

Governor George W. Bush wants to generate some savings by spending less on welfare administration. After nine months of stalling, the Clinton White House has just turned him down.

This is the same Bill Clinton who famously promised "to end welfare as we know it." This is the same Bill Clinton who has been pressing to expand health coverage for poor children, insisting that the budget agreement with Congress earmark \$18 billion for that purpose. This is the same Bill Clinton who during last year's election campaign signed a welfare reform bill supposedly giving wide discretion to the states. In the end, though, this same Bill Clinton overruled his own Cabinet to side with his reactionary union allies.

The story is worth recounting simply to show what it's like to negotiate with our present President, but also because it has huge potential implications for welfare reform nationwide. The administrative costs that Governor Bush wants to pare in Texas cost federal and state governments a whopping \$28 billion a year—to deliver \$250 billion a year in welfare benefits. Several governors are convinced these administrative functions could be privatized, with likely administrative savings of 20% to 35%.

Many states are already experimenting with contracting out parts of their welfare apparatus. Thirty states use Lockheed Martin to collect child Support payments, for example, and the company also runs the federal computer to find deadbeat dads. Maximus Corp. of McLean, Va., which helps run local welfare offices for states, has doubled in size in the past year. Wisconsin is allowing both private companies and non-profits such as Goodwill Industries to bid on screening, training and placing welfare recipients in jobs. California and Arizona have plans similar to that just vetoed in Texas.

Paring state bureaucracies, of course, is anathema to public employee unions: to them the loss of state jobs spells smaller union dues and less political clout. When Governor Bush and Texas legislators decided to contract with private firms to set up one-stop assistance bureaus that would allow recipients to apply for all their benefits at once, the unions went ballistic. Their radio ads featured the sound of exploding bombs; "Texas is under attack. They're coming after us," an announcer intoned. "The guys who brought us the \$3,000 toilet seat are trying to take over public services for families, children and seniors."

Worried that Governor Bush's plan would create a bandwagon effect in other states, the unions helped convince the White House to sit for nine months on his request for a federal waiver. On March 28, President Clinton met at the White House to discuss the Texas welfare plan with four union leaders, including AFL-CIO President John Sweeney.

In April, a memo to the President warned that "we must give Texas an answer immediately." The memo—signed by Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman and White House domestic policy adviser Bruce Reed—observed that "the state has engaged in good faith discussions with various agencies for more than nine months, and state officials are now publicly criticizing the administration." It suggested the White House approve a compromise plan, giving Texas leeway on administration of income supports while barring private workers from the food stamp and Medicaid programs, on which the welfare reform bill provided tighter federal regulation.

As you know, labor leaders would like us to refuse the Texas request entirely," the memo read. "They see even limited privatization as a dangerous precedent and have

made clear they view this decision as critically important to public employee unions." On May 5, Governor Bush fired off an angry letter to Secretary Shalala complaining about "double talk and runarounds." And last Friday, Governor Bush finally got his answer: No.

Mr. Clinton rejected not only the Texas waiver, but also the compromise proposed by his own Cabinet officials. At a news briefing Ms. Shalala explained that only state employees could determine eligibility for federal programs. Governor Bush's office criticized the White House for "letting its waiver policy be determined by the AFL-CIO."

For all the Clinton welfare promises, and all the ballyhoo about the welfare reform bill, the Clinton White House is now fighting a rear-guard action to save welfare as we know it. We have to wonder what this says about whether the White House will make a good-faith effort to honor the federal budget agreement now being ballyhooed as welfare reform was a year ago.

PRINCIPLED WRITINGS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer into the RECORD two record examples of the fine writing often found in one of district newspapers, *The Brazosport Facts*. While many find it easy to deride the press as liberal and closed to the notions of liberty, free markets, and constitutional principles, I am pleased to report that *The Brazosport Facts* in general, and these two authors in specific, seek to bring a fair, even balance to the coverage of news and ideas.

Today I enter into the RECORD an editorial written by Glenn Heath, a former executive editor of *The Brazosport Facts* and now a retired member of the community active yet active on the paper's editorial board. Also, I enter into the RECORD a column written by Bill Sturdevant, a frequent contributor to the *Facts*.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my fellow Members of Congress to read these principled writings. I offer my congratulations and thanks to these two men for supporting the ideas of liberty; and to the entire staff of *The Brazosport Facts* for their ongoing dedication to presenting fair coverage of events and ideas.

FREEDOM & SAFETY

A larger principle than the bill itself is involved. The principle applies to many human circumstances where a mandated gain entails a substantial loss.

For decades, a safety measure has been before the Legislature, either asking the state to require motorcycle riders to wear a protective helmet, or asking the state to repeal such a law. Riders have been in the gallery in force to oppose one or support the other.

This time it's repeal. Sen. Jerry Patterson's bill would relieve all motorcycle riders aged 21 or over of wearing the helmet. Legislators deleted a provision that they must carry added insurance if they did so.

The Senate is expected to vote on Patterson's bill Thursday or Friday.

From a purely practical standpoint, the arguments for the original bill had merit. In case of an accident, the helmet would help protect against head injuries.

Even most riders would admit that motorcycles can be dangerous. In the best of road

conditions, their speed capability is often abused; and on slick surfaces or loose surfacings they can be treacherous. In a crash with a four-wheel vehicle, the motorcycles always lose.

But motorcycles are designed as much for fun as for practical transportation. Even those who accept the helmet for its safety would agree that using one diminishes the pleasure of motorcycling.

More important, the helmet protects no one but the one wearing it. So the effect of the law is to force a person to do something entirely for personal safety.

That should be that person's choice. No government should regulate an individual's right to accept risks, and in doing so deprive that person of the freedom to enjoy a pleasure.

That doesn't mean there should be no rules of highway safety. Faulty brakes threaten not just the driver of an auto, but every other vehicle on the road. Slick tires, malfunctioning lights endanger others. These are concerns of government.

But not air bags. These don't prevent crashes and they don't protect others on the road; they only tend to reduce the injuries to a driver and possibly a passenger after a crash.

When air bags were a prospective federal mandate, the estimated cost for each was about \$300. Once they were in place, they were said to have saved 1,600 lives. For this to happen, tens of millions of motorists must pay the high cost of the devices.

And in a few cases, the air bags have actually killed people. New proposals would soften the impact, and would allow a motorist to have the air bag disabled. Then why shouldn't the motorist be allowed to avoid the expense altogether?

These are only two examples. We need protection from the negligence of others, but there should be limits on how much government limits our freedom and pleasure in protecting us from ourselves.

Benjamin Franklin had words for it: "Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety."

WHEN POLITICIANS SAY ENTITLEMENTS, THINK ROBBERY

(By Bill Sturdevant)

Rights are counterbalanced with responsibility; juxtaposed and eternally linked. In the United States of America, we have a government created by a group of individuals collectively called "the people," who are not only "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," those being "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," but also have the "equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry," and "to honor and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them." (Thomas Jefferson).

In short, we have the right to choose what is best for us. We have the right to pursue happiness as we define it, we have the right to keep the fruits of our labor that we earn in that pursuit, and we have the right to decide how to dispose of those rewards. At the same time, we must reconcile these rights with the responsibility of respecting the rights of others, and living with the consequences of our decisions and actions. If our country's founding fathers had written a golden rule for our citizens, it would have read "Respect the God-given rights of others, while at the same time protecting your own rights."

What bothers me is that there seem to be fewer and fewer people who understand and live by this golden rule. More and more

often, people are turning to the federal government to secure the force necessary to take from others something that they are not by right entitled to. I may have the right to eat, but I don't have the right to steal someone else's food. I have the right to have children, but I don't have the right to force someone else to pay for my child's food, house, clothes or education. The decision is mine; it therefore follows that the responsibility is also mine. Many federal "entitlement" programs, including Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, are morally wrong because they require, by threat of force, that people give up part of what they earn so that it can be redistributed to someone who did not earn it.

But wait a minute, you say. All of the above mentioned federal programs were created by the will of the majority of Americans, and it is therefore our civic duty to contribute. My response to that is, "So what?" My rights are not bestowed to me by government or by a majority of the electorate. They do not have the legitimate authority to force me to contribute to programs that are not enumerated in the Constitution. In too many cases in the history of mankind, the majority has used the power of government to enslave the minority, or at least create an unfair advantage for themselves.

Say that a congressman and a police officer were riding in a bus that was full of other passengers. On the bus was a "rich" man, who had one dollar more than the others. The Congressman announced: "If you vote for me, I will use the government's police power to take the dollar from the rich man, and redistribute it to you." A vote was held, and the majority of those on the bus decided the rich man should contribute his dollar for the good of all the rest. The policeman seized the dollar, and the congressman divided it up. He gave 25 cents to the policeman, 25 cents was given to the people on the bus, (which they immediately started fighting over), and he kept 50 cents for himself. It seemed that everyone, except the rich man, was happy, but were they right?

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson said of the "sacred principle" of our federal government, "that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression." It could be argued that it was wrong to take the dollar from the rich man because he could have used it to build a factory, employ everyone on the bus, and thus create wealth for all.

My point is that it doesn't matter what you or I may think, the person who earns the money is the only one with the right to decide how to spend it, so long as doing so does not infringe on your or my legitimate rights. Jefferson continued by defining the "good government" as being "wise and frugal, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned."

The next time a politician promises you an "entitlement," think about who he is going to rob to pay for it. Ask yourself if, by accepting it, you would have to abdicate your personal responsibility and therefore your freedom. Ask yourself if you are legitimately entitled to it because you earned it. If the government has the power to "take from Peter to pay Paul," what is to stop it from taking from both? Ask yourself why the politician isn't battling to restore your lost liberty.

Please understand that I am not against charity. There are people who, through no fault of their own, need temporary assist-

ance, and I believe we have a moral obligation to help them if we can. But to lose our freedom, in the name of "charity," by allowing confiscatory taxation of our money, really only benefits politicians and bureaucrats. This is not only dangerous, it is absurd.

Only by accepting our responsibility to honor the rights of others can we hope to protect our own rights. As Jefferson said, only by protecting our rights can we hope to "regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety."

SUPPORT OF THE SCREENING APPROACH ADOPTED IN THE COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING ACT, H.R. 1128

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss important information on the issue of colorectal cancer screening. Earlier this year, I introduced the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act, H.R. 1128, which would provide Medicare coverage for all available colorectal cancer screening procedures including the fecal occult blood test, sigmoidoscopy, the barium exam, and colonoscopy. I hope that Congress will soon consider colorectal cancer screening as part of a package of preventive benefits to be included in Medicare reform legislation.

The purpose of my remarks today is to share with my colleagues important recent statements in support of the colorectal cancer screening approach taken in H.R. 1128 by the American Cancer Society, former Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder, and the Washington D.C. Chapter of the NAACP. The Colorectal Cancer Screening Act is the only legislation in the House which provides coverage for all available colorectal cancer screening procedures, including the barium exam, allowing doctors and patients to choose procedures, rather than the Federal Government. H.R. 1128 is also important because it is the only House legislation which assures that adequate screening options will be available to meet the screening needs of African-American Medicare recipients.

In remarks submitted last Congress, I cited several medical studies which show that African-Americans disproportionately develop cancer in the right side of the colon, the portion of the colon that is beyond the reach of sigmoidoscopy, a common screening procedure. These studies make clear that a procedure, such as the barium exam, which can screen the entire colon, must be made available to meet the needs of African-American patients. The barium examination is the safest and most cost-effective way to screen the entire colon, and is one of only two procedures which can image the entire colon. The studies also indicate that colorectal cancer screening programs that do not include barium exams are inadequate for African-Americans.

The American Cancer Society recently released its new colorectal cancer screening guidelines. These screening recommendations were produced as a result of a comprehensive examination of all available information regarding the cost and availability of various screening procedures. One of the significant changes

from earlier versions is that the ACS now recommends the barium enema as one of the options for the initial screening of average and moderate-risk individuals over age 50. The American Cancer Society recommendations are as follows:

* * * the National Board of the American Cancer Society recently approved new colorectal guidelines which provide clear guidance to practitioners and their patients for the early detection of colorectal polyps and cancer at various levels of risk. These guidelines include the following:

For average risk individuals (65 percent-75 percent of cases), the American Cancer Society recommends annual fecal occult blood test plus sigmoidoscopy every 5 years; or colonoscopy every 10 years or double contrast barium enema every 5 to 10 years. Testing should begin at age 50.

For moderate risk individuals (20 percent-30 percent of cases), the American Cancer Society recommends colonoscopy or a total colon exam, which includes colonoscopy or double contrast barium enema, depending on family history and the size of the polyps. Testing interval and age to begin depend on initial diagnosis and family history.

For high risk individuals (5 percent-8 percent of cases) with a history of familial adenomatous polyps, the Society recommends early surveillance with endoscopy, counseling to consider genetic testing, and referral to a specialty center. Testing should begin at puberty. For high risk individuals with a family history of hereditary non-polyposis colon cancer, the Society recommends colonoscopy and counseling to consider genetic testing. Testing should begin at age 21.

In addition, former Governor L. Douglas Wilder recently wrote a commentary in the *Richmond Times Dispatch*, which discussed the importance of prostate and colorectal cancer screening procedures. His comments support the colorectal cancer screening approach adopted in H.R. 1128. Governor Wilder's commentary follows.

Finally, the Washington Branch of the NAACP wrote a letter to the House Ways and Means Health Subcommittee on the importance of colorectal cancer screening for African-Americans. The letter written by the NAACP supports the screening provisions of H.R. 1128 and barium exams. The letter follows.

I commend Governor Wilder and the Washington Branch of the NAACP for their involvement in this issue, and I urge my colleagues to read and examine all of the aforementioned statements.

Mr. Speaker, colorectal cancer screening is an important part of providing preventive services to our Nation's seniors, a concept which I strongly support. However, it is also important that colorectal cancer screening legislation meet the needs of our Nation's seniors. There is an emerging consensus that barium exams must be included in colorectal cancer screening legislation. I urge my colleagues to join this consensus by supporting the provisions of H.R. 1128, the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act.

[From the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, Apr. 6, 1997]

BLACKS NEED BETTER ACCESS TO SCREENING TESTS FOR CANCER

(By L. Douglas Wilder)

RICHMOND.—A recent symposium on "Race and Health Care as We Approach the Twenty-First Century" at Virginia Commonwealth University was the first of what will