on the Treasury-Post Office Committee. We are doing everything we can to work with General McCaffrey, the new drug czar, to restore much of this funding and do everything we can, but along with government funding there are some other things that we can do to fight drugs.

And I do believe in these interdiction programs. I do believe in local policing in States like Georgia where, for example, the police opened up a satellite station in the middle of one of the biggest housing projects, where they had the high drug use and they had crime and teenage dropout and teenage pregnancy problems. As a result of them doing that, the children got to know the police officers. The families came out of the house and the streets got to be safe. And in Statesboro, GA, in that high crime area, drug use has dropped.

That is the sort of thing that we are trying to encourage with our budget is local policies to fight drugs.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman makes an excellent point. Two key considerations here. First of all, while the administration puts out the rhetoric of being concerned about drug use and supposedly doing something about it, the facts and this is typically the case throughout this administration, just do not bear out the rhetoric.

As the gentleman and my friend pointed out, the office of Drug Enforcement Administration reporting to the White House has in fact been cut by, I think the figure used was 84 percent. In fact, it has been decimated. But this President, knowing that he can use perception as opposed to substance, in his last State of the Union Speech appointed one of this Nation's heroes, General Barry McCaffrey, to head up the drug effort because he wanted to give the people the perception that he in fact is really doing something substantive. So he appoints a genuine hero in this country, whom all of us have the highest respect for and whom all of us want to help, while at the same time he is decimating the funding to allow the programs under the control of that individual and that agency in fact to go forward.

Furthermore, perceptually, this administration has created a casual atmosphere about drug use. That casual atmosphere then gets translated to our teenagers across the country, and they then think maybe it is okay to do some drugs or limited use and we see the

numbers start to go up, as our colleague has pointed out. We saw descending use of drugs in this country for the previous 12 years, and in the last 3 years we have seen an increase in drug use by the use of this country.

While we cannot blame any one person for that, we can look at the factors that may in fact be causing that increase and the fact that we have to be doing more substantively to deal with that increase. As the gentleman points out, that is one of the issues that we have been fighting to have as a top priority for the past 2 years since the Republican Party has controlled this institution.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to conclude this section of our five-part discussion with this comment. Two other things we want to do with drugs is to have severe penalties, pressure; if you are pushing drugs to school kids on basketball courts or playgrounds, you go to jail. You stay in jail. We need to have that.

Then finally for the addicts, why not have a 24-hour a day hotline that says if a drug addict says I am ready to kill myself, I have hit bottom, I want to bounce back up, give a 24-hour hotline that we will get you help the next day, we will get you help on the spot, because once an individual has made up his or her mind to kick the habit, then they are the easiest to cure.

We are going to talk again about in a second on illegal immigration, but in the meantime let me yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just came from a Committee on Rules meeting and heard what my colleagues were doing on this proliferation of drug use in America. It is such a sad, sad thing. The gentleman over here from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] mentioned casual attitude. Let me tell how bad that casual attitude is coming out of the White House and what is happening to our children and our grandchildren.

Seventy-five percent of all violent crime in America today that is committed against women and children, 75 percent that is committed against women and children are drug-related. What has this casual attitude done? It is the most pathetic thing. Today among 12- and 13-year olds, marijuana use is up 137 percent. And in the 14- and 15-year-old range, it is up 200 percent. Among young adults, it has doubled just in the last four years. The worst part of it is these kinds of drugs today, because of this casual attitude coming out of the White House and other places, means that drugs now are being used as weapons against women and children. A drug like Rohypnol, for instance, is used as a weapon where, after young women have been plied with marijuana or with alcohol, they have had a Rohypnol tablet slipped into their drink. It renders them unconscious, but awake, so that they cannot

defend themselves but they can see what is going on when the rape is taking place. This is a whole new generation that is now exposed to this.

When we compare this to Nancy Reagan's "Just Say No" and Ronald Reagan when he sponsored, when he approved my legislation which had random drug testing for our military, we had use of drugs in our military that was running at 25 percent back in the early 1980s, and once we implemented that random drug testing system, it dropped to 4.5 percent. Drug use all over America began to drop.

Now look what has happened. It has turned around and it is just ruining these kids. Is a terrible thing.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention and we need to focus on this all the way. There better be a change at the White House in this casual attitude.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to go on to the next topic that Mr. WELDON and I wanted to bring up, the subject of illegal immigration.

First, let me recognize Mr. BOB EHRLICH of Maryland, who is here with us tonight. Before I yield to the gentleman, let me throw out some statistics on how bad the illegal immigration problem is, because most Americans know that we have a lot of illegal aliens in America but they do not know how extensive the problem is.

There are an estimated 4.5 million illegal aliens in America now, that is about the size of the State of Indiana; 300,000 new illegal aliens come each year and so the problem is getting bigger and bigger. In many cases, they are using false documents to get American welfare benefits, American jobs and so forth, and it is displacing people and putting a further tax drain on us.

One of the huge tax drains is in the Federal penal system where right now approximately 22 percent of the prisoners in the Federal penitentiaries are illegal aliens, and about 80 percent of them are violent offenders which are the most expensive to incarcerate.

We have a lot of direct and indirect costs because of the strain of illegal aliens, but one of them is now that school systems must offer not just bilingual education but multi-lingual education. In Seattle, for example, there are 75 different languages spoken in the school system; in Los Angeles, 80; 100 in Chicago.

Now, we are all sons and daughters of immigrants, most of us sons and daughters of legal immigrants. But what they did when they came to America is they learned American culture and they learned English as our common language. They did not turn their back on the home country great traditions. Savannah, GA, where I live, has ethnic celebrations all through the year, because we have a strong ethnic heritage. We want to keep that in mind and celebrate it.

I know where I was raised, not in Savannah but in Athens, GA, a lot of Cuban families came after Castro took

over and in most of their homes they spoke Spanish. But their children were raised in the school systems where they learned English. Now those children are in very good jobs because they were not trained to be special. They were trained—well, I take that back. They were trained to be special because all Americans are special. But now our school systems have all these ridiculous requirements. I have heard that the voting ballot in California is in seven different languages. Can you imagine voting but not knowing English?

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH].

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said an awful lot of truth here. It really speaks to the fact that we are a multi-ethnic culture and we revel in that fact.

The gentleman just recited that fact, but we are one culture. And that one culture has a common language, which is English. Of course, the English bill will certainly dominate the debate on this floor over the next couple days. But I know the gentleman has put it very well. What better means to you achieve economic mobility in this country other than by a common language? Does it make any sense that any other options—look what is happening in Quebec right to the north?

Multi-ethnic but one single culture, that is the way to the American dream. That is the way to economic prosperity. That is certainly the message that should go out from this Congress.

Mr. KINGSTON. If you will remember the biblical story about the tower of Babel, the story is that the villagers decided to build a tower to heaven. And the Lord did not want that done and, as a preemptive measure, gave them all different languages. And then they could not work together, and they broke up and they started all the other nations.

I am not saying that we cannot work with each other when we speak different languages, but the fact is, it is interesting that thousands and thousands of years ago, in a Bible story we all learned as children, the way to break up a nation was to have different languages. I believe, to say it in a positive light, the way to unify America further is having one common language. Today there are 320 languages spoken in the United States of America.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the issue of immigration, again, this administration wants to create the perception among the American people that Republicans do not care, that we are not sensitive, that we are not compassionate. And we have to rise up and we have to shout as loud as we can the facts, because that is not the case.

What we are trying to do is to stop the abuse. I think the best case that I can point to of what is going haywire in this country was brought to my attention by a good friend and colleague

from California, ELTON GALLEGLY, who has been the leader in this Congress in terms of immigration. ELTON GALLEGLY showed me a brochure, I think it was the last session of Congress, printed in Spanish, paid for by the U.S. taxpayers.

This four-page brochure was being handed out in southern California to anyone who was Spanish speaking that needed health care. And what it said was that if you are pregnant, you can go to any hospital within the jurisdiction of the brochure being given out, I think it was Orange County, and you can get prenatal care, postnatal care, and have the cost of delivering your child borne by the taxpayers of this country.

If you are a young Mexican mother and you know in a brochure printed in your native language that you can come across the border to America, where health care is the best in the world, and you can go to any hospital and have your prenatal care provided, your baby delivered and your postnatal care provided, what are you going to do? You are going to do everything you can to come across that border.

Here is the real rub. The person also knows, the mother also knows when that child is born in America, guess what, that child is an American citizen. Even though that child is born to an illegal immigrant in this country, that child becomes a full U.S. citizen with the same rights as any other child born here.

But what really bothered me about this brochure, which should bother every Member of this institution, was a paragraph in the bottom of the third page that said, you cannot be turned into the immigration service even if you are here illegally.

□ 2115

Now we wonder why we have an immigration problem. Here is a brochure printed by the taxpayers of this country in Spanish given to people all over the southern part of California and in Mexico, and we wonder why they are all coming across the border. We just cannot continue to be the health care resource center for the world. That is what we are talking about, immigration reform that stops that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, let me give some numbers on that:

1996 taxpayers will spend \$26 billion to provide welfare benefits to noncitizens which includes 11 billion in Medicaid benefits, which is basically free insurance, health care, free health care; 4.4 billion in Supplemental Security Income, which is up, incidentally, 825 percent.

Now remember we are just talking about noncitizens.

There is 2.9 billion in food stamps; 2.3 billion in Aid to Families with Dependent Children; 3.89 billion in housing cash assistance and other subsidies. And that is from a Harvard University study; that is not exactly, you know, a conservative group up there. But this

is putting an additional tax strain on American middle class taxpayers.

I believe we need to strengthen our border patrols. We need to crack down on deportation of criminals aliens. We need to have sponsorship, legally binding; so if you want to bring your family member or whoever in, fine, but you need to be responsible for that person to make sure he or she is independent of government benefits.

We also need to protect American jobs. There are a lot of American jobs that have been displaced.

Then finally tomorrow this House will vote on English-first as a language. I believe we have enough votes to pass it. I think the President is probably going to veto it, but I am not discouraged because the liberal Governor of Georgia vetoed it two or three times himself. Finally this year, because of election year pressures, he signed it. As we saw today with welfare, our President is very sensitive to election year pressures, and maybe we can get his attention on it.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will yield, I think the message is well taken.

I hear this term sensitivity used in this House so much. But I never hear that term used in the context of the American taxpayer.

The gentleman cited an interesting statistic early on; I think it bears repeating. The gentleman, I believe, said that 22 percent of the population in the Federal penal system in this country, is illegal aliens; is that correct?

Mr. KINGSTON. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. EHRLICH. This free ride on the American taxpayer has to end. That is the bottom line to illegal drugs. That is the bottom line to illegal immigration. That is the bottom line to reforming our legal immigration system. That is the bottom line to welfare reform as we have discussed. It is the bottom line to almost every issue in this town because, as the gentleman just said, working Americans are just tired of it. They are tired of the free ride.

We have a very hospitable people in this country. We are a Nation of immigrants, as the gentleman has said. We are sensitive to the concerns and the plights of people. But at some point this Congress has to say:

You know what, folks? You know what, world? There is a limit to what we can do, and we expect you to abide by our laws.

Mr. KINGSTON. Our compassion does not rule out common sense, and we have to just put a little bit more common sense in it. Just as we have said, we are going to address this illegal immigration, this English-first issue. This Congress is going to move in that direction.

The other thing that we all mention is \$26 billion is the direct cost of illegal immigration. There are other indirect costs, but that tax strain is further adding to the third issue that we want-

ed to discuss. That is the fact that this Congress, this Republican agenda, wants to have for our middle class citizens lower taxes, higher wages and more free time.

I am going to show you some of the statistics on taxes, but right now we know that the average middle class family is paying 38 percent of the total household income in taxes, which basically means the second income earner is working for the government. That is just, you know, what is happening. Right now we all work until May 7 to have the tax-free independence. So from January 1 to May 7 every year, people are working just to pay the IRS and State and local taxes.

Now, if you add on the cost of government regulations and other taxes, you are going until July 3d for Independence Day.

Now people will say, well, what are you talking about? Let me show you this chart.

This is a gas pump. On \$1.20 for a gallon of gas—fortunately I am paying a little bit less in Georgia, but I know the folks in Maryland, they all are paying more than \$1.20. But on a \$1.20 gallon of gas, 56 cents goes to taxes, and that includes—I am just going to read:

FICA tax, corporate income tax, individual tax, capital gains tax, customs, ad valorem taxes, State taxes, corporate income, unemployment taxes, motor fuel taxes, excise taxes, used oil disposal taxes, business property taxes, pipeline throughput taxes. It is ridiculous. When people buy 10 gallons worth of gas, they are paying \$5.60. They do not even think about taxes on top of what has already been taken out of their paycheck.

Now let us talk about a bottle of beer, 43 cents on a dollar bottle—well a little over a dollar, but 43 cents on a bottle of beer goes to taxes, basically the same kind of thing.

On a loaf of bread there are 118 different taxes that you and I and our families pay when we go to the grocery store to buy a loaf of bread. Hidden in the cost of that bread are 118 different taxes. That is why the middle class families are working their tails off. The harder they work, the less time they have because the more taxes they have to pay, and we do not have that family fellowship that we so desperately need to impart values to our next generation.

Mr. EHRLICH. That is why the middle class in this country is nervous. When working folks get nervous, this place feels it. The gentleman has raised a very interesting point. The gentleman talked about, what was it, 120 different taxes on a loaf of bread?

Mr. KINGSTON. One hundred eighteen.

Mr. EHRLICH. One hundred eighteen. But when we go to the grocery store, what do we see? One price, one price. We never think about it.

And I love this term "takehome pay." What does takehome pay mean to you, to the average person?

Well, after you work until what, July 3d this year, you get your takehome pay. You work the rest of the year for yourself; right?

Mr. KINGSTON. Well now, actually your direct tax burden—you work from January 1 to May 7, and then the indirect tax in regulatory burden, you go on to July 3d.

Mr. EHRLICH. But the rest of the year you are really not taking home the rest of your paycheck because, despite your takehome pay, you take your takehome pay, your cash, and you go out and you buy things which are taxes.

So I think we really need to understand the dramatic way in which taxes impact the average working person in this country.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now to give my colleagues an idea of the Federal Government Washington command control bureaucracy view on taxes versus drugs, when we talked about earlier 13- and 14-year-olds using marijuana higher than ever before, I think, in history, but it is up anywhere from 137 to 200 percent depending on what age group in that 12-to-14 range, here is what we have fighting drugs.

Now this chart, I hope you can see it.

The DEA has 6,700 employees, and that is to fight drugs. The Border Patrol, immigration folks, 5,800 employees. So that is what we have got. You know, we will just round this up and say about 13,000 employees for fighting drugs and illegal immigration.

For the IRS we have 111,000 employees. Now, of those 111,000 employees, for every 3,000 citizens of America there is one criminal investigator.

So what we are saying is, no, we cannot fight drugs, we cannot fight illegal immigration, but we can audit you, and we can make sure that you are paying your taxes, and people should pay their taxes, and IRS should be able to collect it.

But it shows a disproportionate value rendered when you have 110,000 IRS employees versus 13,000 Border Patrol and drug enforcement.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will yield, it reflects the values that have held sway in this town for at least 30 to 40 years. That is exactly what it reflects.

I know the gentleman is very anxious to talk about the topic of the day, the issue of the day, welfare reform.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am. But before we leave that, I do want to get one other thing on taxes.

There was a big discussion about the Clinton tax increase went to balancing the budget 1993, when Clinton passed the largest tax increase in the history of America, \$245 billion. That money did not go into deficit reduction. That money went into more Federal Government.

Now, you know, the thinking that Americans do not deserve tax relief right after the President just passed such a huge tax credit—what the Republican Party was trying to do was

basically say we want to give you back some of the money that the President took from you in 1993, and one of those was a \$500 per child tax credit.

So, working person, and I love to tell the story about John Johnson who works for UPS, U-P-S, in my district, and he said to me:

You know, I make pretty good money. I do a lot of overtime. I worked hard. My wife is a school teacher, and between the two of us we do OK. But we have got three kids. And at the end of the month we are not able to go down to Florida or go up to Atlanta and see a Braves game or do some of the nice things because we have got to buy a new set of tires, a new dryer. We have got to spend money on groceries, and so forth, and we cannot get ahead.

And this is a real story.

Now, with the \$500 per child tax credit, he and his wife could have had \$1,500 in their pocket that they could have spent any way they wanted to. And I think they know how to do it a heck of a lot better than Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will yield, what is so dangerous, what is so radical, and my favorite term in this Congress, what is so extreme about working people in this country taking home just a little bit more money? And I think I have the answer to that question: Class warfare works in elections.

How much class warfare do we see on this floor every day? How many times do we hear this phrase, the rich, the rich? And you know what? Those folks you just mentioned in your district, they are rich. They do not know it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes, they are, because under the liberal Washington definition of rich, that means you hold a job and you pay taxes.

You know another thing: marriage tax penalty. Two people living together doing everything that a married couple does pay less taxes than if they go down to the chapel and get a ring around their finger. That is absurd. Marriage is the key foundation block of the family in America, and here the first thing we do right off the bat is tell a couple:

Hey, it is cheaper to live together than it is to get married.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will yield, what is the basic fabric of the free enterprise system in America? Small business people, small businessmen, and particularly small business women. Yet, we make it extremely difficult for these small business folks, who create 80 to 85 percent of the jobs in this country, to transfer their small businesses to the next generation. We punish success.

Of course, that is what class warfare is all about, punishing success. And I rally think it is incumbent upon this Congress—and now we have been joined by the President of the freshman class, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], and I know he has very strong views on this issue, being a business man himself.

We make it for some reason part of the political atmosphere in this country to practice this class warfare, generation warfare to make that person who is making \$25,000 a year jealous of that person making \$38,000 a year, which is not the way it is supposed to be. Yet every day in this House we hear from across the aisle:

Class warfare.

Tired of it.

Mr. KINGSTON. I have a friend of mine named Ted Fox, and Ted says this is what Congress' basic mentality is, that it is the three of us right here. We are walking down the street together, and one had more money than the other two. The other two could vote to take your money, and it would be morally fine and justified.

□ 2130

That is exactly, that is the whole left-wing premise: It is okay to steal, as long as you vote it as law in Congress. That is their whole mentality.

I want to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] because he has been involved in so many of these good changes we have done. First, I want to say this, the idea behind class warfare is a loser. You are just bashing people.

The other day we had a leading Democrat say in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I will give you both and anybody else interested a copy of this, that the employer-employee relationship is similar to the jailer and prisoner relationship or the slave and the master relationship. That was from a leading Democrat, in one of the pro-family debates we were having.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. My thanks to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the debate and wanted to come down and share the gentleman's comments and concerns.

In my perception, I think, of what we have seen in the brief year and a half and a little bit more that we have been in Washington as freshmen, it has been one of continual amazement in our dialog with the American people and how we think our Government relates to society in general, and how we are coming up against some pretty old ideas that have been around town for the last 40 years about government and its relationship with the people, as if that is the only relationship that is in America today.

It kind of epitomizes the Great Society and some of the ways of thinking of the last 40 years, in that the only relationship in America is Americans, with their government, and that there is only a two-way street there.

In coming to Washington and having to develop ideas on how to solve complex problems, like the deficit that we have, the up to \$200 billion deficit and \$5 trillion worth of debt, we have to begin to think in terms of other relationships that comprise America; that there are other institutions out there

that are perhaps fundamentally more suited to the solving of some of our society's problems.

So when we get people coming on the House floor debating class warfare and this idea that there is a pot with only so much in it and you have to divvy it up among the people in the United States, and the only relationship that Americans have is with their Government, they are some of the ideas we have to begin to defuse. In so doing, we have to remind the American people that there are other institutions out there that are perhaps more suited to taking up the responsibilities that we have seen fit over the last 40 years to assume.

There are family units, there is business, legitimate business, and there are religious and civic institutions. Some of those jobs that government is doing right now are far more suited to these other institutions. Rather than get into this dialog about there being finite resources and we have to promote class warfare to get our piece of the pie, and that government should be involved in doing all these things and that is the only way we are going to solve our problem, I think what we need to do is to speak in terms of what other institutions in this country are better suited to solving these problems. If we were thinking in those terms we would probably not be \$5 trillion in debt right now.

Mr. KINGSTON. I will say one thing, Mr. Speaker, that we all who are parents know the joy of holding our own child for the first time. You can hold your nephew or niece, you can hold a friend's baby, and you can love that baby and go to bat for him time and time again and care for him very deeply, but when you hold your own baby it is a whole new ball game.

The difference is we have Washington bureaucrats, and as well-minded as they may be about the children in California, in Maryland, in Georgia, and I am sure they love them to death, and I am sure they would never use children as political pawns, but the fact is the folks in Georgia, California, and Maryland love our kids a heck of a lot better than Washington bureaucrats, regardless of how great they may be up here.

WELFARE

Mr. Speaker, we want to move to our next topic, which ties into the family. It ties into the tax burden. That is that of welfare. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] had mentioned that earlier. I could tell he was chomping at the bit. I need to congratulate the two gentlemen for their leadership on this issue, because it is truly because their freshman class has been so persistent when the President has twice vetoed welfare reform, and you two have fought hard to bring it back to the floor time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed the President vetoed welfare twice, but that is part of the process. The fact is in our American system, hey, it is 3 months away from election, and he is

going to sign it. He is going to sign it for that reason. I understand that, and I will not complain about it if we get a bill and we help get children out of the poverty trap, so they can enjoy the social and economic mainstream.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, once we think about getting some other bills on which we have had vetoes in the past, maybe a clean products liability bill, maybe we can get that signed. The president of the class is here and I know he would love that.

Before I begin my remarks on welfare, I have to be maybe the first in the entire House to congratulate my friend on his engagement, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH]. I am very proud of the gentleman, and so is my wife.

Welfare reform. It is a great day, a great day for America. Substance triumphs over politics: Real work requirements, real reform of our legal immigration system, real time limits. It really leads into what the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] was talking about just 2 minutes ago: what institutions do when we realize finally that government cannot do everything; that \$5 trillion to \$6 trillion in debt has made us at this point a permanent debtor nation, and we all know no superpower can live on for very long being a permanent debtor nation.

What institutions will take over for government? One is the private sector: jobs, real work, a quid pro quo for the Federal taxpayer. You want hard-earned tax money to live? Fine. It is a legitimate thing for government to do, to provide temporary assistance to folks. No one argues that. It should not be generational, it should not be multigenerational. Look what it has done to the society.

What is part of the answer? Work. The very foundation, the philosophical foundation of our welfare bill, which is quite similar to what the President vetoed last year, is work.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it also is fair in saying too that when we are dealing with generations of people who are used to being on the welfare rolls, we have to be concerned a little more about conscience-building among those ranks to get them off. Work is a moral responsibility. It really is not something that government should be teaching right now.

Every citizen in this country has the obligation of work, but it is very hard to instill those values, being a government institution. That is why block granting and getting these ideas away from government and starting to think about religious and civic institutions instilling those morals, and in the business institutions learning to work, so people go out and get the job and get the satisfaction of a day's pay for a day's work. It will be a wonderful thing. Government cannot teach those things.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the things that is dear to the heart of every

American citizen, Mr. Speaker, and particularly Virginia legislators, because it has the first House of Burgesses, which was the first legislative body in America, Jamestown, as the gentleman recalls from our history, the Jamestown Colony, many of the people who came over had their job classification as gentlemen. They thought they were coming to America, to the streets of gold, and so forth, the land of opportunity. They did not realize it had a work requirement to it. As a result, I think half of the crew perished that first and very harsh winter. Then Captain John Smith said, all right, there is going to be a new game. Everybody is going to work. When they did, the colony survived.

What we are saying is that if you are able to work, you are going to be required to work, and you are going to be better for it because you can join the socioeconomic mainstream. President Clinton loves to tell the story about the little boy who says, "The best thing about my Mama being off welfare is because when people ask me what she does, I can say she has a job," so we are very much in line, here.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to recognize the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], who is here to join us, and I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, we have our classmate outnumbered, 3 to 1. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is a good friend of all of us and a great leader in our class. Before he speaks, I just want to say one thing.

All of us go back to our districts every weekend and talk to our constituents. That is part of the job. The modern House has evolved into that. It is such an important part of our jobs. Housing policy is a major issue in my district, particularly a settlement in Baltimore, which I know my friends in the class know about too well; welfare reform, personal responsibility as a concept.

What I see as the common denominator to all these issues is just a working class interest in having people work. It is a working class resentment toward those who will not, not cannot, but will not. I see it time and time again in comments from people I represent who stop me in shopping malls, gas stations, the hardware store, wherever, and they say, "We work very hard to send our kids to school, to pay our mortgage, to buy our car. We do everything, EHRLICH, you want us to do. Yet we see in the newspaper every day people who will not who are rewarded for it."

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker let me apologize to the gentleman who I said earlier was from Nevada. We have so many good-looking freshmen faces that sometimes I just assume they are from all out West somewhere, and throw all those categories out there. I apologize, and I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. No apology necessary, Mr. Speaker. I am just pleased

to join you all in celebrating what I think is a great victory for America today.

Today really is not a day for partisanship, it is a day for celebration. The truth is all across America, Americans understand that the welfare system we have, though well-intended, simply is not working. It is not working for the Americans that are at work and paying taxes, now paying taxes of close to half of their income, supporting those people. It is not working for them.

But even more importantly, the welfare system that we have created in this Nation, out of a desire to help our fellow man and our fellow women and the poor children in this country, simply is not benefiting them. I think the beauty of it, and it is well put in the gentleman's quote about the young boy who says, "Now I can say that my mother has a job, or is not on welfare any longer," is the benefit for those people who are right now trapped in the system.

In a way, God created us to respond to incentives. The incentives in the current system are very bad. The incentives encourage people not to go back to work. They encourage people to have multiple illegitimate births. They encourage people to engage in lifestyles which are self-destructive.

All Americans recognize that there ought to be a safety net there to help those in need, but the safety net we have built has become not only a safety net but a trap. People try to climb out of that net and are caught up in it. Indeed, they spend way too long in it. It destroys them, it destroys their self-respect, and it destroys their families.

What we have done with this welfare bill, and I commend the President. I do not really care what his reasons are. He opposed it twice before. Now he has joined us. The bottom line point is we are going to make America better. We are fulfilling his promise to end welfare as we know it, because way back 3 years ago when he made that promise Americans understood welfare as we know it was a failure.

Now we are embarked on a program which will redesign welfare in America to help those that need help, but not just help them at their down point in their lives, help them get back into the job market, help them make themselves productive citizens again, help them attain back that point in their lives when they can respect what they do and when they can feel good about it, and when they can hold their head high and become participants in this economy and in the great experiment which is America, which is that we are going to reward initiative, that we are going to reward hard work. That is what this Nation was built on.

We have been cutting a whole block of Americans out from under that dream, saying to them, "No, you really cannot work. We know you are not able to work, so we are going to take care of you." That is not an answer, and that

is not giving them hope, it is not giving them a future.

I just think it is a tremendous day to celebrate the fact that we are in fact revising a failed system and making the Nation better, not only for the people trapped in the system but for those of us who are picking up the tab, as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we now have with us another freshman, the gentleman from Washington, Mr. RANDY TATE, and I will attribute him to the State of Washington, rightly or wrongly. I know it is west of the Mississippi.

Mr. TATE. I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Speaker. To folks out in the real Washington, this is an exciting day. To me welfare reform is not about balancing the budget. It has nothing to do with that, from my perspective. It is about helping people that are trapped in a system that has destroyed their self-esteem, that is taking their initiative away, that has trapped families and hurt children. We have spent, I have heard that number many times, \$5 trillion since the 1960s. If we put that in real dollars, that is more than we spent fighting the Japanese and Germans during World War II, and we won that battle.

Everyone agrees welfare has failed. President Clinton said just right here during his State of the Union that this is the year to end welfare as we know it. Today, in the House of Representatives, we began to end welfare as we know it, not for the sake of balancing the budget, not sitting there and counting beans. It is about helping people. That is what this whole debate is about, breaking down the system to make it work for people again, to help families, to help moms, to help dads, to help kids have a better future.

□ 2145

Mr. EHRLICH. The gentleman has really brought up the fifth topic of the evening, which is words and actions.

Mr. KINGSTON. Before going to the fifth topic, I want to make it very abundantly clear for the record that we would not be in a position of having a welfare bill today if not for the action of the freshman class and the leadership of the 4 of you and many of your colleagues, because I can say this having come the previous term. We all talked about welfare, we never could get a bill on the floor of the House. You have been persistent.

I would like to say also, I do not think there is anything extreme about saying able-bodied people who can work would be required to work, and I do not think there is anything extreme about getting people out of the poverty trap, and I do not think there is anything extreme about saying to noncitizens, you cannot have our welfare benefits if that is the reason you have come into the country.

I know your class has caught lots of criticism, but this victory today belongs to your class. I think that is very important.

Mr. RADANOVICH. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to add to that comment and appreciate the sentiment. Before saying what I am going to say, there are two things that need to be said. One is that it does not matter who gets credit for this, it passed and it was good for America. So it does not make any difference if the President gets credit or Congress gets credit.

However, having said that, I would say one thing, and that is during the dark times of late December, early January, when we were struck in the middle of a Government shutdown, when the freshmen were getting a lot of flak for standing on resolve and keeping certain people to their word, this is the fruit of that.

I think that I am not at all out of line to say that had we not gone through a Government shutdown, we would not have had the President of the United States in the Chamber saying that the era of big Government is over and we would not have a President in here signing welfare reform that changes welfare as we know it simply because he knew that there were people in the House of Representatives that were going to keep him to his word, come heck or high water.

I think that that needs to be said. We are seeing the fruits of that shutdown. I know it is a tough subject, I know it is not what people want to go back to and talk about, but the American people know that that was absolutely necessary in order to get the changes that we are beginning to see the fruit of now.

Mr. EHRLICH. The President of the class just used the word "fortitude," and the word "integrity" gets brought up, and the word "consistency." Now you are joined by 4 freshman, the gentleman from Georgia is really surrounded; five actually with the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY]. There is a quote right next to the gentleman. One of the President's closest advisers made that quote recently, I believe on Larry King Live, in February 1996. It is really interesting for the freshmen and certainly for the non-freshmen in this Congress to look at quotes like this and wonder what is meant.

I know when I go back home on weekends, people come up to me, and I get a lot of credit for doing the easiest thing in the world, what no politician should get credit for in any legislative body anywhere, which is keeping his or her word. We should not get credit for it, yet we all get credit for it every weekend, every day, and in talking to my colleagues, I know we do. It is somewhat of a symbol of how far we have fallen, and this institution has fallen, our profession. We hate to admit it now, but we are full-time politicians, Members of Congress.

"For this President, words are actions." Mr. Stephanopoulos, words are not actions. Words are cheap, words are meaningless. Words, whether it is the State of the Union, these words we are

speaking tonight, if they are not backed up with real actions, are without meaning.

I know the gentleman from Arizona is chomping at the bit over there.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield, let me just make this point. If Mr. Stephanopoulos said this, "For this President, words are actions," it pretty well defines the situation. I guess then saying that we should end welfare as we know it means that you have ended it. And yet in the first 3 years of this administration, nothing changed for America, not until the rubber hit the road, not until the votes were cast on the floor of this House to actually change the welfare system as written in the law did anything meaningful ever happen.

I would like to add one point to that. The victory, while it may be driven in part by the freshman class, as our colleague from Georgia has just pointed out, it was really driven by Main Street, America. This today was and is, and I guess we can claim victory today because the President has come forward and to his credit he has said he will sign this bill, that is victory for Main Street, America, because the values that freshmen have been advocating, the ideas of changing welfare to make it work for all Americans, those in the system and those paying for the system, those ideas came not from freshmen, they came from Main Street, America. They came from the people that we went to and asked what they wanted to see happen in this country and they want change. That is the point.

Mr. BILBRAY. If the gentleman will yield, I think the word was used quite appropriately, "integrity." There are those that have been in this town for a long time who think that the freshmen and the new majority is somehow radical because we have brought with us from mainstream America the concept of integrity, that words without commitment, words without action, words that are said without the intent to perform lack integrity. And yet there are those in Washington who are terrified of the 73 freshmen who came here and said, I will not sacrifice either my integrity personally or the integrity of the commitment to the people of the United States. Frankly, I have to sort of chuckle at the fact that Washington is so terrified of a group that is finally bringing some integrity to the House floor.

I want to say this about the welfare reform. I served as the chairman of San Diego County, which has a welfare system larger than 32 States in the Union. We in 1978 proposed a concept that at that time they called cruel and mean-spirited. That concept in 1978 was workfare. Every bureaucrat and every obstructionist tried to stop us from executing a concept that would bring dignity back into the public assistance programs. When we were fighting on things like welfare fraud, as an administrator I looked at it, at the cards and

said "There is not even a picture on the ID. Let's put a picture on the ID." Common sense. Washington said no, because they said it would violate the privacy of the welfare recipient.

These are just a few of many stories where every time you try to do something right with welfare, Washington stood in the way. Tonight we finally brought the integrity of the system before the American people and said if you want to promise that we are going to change welfare as we know it, then you have got to have the guts to change it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me reclaim the time just to remind everybody we have about 4 minutes left. So if each of you want to have a closing statement of 1 minute each.

Mr. EHRLICH. Just to back up what the gentleman from California had to say, I know the gentleman has another quote right next to him: "The President has kept all the promises he meant to keep."

What does that mean? The American people deserve to know what that means. They deserve to know when the President makes a promise which promise he means and which promise he does not mean. I do not care if you are liberal, conservative, Republican, Democrat. Your words should have meaning. Your words should have, as the gentleman said, integrity behind them if you sit in any legislative body, particularly the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TATE. I could not agree more. What does that mean? Are there promises you did not mean to keep, Mr. President? That is the question that I think is quite clear. The President did not mean to keep his tax cut for the middle class because he never provided a plan to do that. He never meant to balance the budget.

We had to bring him kicking and screaming all the way to the dance, so to speak, all the way to actually provide a plan finally, 3 years into his term, and, lastly, welfare reform today. It was not until the last moment, after he had already vetoed it twice, did he finally agree to sign welfare reform.

So I think I know exactly what it meant. Say one thing when you run, do another thing when you get elected. That is not what this Republican Congress is all about.

Mr. BILBRAY. I think the sad part about it is America and this Congress knows that if it was not election year, we would not have gotten three-quarters of Congress supporting what the American people are demanding. We operate a welfare system in this society that we would not do to our own children. But we justify it under the guise of being merciful. It would be illegal for us to do to our own children what we do on welfare. We pay underage children to live alone and send them a check. If you and I did that to our own children, it would not only be child abandonment, it would be child abuse.

But there are those here who claim they care about the children and hide behind the words they care about the children when in fact what they are doing is government-subsidized child abuse.

Tonight we had a great victory, and the American people had the great victory of making politics work for the American people, changing the system. I worry that without the American people keeping a clear message in the next election, that there are those who will try to go back to the old, worn-out, corrupt systems of the old Washington rather than moving forward with the integrity of the new majority.

Mr. Kingston. Let me reclaim the time just to yield to the president of the freshman class that has made all these changes possible. We are closing our discussion of illegal immigration, drug use, higher wages, lower taxes and, of course, welfare reform. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. I thank the gentleman. My final words are promises made, promises kept; the promise to the American people that until we start keeping word and following through in Washington, it will be a long time even then before they begin to feel the results on Main Street, America. This is really truly where it happens. That is the commitment that we intend to keep to the American people.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], and the Gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] for participating in this special order.

IN SUPPORT OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3230, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to not take the entire hour, but I did want to rise this evening first of all to commend my colleagues for the excellent work they did in discussing the message of the Republican Party, and not just the Republican Party but, as evidenced by the vote on the welfare reform bill today, the overwhelming majority of Members of this institution. In fact, on the final vote there were 98 Democrats who voted for the bill and 98 who opposed it. So it truly was a bipartisan effort.

While there is much perceptual criticism of the Republicans in the Congress this year, the fact is that most of our initiatives have passed with bipar-

tisan support and our colleagues on the other side have joined us.

That leads me to my point of discussion tonight, which is also bipartisan and which I expect to hit the House floor tomorrow, and that is the final conference report on the defense authorization bill for 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development for the House Committee on National Security and one of the conferees who chaired two of the panels with the Senate in deliberating the final conference report that will come before us tomorrow.

Let me start out by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is a good bill. It is not everything that I had wanted. I will talk about some of the weaknesses that I think we did not get in this bill, but all in all it is a good piece of legislation that deserves the support from a bipartisan standpoint of the majority of the Members of this institution.

But I want to start off by clearing up some misconceptions. The President and certain members of his administration and some on the other side in the more liberal wing of the Democratic Party have gone around the country talking about the Republicans wanting to have massive plus-ups in defense spending and that in fact the Republicans are giving the Pentagon programs that they really do not want, that we are just about buying more weapons systems and that we really are not concerned about the human problems that people in this country face.

Let me start out by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I come to this body as a public school teacher. I taught for 7 years in the public schools of Pennsylvania. I ran a chapter 1 program for 3 years in one of my depressed communities like West Philadelphia, then worked for a corporation running their training department and ran for office as the mayor of my hometown. All of those things I did to try to help people and to try to make a difference.

In my 10 years in Washington, I have tried to exercise in every possible way through my votes and my actions support and compassion for those needs that ordinary people have. In fact, I take great pride this year in the fact that, working with my colleague the gentleman from New York, RICK LAZIO, after Speaker GINGRICH had asked RICK and I to cochair an effort dealing with anti-poverty initiatives, that we were able to plus-up the funding for the community services block grant program in the appropriate appropriations bill on the House floor by \$100 million.

This money goes directly to a network of 1100 community action agencies nationwide that basically is totally consistent with the Republican philosophy of empowering people locally to solve the problems of the poor. This plus-up in funding did not get much play in the national media. It was the single largest plus-up in the