

endangered some of the moderate Arab governments and galvanized Muslim militants.

The recent military takeover of Pakistan and the subsequent anti-American demonstration in Islamabad should not be ignored. It is time we in Congress seriously rethink our role in the region and in the world. We ought to do more to promote peace and trade with our potential enemies, rather than resorting to bombing and sanctions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOSSELLA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SAVING 1 PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL BUDGET TO SECURE SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity in this 1 hour special order to invite my colleagues in the majority conference to come join in our discussion of our accomplishments, and to also define somewhat the negotiating that is going on right now between the Congress and the President with respect to getting our budget resolution passed and getting the final agreement nailed down.

Before I do that, I want to talk about one of the announcements that is coming out tomorrow from the Department of Education. Over at the Department, a number of us paid a visit to them just a couple of weeks ago when the Secretary of Education had assured the country, certainly the Congress and the White House, as well, that it was impossible to find this one penny on the dollar savings that we hoped to secure in order to save social security and prevent the President's raid on the social security program.

The Secretary of Education said there is no savings to be found in the

administration at the Department of Education, that the agency is run efficiently and is run in the most lean manner possible.

So the three of us Members of Congress who walked down there had a difference of opinion. We physically showed up on the premises and started going office to office to find out if we could not help the Secretary find that penny on the dollar, and lo and behold, we found a number of places where it would be wise to look.

We found an account called a grant back fund, for example, that has about \$725 million in there that is not spent in the way that the statutes have defined. We also found some duplicate payments to the tune of about \$40 million. We have found several other things since then.

The most remarkable thing we found is that going back to 1998, the Department of Education's books are not auditable. In fact, tomorrow the Department of Education will be receiving notification from the auditors, who are charged with auditing the Department of Education, to finding out where this money goes, they will be receiving this notice claiming, showing, certifying that the Department of Education's books are not auditable.

This is a remarkable revelation coming out of the Department, especially at a time when the Secretary ran over here immediately after we started talking about saving money and telling us with certainty that there is no savings to be found in the Department of Education. He has no basis to make such a claim. His books over at the Department of Education are not auditable.

Mr. Speaker, I just had an opportunity to visit some schoolkids in my district on Monday. I visited three schools. Children in America's schools throughout the country are much like those children in my district in Colorado. They understand accountability. They understand completing assignments on time. They understand completing the work according to their requirements and being held accountable.

When a teacher says a report is due on a certain day, the kids understand that if they do not turn it in on that day, they will get an F. The Department, when they are supposed to audit their books and certify to the Congress that their books are clean, that they have balanced, that they are auditable, we should expect them to follow through. The Department of Education has failed to accomplish that objective. They will tell us tomorrow, we cannot find where the \$120 billion in taxpayer money has been spent and how it has been spent.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague for yielding, Mr. Speaker. I just would ask my colleague, when were the reports or when was the audit or finan-

cial statement from the Department of Education due? Was it not March, or sometime earlier this year?

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is right.

Mr. HAYWORTH. So now it is November. They received an incomplete grade, basically, for lo these 9 months, and tomorrow, I guess *sotto voce*, in low, spoken terms, the Department of Education is going to admit that it has made an F in terms of fiscal responsibility, and even more than fiscal responsibility, fiscal accountability. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater evidence that we take the right approach to get dollars to the classroom, rather than deal with the care and feeding of a Washington bureaucracy.

I would just ask my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, and first of all, let me commend him, sir, and let me also commend my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) for making that trip 2½ weeks ago to the Department of Education.

I understand, and now help me on this, there is, in essence, a fund of cash, some have described it as a slush fund, to the tune of how many millions, \$725 million?

Mr. SCHAFFER. One of the reports on that fund suggested that there has been in the past, recently, about \$725 million. The Secretary says it is a little bit less than that, but still there are hundreds of millions of dollars, even about by the Secretary's account. The bottom line is they are not real sure.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again, so we can try to get a handle on the sums we are talking about, money that could be well spent in America's classrooms helping teachers teach and helping children learn, annually we are looking at an appropriation for that cabinet level agency of \$35 billion?

Mr. SCHAFFER. A \$35 billion annual appropriation, which is this year's appropriation, but on top of that there is another \$85 billion in loans that that department manages, so a grand total of \$120 billion is managed by the Department of Education. It effectively makes it one of the largest financial institutions in the world.

Mr. HAYWORTH. So forget, if my friend would yield further, forget the colloquialism about an 800-pound gorilla. We have a \$120 billion sum of money that in essence is unaccounted for from the department in Washington, D.C. charged with teaching responsibility and the three Rs.

Maybe that is the fact, Mr. Speaker. We talk about reading, writing, arithmetic. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, to our friends in the Department of Education, we need to teach a fourth R, responsibility, and accountability, and counting, with a C, to be able to actually handle their books.

I think it is important to inform the body, Mr. Speaker, based on current events, that we do welcome back to the Chamber the House minority leader,

the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT). I had a chance to welcome him. I am sorry he was not here yesterday to be involved in the budget negotiations. I understand he was fundraising on the West Coast.

We certainly find it interesting, those denizens of campaign finance reform, busily raising campaign cash. But we welcome him back.

Mr. Speaker, if I could inform my colleagues, I understand that substantial progress has been made toward a budget agreement. Indeed, the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House have agreed to across-the-board savings. Sadly, the problem comes in this Chamber, because of an inability of the minority to join with us to find those across-the-board savings.

We have advocated simply finding savings in one penny of every discretionary dollar spent. We think that is a way to come together, and we understand there are priorities on the left, there are priorities on our side, the other body has priorities, and the administration has priorities.

Once we come to a basic agreement, which apparently has been done, the best way to fit in the amount of overspending or what would be overspending and a raid of the social security trust fund, the best way to accommodate that spending without raiding the social security trust fund is to simply call for across-the-board savings of one penny on every dollar.

Mr. Speaker, we understand the President of the United States has given his word to the House Speaker, and I would hope that our friends on the other side of the aisle could reach an accommodation with the administration for a simple, across-the-board savings.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring this back to the perspective of American families. The gentleman has a family, and he and his wife have to do what Libby and I do, sit down at the kitchen table quite frequently and decide what they are going to cut out. Do we really need the new curtains this month? Maybe we can postpone buying the new mattress for the bed, and things like this; that if we can postpone a spending decision, we will.

All we have asked the Washington bureaucrats to do is think like the American family. Here is \$5, hard-earned money. The gentleman's money is as good as mine. He works hard to pay it, the American people work hard to pay it. All we are asking the bureaucrats is, take this \$5 that you have gotten from hard-working Americans and find this, one nickel. Just get one nickel out of it. That is not hard to do.

When we sit around at our kitchen table, it is not a nickel we are looking for. We have to cut out \$2 or \$3 from this \$5, and it is not that hard to do.

The administration this year proposed buying an island off of Hawaii for \$30 million. What was the purpose? For duck breeding. The only problem was, only 10 ducks took them up on this honeymoon package offer, so there are 10 ducks who would use this facility for \$30 million. Fortunately, Congress persuaded the administration to back off this, but this is an example of something that is absurd.

What about the Pentagon? The Pentagon lost one \$1 million rocket launcher. Now, talk about gun control, does it not bother this administration that we have lost a rocket launcher? I am not sure what can be done with a rocket launcher, but I do not know why you would lose one, and who would want to take it?

What about an \$850,000 tugboat that disappears? Where do you hide a tugboat? How do you lose a tugboat? Where can you put one? It is just ridiculous, the examples go on and on and on. All we are asking this administration to do is go back and cut out the waste, fraud, and abuse in the budget.

Mr. SCHAFFER. I would say to the gentleman, it is my understanding that the President has agreed as of today that there is enough savings for this across-the-board savings. He has realized that there is a substantial amount of waste, fraud, and abuse in government that we can reduce, that we can effectively save; find less than a penny on the dollar, is what we are down to now, but that we can save this money. We can save the penny on the dollar without affecting the important services of government.

The President agrees now, but for some reason the deal is not going forward. If anyone has any insight on this, I understand that it is the minority leader on the Democrat side who just arrived back from his fundraising mission in California who has come and disagrees now with the President and the Republicans that this money can be saved in government. That is why we are at an impasse.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the reasons why we said to the bureaucracies, look, you spend, say in the case of the Pentagon, \$240 to \$260 billion a Year.

1345

I think USDA, the agriculture folks, get about \$64 billion a year. What we are saying to them is they have capable administrators, they can figure out where the waste is. We are not going to dictate it top down from our body saying these are the ones to cut. We expect they know where their waste is and they can ferret it out, and we get criticized for not being more specific where the money should come from. We are being flexible, because we believe that those who are closest to it know where the waste is.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentleman from Georgia raises an important point. When we are talking about finding savings of one penny on every dollar of discretionary spending, we are

not, I repeat, we are not talking about cutting Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, any of those vital programs that help the truly needy and those who have earned that type of success and that type of largesse. What we are talking about is saving the Social Security funds for Social Security and Medicare exclusively.

The best way we can do that is for every discretionary dollar spent, and goodness knows there are billions of them, invoking the memory of the late Carl Sagan, "billions and billions" of dollars. Let us find a penny on every dollar.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) asked the question, why is it apparently that the Minority Leader is reluctant to accept an agreement reached by the President and by the Speaker of the House? Well, let us give the Minority Leader the benefit of the doubt. I understand what it is like. I caught what is called in common parlance the red-eye flight back Monday from the West Coast to be here for votes. I understand jet lag and the taxing time on one's body. And perhaps it is a situation where the administration is briefing the Minority Leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to wait. I know that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), Speaker of the House, was here all weekend. Is the gentleman saying that the Republicans were the only people who stayed in town to protect Social Security?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would not suggest that for everyone on the other side of the aisle, and certainly administration representatives, and I know representatives from the Committee on Appropriations, were here. But, apparently, the House Minority Leader, the man in whom Members of the opposition party place their trust and the responsibility of leadership, saw fit to leave town instead of being involved in the budget negotiations. It brings all of this talk about a do-nothing Congress, it rings kind of hollow for those who, I suppose in good faith, want to see a solid record, to leave town on a fund-raising trip for campaign cash.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I have been in every single one of those negotiation meetings. And last night, the night in question, I talked to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) twice on questions involving negotiations. I want to tell what is dividing us at this moment. What is dividing us at this moment is one remaining question.

The Republican side, after having spent \$17 billion of Social Security money, the Republican side is now asking for a "let's pretend" fig leaf so that they can point to a tiny, minuscule across-the-board cut as their "let's pretend" indicator that they did not touch Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, we, in return, are asking if they want that, we are asking them to do something real. We are asking to take whatever money the government might earn in any suit against the tobacco companies, which could be up to \$20 billion a year, and we are asking the Republican side to deposit that money into the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare trust fund. That would extend the life of those funds on average by 3 years. And what we have gotten from the Republican side is a flat "no," which means apparently that the Republican leadership would rather protect their friends in the tobacco industry than protect Social Security and Medicare. That is the truth.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming the time from the gentleman from Wisconsin, let me first of all thank the distinguished gentleman for being here—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) will suspend. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) controls the hour, so the gentleman from Colorado is recognized to control the hour.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for being here this weekend. I think that is very important. I wish he was the decisionmaker on their side. Unfortunately, the decisionmaker, the Minority Leader, was not here over the weekend.

The proposal for the tobacco, I do not know where that has been all year long. We have been in session since January. This is the first I have heard of it. I am not saying I am the most informed Member of Congress. Maybe my colleagues have heard of it. In fact, I would like to see the hand of anybody in here who has heard of it, and pretty much no hands go up.

It is a new proposal. I am glad to know it is out there. But the reality is we are going to leave town maybe not tomorrow, maybe not the next day, and maybe not the next week, but when we leave town, there will be \$160 billion untouched in the Social Security Trust Fund, and that never happened under the Democrat majority.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield time to me? I thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Georgia. I am sorry that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations is no longer here with us, because I think we have an honest disagreement in terms of the way he portrayed what we have done to save the Social Security fund, which we pledged to save, in stark contrast to the President who came in January and said let us save 62 percent of the Social Secu-

rity surplus and then spend close to 40 percent on new government programs.

I did not hear from the gentleman from Wisconsin, was he proposing new taxes on the working poor to go to this? I did not hear that side of what he was talking about in terms of the tobacco settlement, so I am uncertain. If he was proposing new taxation on the working poor and on working Americans, I think there is justifiably a problem.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for an answer to that question?

Mr. SCHAFFER. Sure, we will yield for an answer.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman well knows this has nothing whatsoever to do with taxes. What we are suggesting is if there is a suit by the Justice Department successfully concluded, which requires the tobacco companies to pay back into the Federal Treasury money which we would not have paid for illnesses caused by tobacco if they had not lied to the country for 20 years, that if there is a recovery of that kind of suit, that that money would go into Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman should not pretend this has anything to do with taxes. He knows well it does not.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I think he is setting up the parameters of something that is very interesting. If every bit of that money would go to the Social Security and Medicare trust fund instead of to the trial lawyers, if the money would truly go for public health, then I think there may be an area of agreement. I welcome that type of light and I welcome the passion that the gentleman from Wisconsin brings.

But the fact remains, the situation that exists today is one in which we are trying to find a way to deal with priorities and to find savings. Again, we are talking about simple savings of 1 cent on every dollar of discretionary spending, and to defend both the priorities of the left and our own priorities, as well as the priorities of the administration, that would be the simplest way to solve the problem.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me say this about the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin. As it was explained and presented right now, I think it makes sense. I think that as I understand it, we are talking about if there is a settlement, put excess money into Social Security. I think that is a step in the right direction. I have no problems with that.

I hope also on that side we can get them to join us in finding that measly little penny for each dollar. If we can do that, I think we can leave town, again, with the \$160 billion in Social Security, the surplus left intact, unraided. I certainly welcome the opportunity to work together.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this interesting dia-

logue. And let me just add, not to get off the path, but clearly I think Americans recognize inherent waste in government. We should challenge the bureaucracies, we should continually challenge the Federal agencies to reduce and eliminate waste, just as any private business does, just as any family does.

But we are getting off the page to the degree that the clear philosophical difference between the groups here in Washington, between the parties, between this Republican Congress and the White House, comes down to faith and power and freedom. And by that I mean we believe and have faith in the American people who work hard every day, sometimes two and three jobs, to keep more of their hard-earned money to invest back in themselves, in their families, in their small businesses, in the economy so that we can have a growing and prosperous economy. Something that was laid back in the 1980s when Ronald Reagan promised a tax cut. Practically every person who believed in big government said no. Guess what? Tax cuts worked.

Secondly, control. Here there are a number of individuals who believe that control by Washington is better than family control or business control. By that I mean freedom. If we truly believe in the notions of what this country is built on, freedom, individual freedoms, political and economic freedoms, then we shall continue to fight for those Americans who believe in that principle, when the alternative is that the White House wants more taxes or more spending.

Before that, well, the problem really has been, the reason why these appropriations bills have been vetoed is because they wanted more money. Well, where is that money going to come from? That is going to come from hard-working Americans. I encourage the gentlemen to continue in this dialogue and continue to work for the hard-working taxpayers of America.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And I think it is important to make this point, because I think we would be remiss if we did not for purposes of total candor, intellectual integrity and a good sense of history, again, I welcome the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and obviously he has passionate feelings and they are deeply and honestly held. But for the record we should indicate and point out that when my friend from Wisconsin chaired the Committee on Appropriations, when my friends on the other side of the aisle were in charge of this House, they spent huge sums of Social Security money for bigger and bigger and bigger government programs.

That framed their priorities. And so I welcome any type of alternatives they might offer to truly help us preserve the Social Security fund 100 percent for Social Security. I would make this

point because the gentleman from Wisconsin raised this topic. He said \$17 billion were being raided out of the program. That begs the question, Mr. Speaker, to help us find the money, why do the minority appropriators not join with the gentleman from Georgia and the others on the Majority side to find the savings? All we are asking is one penny on every dollar of discretionary spending. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is obviously that a penny saved is retirement secured.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I too appreciate the gentleman who joined us earlier. But as the Associated Press mentioned, and I want to refer to this Associated Press quote: "Democrats admit that there is an effort to raid the Social Security Administration over at the White House," and here in Congress as well. "Privately, some Democrats say a final budget deal that uses some of the pension program's surpluses would be a political victory for them because it would fracture the GOP by infuriating conservatives."

Well, it would infuriate conservatives. The Associated Press quote from one month ago is one that I think accurately states and reflects the differences of opinion that we have going on here in Washington, D.C. There is a side that truly believes it is in the best interests of the country to raid that Social Security program, and we said no. We said enough is enough. After 30 years of raiding Social Security and sinking this country deeper and deeper in debt year after year, there is no excuse. We are spending more money than the country has. And, by golly, if every agency had, if every Secretary would be willing to join us in just going through their administrative budgets and finding that one penny on the dollar to help avoid the White House raid on Social Security, think of how far that would go to deliver education services to children at the school level rather than soak those dollars up here in Washington at the bureaucratic level. Think of how far that would go to shoring up the Medicare program rather than watching those dollars siphoned off and sidetracked on administrative expenses and bloated bureaucracy. Think of how far that would go for programs like transportation, national defense, right on down the line. There are so many priorities that this country has and we can fund them without succumbing to the Democrat motivation to dip into Social Security. We can work hard together as a Congress, both parties.

I think the President finally understood this. When the President today agreed to an across-the-board reduction in administrative costs, waste, fraud and abuse in order to avoid the Social Security raid, I think he finally realized that the majority in Congress, that we are serious. We are not backing down on this particular point. The only reason we do not have a budget agreement as of today is because of certain

Members in the minority side cannot see eye to eye with the President right now.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

1400

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, let me point out that is not the only reason we do not have a budget agreement today. One of the reasons is because the majority party in the House for 8 months proposed a trillion dollar tax cut that did not work, that went to the richest families in America, that assumed we would spend \$198 billion less on national defense than President Clinton's budget proposals over the next 10 years. The American people rejected it. The numbers did not work.

I am amazed to sit here and hear my colleagues talk about not raiding Social Security by reducing four-tenths of 1 percent of the discretionary programs when they offered a trillion dollar tax cut that was going to devastate our ability financially to protect Social Security. I welcome the debate.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I realize that there is a difference of opinion. The side of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) does not support tax relief. Our side does.

For an opinion from a gentleman who has led the Committee on Ways and Means in trying to provide this middle-class American family tax cut, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for pointing out this key distinction and difference. Yes, unapologetically, I believe hard-working Americans should hold on to more of the money they earn instead of sending it to Washington. Yes, \$1 trillion out after \$3 trillion projected surplus over the next decade is reasonable. Because \$2 trillion are going to save Social Security and Medicare, and the other trillion dollars, as we can see from the institutional pressure of the other side, they want to spend that money. They would rather have Washington spend that money. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the wrong thing to do. All the American people should hold onto their money.

As to the canard of tax cuts for the wealthy, I would simply point out that all working Americans who pay taxes should have a right to have their money back. Certainly my friends on the left do not impugn initiative and success. They are not coming to the floor to do that. But, again, it begs the question.

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the left should join with us if they bemoan or belittle four-tenths of a cent in terms of reductions. They should join with us. If they do not think it is a big deal, then join with us and let us reach an agreement.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) who is here and would like a chance to defend his party's position.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman turning to the right to talk to his gentleman on the left. But if we want to get this clear, let us remember why we are here. One, the gentleman's party has never really supported Social Security and Medicare. At the beginning of the year, the gentleman recommended that a trillion dollars be cut in taxes, noble a cause as it is. Everyone, including those who are going to get the tax break, recognize that would undermine our ability to deal with Social Security and Medicare.

We have not as a Congress dealt with drug benefits. We have not dealt with fixing Medicare. We have not dealt with Social Security. But what we have here is a last minute attempt by the majority party to blame everybody under the sun for their failure to get a budget together and for their failure to come up with solutions for these problems.

So my colleagues can have a trillion dollars for tax cuts, and that did not endanger Social Security. But now they are trying to cover themselves with those very Social Security recipients, because their own polls say they dropped 12 points with senior citizens when they tried that game.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we certainly would invite our friends on the left to apply for their own hour of special order if they would like to continue the dialogue.

But of course one of the oldest political tricks in the book is to try to change the subject. We appreciate that, and we understand their inherent distrust of allowing the American people to hold on to more of their money, not to mention, unfortunately, their mistaken notion that you cannot actually increase government revenues by allowing people to save, spend, and invest more of their own money that leads to economic success, that leads to more jobs, that leads to prosperity, and in turn brings in more receipts in taxation to the Federal Government. But that is fine. It is nice to have a catchy slogan.

The fact remains that there is a very simple way to deal with the question we face right now. That is to save one penny on every dollar of discretionary spending. My friends who pledge fealty to Social Security should note this, and let us note this for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, just for historical accuracy, over three-quarters of the Republicans serving in Congress at the time of the Social Security Act supported Social Security. So all the canards and misinformation and perhaps confusion on the left can be cleared up.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to allude back to a comment that was made earlier; and that is, when the Republican House passed a tax cut for the American people, one that the American people deserve in times of surplus, in times of plenty, money that they rightfully earn, and when the Republican Senate passed the tax cut for the same reasons, it was not the American people that rejected the tax cut, it was the White House that rejected the tax cut.

We will continue between now and next year or as long as it takes to fight for tax relief for the American people, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) pointed to, because it means more jobs, because it means economic growth, because it means getting money out of Washington, because when money is left on the table here, it is spent and it is wasted unnecessarily.

So, yes, it is a healthy debate, and the American people deserve the healthy debate to see the differences between those who do not believe in tax relief, between those who believe that taking hard-earned money and keeping it and spending it as they see fit is the right way as opposed to a clear and, I think, strong distinction on the other side, and that is this Republican Congress who believe that the American people work too hard to send too much money to Washington and not sending enough back this return.

So I commend the gentleman for continuing to fight for the American people and engaging in this debate. Perhaps what we need is a change of personnel in the White House so that when a Republican House passes a tax cut, and a Republican Senate passes a tax cut, it will be signed into law, and then, and only then, will the American people get the tax cut that they truly deserve.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that we all go over and talk about this tax reduction and the budget. But one has to do it going to the lectern behind the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), right in front of our distinguished Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). Because at that position in this chamber in January, the President, in his historic State of the Union Address, said let us spend 38 percent of the Social Security surplus. He said let us preserve 62 percent and then outlined spending of 38 percent.

Now, we stopped that debate to say, do you know what, Congress? Republican and Democrats have always raided that cash cow called the Social Security Trust Fund. Let us stop doing that. Let us protect and preserve grandma's pension. Let us do not do that. That was one of the most significant things about this Congress.

But then the second part of our budget, along with preserving 100 percent of Social Security, was to pay down the debt. Our budget had \$2.2 trillion in debt reduction.

Then, thirdly, and most importantly, because this is a triangle, this is a sequence, Social Security, debt reduction, and then a trigger. Maybe this is what the Democrats did not like, but the trigger said, after you have taken care of Social Security, after you have taken care of debt reduction, then you have tax relief, because the American people are entitled to their change.

If one goes to Wal-Mart and one buys a \$7 hammer, the cashier does not load one's grocery cart up with more goods. She gives one one's \$3 back.

That is all we are saying is that, after we have paid Social Security obligations, debt reduction obligations, let the American workers have their overpayment back. It is so simple. It is an equity question for American workers. I am not sure why the liberals on the other side do not understand that.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, it is a simple question that I think most Americans would certainly agree with, because most Americans are oriented towards savings. They do not want to waste their hard-earned dollars when it comes to their own family budgets, and they do not want to send more money to Washington than we need here in Washington in order to effectively run the Government. That is why tax relief is such an important topic and so important to pursue it.

I want to take Members through a brief economic history lesson on the history of this Congress raiding the Social Security fund. This graph goes all the way back to 1983.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said the history of this Congress, the history of the United States Congress.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The United States Congress, correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KINGSTON. Because this Congress stopped the raid, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman correcting me.

Going back to 1983, one can see the growth in borrowing from the Social Security fund in order to pay for the rest of government.

What this big pink blob represents is Social Security debt. This is \$638 billion. This is just principle, by the way. When it comes to actually paying this back, there is a certain amount of interest that we will be responsible for paying as well.

One can see this spike right up here is about as bad as it got, about \$80 billion-a-year raid on Social Security. That was the year that Republicans were reelected into the majority here in Congress. One can see that we decided to turn things around. This dramatic drop that one sees going into 1999 is the result of a more fiscally responsible approach to budgeting here in Washington.

We did not cut spending, really, in real dollars in Washington, but we did

dramatically slow the rate of growth in Federal spending so that the American economy can catch up. The result is, here in 1999, we are no longer borrowing from the Social Security fund in order to pay for the rest of government.

But this is a point that the President up until today did not want to be. This is a point where many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they do not want to be here either. See, they want to continue borrowing from Social Security so they can pay for a lot of the things that they think are important but that the American people believe we probably do not need.

This is a remarkable graph, because it shows here in the final year, it almost looks like the end of the graph here, but this is a 1-year decline in Social Security borrowing that we see here. This is a picture of what we have accomplished in Congress as Republicans taking the majority in the House and the Senate and standing up to the White House.

Even the President understands that borrowing from Social Security needs to end. It ended this year. We are proud of that. We want to see this line even further drop below the baseline here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of points. First of all, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, we can reiterate this enough. Because last month, the folks who do all the calculations, the budgeters in this town took a look, and the reason that chart exists as it does today is because all the folks who deal with all the economic forecasts and who take a look at the tax receipts coming in and the money being spent going out evaluated what transpired in the last fiscal year. What they said was nothing short of historic and cannot be repeated enough.

They found that, for the first time since 1960 when I was 2 years of age, when that great and good man Dwight David Eisenhower resided at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in our executive mansion as President of the United States, for the first time since 1960, Congress balanced the budget, did not use the Social Security Trust Fund, did not raid those funds for more spending, and, moreover, generated a surplus.

My friends who joined us, our friends who were on the political left tend to bemoan any type of spending reduction. The other reason, and I know the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) agree with me, you see the other reason to make sure Americans have more of their hard earned money back in their pockets. It is a simple fact, Mr. Speaker, that if the money is not given back to the people who earned it, there are special interests here in Washington who are more than happy to spend it.

So we should really thank the President for at long last coming to our

point of view for saying, in the wake of his State of the Union message, let me reconsider. Instead of 62 percent, I will go along with the majority party, save 100 percent of the Social Security. That is a victory for the American people.

I thank my friends on the left, despite their vociferous opposition here earlier in this special order to tax relief for going on the RECORD with us. Do my colleagues realize, Mr. Speaker, again last month, when we brought the President's plan to raise revenue through an increase in taxation and fees, not a single Member of this institution voted in favor of the tax increase.

So I appreciate the fact that the President was willing to let the will of the people through the House of Representatives speak. I think that is a positive point.

Now, today, we hear that the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, agrees with the Speaker of the House that there can be an across-the-board spending reduction.

The one part of the puzzle that we hope we can work out, and we are glad the minority leader returned from the west coast and his political fund-raising trip, because now he can join the Speaker of the House at the table and agree to across-the-board savings so we can make sure that hands stay off the Social Security surplus.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Democrat party was invited to the meetings with the President and the Speaker and the majority leader in arriving at these decisions. Can the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) tell us one more time why was the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader not here yesterday?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the minority leader was on the West Coast raising campaign cash. It is interesting to hear the rhetoric about campaign finance reform. But I guess he has to do what he felt was important. That is where his priorities were. I am sure he can address the House and our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, about that.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as for me, I am glad the minority leader is back here to join us and help get to work, and maybe we can get this budget passed and move on, and the country can be safer knowing that the Congress has gone back home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, earlier the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER) talked about the Department of Education. I guess the issue there again is what might have been. See, when it comes to education, I do not think there is a Member of this body who truly does not believe that we need to invest in education. But there are clear, again, distinct differences between how the different sides approach the issue.

See, it is a national issue. Education is clearly a national issue. As someone who wants to see the young people succeed and to grow and to prosper, as the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Colorado I am sure agree, the same time one also agrees that what works in Staten Island and Brooklyn, New York, is different than what works in Arizona. It is different from what works in Colorado.

1415

So I think what we have been trying to get across to those who defend the status quo, and those individuals are folks here in Washington who just want all the money and who would place a lot of strings and mandates on the States and localities, what we have been trying to say is let us commit ourselves to adequate funding for education but allow the local school boards, the parents, the teachers at PS4 in Staten Island, the teachers at PS16 on Staten Island, let them, together with the principals, with the teachers, with the parents who know those kids and who know their needs, let them make those decisions, not someone here in Washington who does not know anybody in those classrooms.

So, again, we must continue to force the issue and to say that we are committed to education, but allow those local parents, the local teachers and principals the flexibility. Because what may work on Staten Island, what the needs are on Staten Island, are clearly, I believe, different from Arizona, Colorado, and the other States.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman over here wants more time, however, we still have some more points we need to make. If we are able to, I will yield later.

At the moment, I want to first make one point in reference to the gentleman from New York and his observation, and I want to make that point with this apple. Most Americans desperately want to see their schools well funded, and they are willing to invest the money that it takes in order to see that schools have the resources to run effectively. But if we look at this apple in terms of the education dollar that an American taxpayer sends to Washington, they would like to believe that this apple, this dollar, actually makes it back to a child's classroom. In reality, here is what happens.

First, we have to realize that the cost of paying taxes alone, just complying with the IRS and the Federal Tax Code, takes a certain bite out of that apple just to begin with. So if we take that section out, just accounting for the Internal Revenue Service for the cost of compliance with the tax codes, we already have a bite taken out of that education dollar.

Then, when those dollars come here to Washington, the chances are very good, and given the debate that we are having today it is easy to see, that some of those dollars can be mis-

directed and spent on programs that really have nothing to do with education. They may be housed in the Department of Education, they may be housed in another education-related agency, but those dollars are not really appropriated in Washington in a way that even gets close to children.

Then there is the issue of the expense associated with the United States Department of Education. Again, a \$120 billion Federal agency that is reporting as of next Thursday, to go back to this graph here, reporting tomorrow that its books for 1998 are not auditable. They do not know, they cannot tell the Congress exactly how they spent their money in 1998 and in subsequent years. So we have that agency, which consumes three office buildings downtown here, and they are full of good conscientious sorts of folks, but people who consume the education dollar and prevent those dollars from getting to the classroom.

So, now, when we talk about the bite that the Department of Education takes out, my goodness, it is a huge chunk of the education dollar. So here is what we are talking about that is left on the education dollar to get back to children and classrooms.

On top of that, we have States that have to comply with Federal rules and regulations that are attached with a small percentage of these Federal funds remaining, and the States have to hire people just to fill out the Federal paperwork in order to answer the Federal Government's rules and expectations on the money. And by the time the education dollar actually gets back to a child, this is about all that is left. It is a shame.

What we are trying to do here in the Republican Congress, by demanding the accountability, by demanding that the waste, fraud, and abuse be eliminated, by trying to guarantee that that one penny on a dollar is saved and not squandered, we are trying to make this education dollar whole again so that we get dollars back to the classroom, and not just part of an apple, not just part of an education dollar. Our children deserve better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Well, Mr. Speaker, as the expression goes, an apple a day keeps the bureaucrat away.

But the gentleman is right. When I go back to Staten Island or Brooklyn, and I was there a couple of days ago in some schools, we hear from these parents and these teachers, who are in a better position to make these decisions for the children, whether the class size is 20 or 30 kids. Wherever they come from, they are there for one reason, to learn and to succeed. We just happen to believe that that money is better spent back in Staten Island and Brooklyn and those decisions are better made in Arizona or in Colorado or in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, generations of children will go through schools and not know the people in Washington who are determining how their education money

is spent, with those mandates and with the strings attached. We are trying to create flexibility. There is nobody in this House, and I would be amazed if somebody were to come to this floor and in good faith argue that there is somebody in this House who is not for education and not for the children of America, for them to prevail and succeed, but there is a definite distinction between those who want control, those who believe that the money is better spent in Washington, those who believe that decisions are better made in Washington as opposed to the folks back home to Staten Island who say give us the tools, give us the resources, give us the money, give us the flexibility to determine what is going to be best for the kids in our classroom. And that is the same in PS18 or PS104 or PS36 back in Staten Island and Brooklyn, and I am sure that is the same in Arizona where the gentleman is from.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I just want to say, as the son of an educator and the brother of a teacher, I really appreciate what the gentleman is saying about teachers because they really do need more control over the classroom.

I am going to yield the floor after this, in terms of my portion, but I just wanted to say this. In the 106th Congress, the Congress we are going to be adjourning, we always talk about winners and losers. Well, let us talk about who won.

For the American consumer, we revamped a 65-year-old banking law to give American families more choices in borrowing, saving money, and buying insurance.

For the rural TV watcher, we have increased the access to local news programs. And if my colleagues think that that is not important, they should think what happens when the people are trying to get hurricane updates.

For the American taxpayers, we said no to the President's trying to increase taxes. On a bipartisan vote we said no to the President's \$42 billion increase in new tax dollars.

For future generations, we have committed to paying \$130 billion in debt reduction; and already we have paid down \$88 billion.

For all Americans, we have increased military morale by increasing their pay 4.8 percent. We have increased funding for equipment modernization and for readiness. And for all of American security, we passed the missile defense system.

For our children, educational flexibility; to put local school boards, teachers, and parents back in charge of their classrooms, not Washington bureaucrats.

For seniors, we have increased access to health care by protecting Medicare and reforming the Balanced Budget Act. And, finally, for the first time since 1969, we stopped the raid on Social Security. And we will be adjourn-

ing with \$147 billion in the Social Security surplus untouched.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know we are not allowed to wear buttons on the floor, but if we were allowed, I would wear this one. Because it says, proudly, we the Members of this Congress have stopped the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to graphically point out again what the gentleman just said. If we go back over the last 30 years of overspending in Washington, D.C., we can see we have to go way back to 1970 to see a time when we generated even a little teeny bit of a surplus. Going forward, over the next 30 years, we can see that this government has consistently, year after year, dipped into Social Security and borrowed from other places in order to create a huge national debt. This is the accumulation of Washington spending more money than the taxpayers have sent to Washington in order to run the government.

Well, we know that that is unnecessary. We do not need to do that. We can see what happened here at its absolute worst. The American people revolted, to some degree. This is the year Republicans were elected to take over the majority of the Congress, the year our party was placed in charge of trying to manage this huge problem.

And we can see the result. By slowing the rate of growth in Federal spending, by being more frugally sensitive as to how to manage the Federal budget, and being more responsible, we managed to shrink this debt. Not only did we see it go away, but it was to the point where, in 1998, we were beginning to mount a surplus that has allowed us to pay down the debt quicker, allowed us to save Social Security, allowed us to rescue the Medicare program, allowed us to provide a strong national defense, and allowed us to spend the time to make government more efficient and effective so that we can get dollars to classrooms, get dollars to the front lines, get dollars to the places that really need it rather than being locked up here in this gigantic bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C.

This is something to be proud of. And this portion of the chart here can grow and grow, if we continue to apply the conservative Republican principles that have gotten us from down here when Democrats were in charge to this line here when Republicans were in charge. A dramatic difference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado, and again we need to reaffirm and amplify not only what the chart indicates but also what our colleague from Georgia mentioned.

We have been able to pay down debt this fiscal year. We are in the process of paying down close to \$150 billion in debt. Over the past 2 years, almost \$140 billion in debt paid down. We are in the process of doing this. And, Mr. Speak-

er, I am sure my colleagues hear at town hall meetings two concerns. From day one, when I was elected to the Congress of the United States, my constituents said loudly and clearly, Mr. Congressman, get Uncle Sam's hand out of Social Security money. Wall that off for Social Security. And we have done so. And the President has at long last agreed with us. But they have also said, pay down the debt; and we have been doing that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can point out again the atmospherics of this chamber, the histrionics from the other side. The problem is this: The institutional pressure of those who want to grow government, Mr. Speaker, those who sadly could be described as serial spenders, and I am not talking about a breakfast offering of fruits and grains topped off with milk, but the serial spenders, the compulsive spenders, who always heed in their priorities the notion that they know better what to do with the people's money. We are saying we are going to save that money for the Social Security Trust Fund.

And it is akin to our rich spiritual tradition where, as part of the service, we pass the plate. All we are asking the left to do is put a penny on the plate. For every dollar of discretionary spending, Mr. Speaker, can they not spare a penny for grandma? A penny saved is retirement secured. One hundred percent of Social Security money to Social Security. And, accordingly, we have made the difference, and we invite our friends on the left to join us.

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from New York once again.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Inasmuch as this debate is coming to a close, Mr. Speaker, allow me just to think, observe what has happened in the last year, and that is that in the beginning of the year we had proposals from the White House for more taxes, more spending, and setting aside only a portion of the Social Security surplus to be walled off. The Republican Congress, fortunately, and rightfully, stepped in and stopped increasing taxes, controlled spending as much as it could, and set aside 100 percent of the Social Security surplus to protect it from unnecessary wasteful government programs.

So as we set our sights on the future, I hope that the American people understand that this Congress is committed to growth, to creating more jobs, to providing more freedom for individuals and small business owners so that they can grow and so that they can prosper, so that we can be better off tomorrow than we are today. Along the way, we know there are going to be people who do not want change, who do not believe in things like free trade, who do not believe in things like lower taxes, who do not believe in things like limited government, but who do believe in the alternative; that decisions are better made here in Washington, and they just want to keep that money coming here so that they can control the tax-paying public's lives a little more.

So as we engage in the debate, and as we go home for the holidays, I hope the American people reflect, as I will do as I head back home to Staten Island, and I hope they understand that there is a party here that sees a brighter and more prosperous future when we place our faith in the American people.

1430

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that I look forward to creating a structure whereby the gentleman from Staten Island, New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), can go back to Staten Island. We are hoping that we will be able to do that.

I would like to praise the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and join the gentleman from Staten Island, New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), for their very eloquent and thoughtful remarks and their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank again my friend, the gentleman from Staten Island, New York (Mr. Fossella), for underscoring this party's commitment to free trade.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, we are here in the final few minutes of what may be for me and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and others our last special order opportunity for the millennium. And so, it is a time that I look on as a pretty solemn occasion because we have worked pretty hard this year and tried to get to this point of getting the White House to realize that raiding Social Security is no longer a good idea and it never was a good idea. It is something we ought to avoid to the greatest extent possible. It is nice to see that the President finally came around to the Republican way of thinking on this point.

The last hurdle remaining is for us to persuade our friends on the other side of the aisle to join the Congress, join the Republican majority, and join the White House now in just securing this final deal, getting this final package agreed upon to save that one penny on the dollar in order to avoid the previous plans to raid Social Security.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank my friends from the left, in the minority, for offering some points of view. And others will come later.

I think it is important to remember this. As the President said when he came to give his State of the Union message, first things first.

Now, we had to get him to agree with us, and he finally did so after initially wanting to spend almost 40 percent of the Social Security fund on new government programs. We finally got him to agree, no, no. Let us save 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security. We welcome that.

The President was also content to let the House work its will when we brought to the floor his package of new

taxation, higher taxation, and fees in the billions of dollars. And not a single Member of this body voted for those new taxes, neither Republicans nor Democrats. So we appreciate him acceding to the will of the House in that regard.

Now, we cannot make too much of this, Mr. Speaker, or emphasize it enough. The President and the Speaker of the House had agreed to the notion of across-the-board savings, maybe not even a penny on every dollar, but savings enough to make sure we stay out of the Social Security Trust Funds.

We welcome back the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader. We are pleased he is back in town, back from his campaign cash swing on the West Coast. We hope now he will sit down and solve the problems. We can get it done.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) for joining us.

I just want to point out one more time that the Department of Education tomorrow will tell the Congress that it is unable to account for its spending in 1998. Its books are not auditable.

This is a threat to American school children around the country. It is a threat to our efforts to try to get dollars to the classroom. It is a huge problem that the White House needs to come to grips with and deal with. We on the Republican side want to fix this mismanagement problem we have over in the Department of Education.

At this point, I would, before I yield back, just ask subsequent speakers to be sure to address this topic of unauditible books over in the Department of Education, tell us whether they are willing to help work with the Republicans to correct this mismanagement, and direct the White House to get us to a point where the Department of Education, a \$120 billion agency, will be able to audit its books.

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 382, PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. SCHAFFER) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-475) on the resolution (H. Res. 382) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. SCHAFFER) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-476) on the resolution (H. Res. 383) waiving a re-

quirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to have a Special Order on National Alzheimer's Month, which is this month of November.

In 1906, a German doctor named Dr. Alois Alzheimer noticed plaques and tangles in the brain tissue of a woman who had died of an unusual mental disease. Today, these plaques and tangles in the parts of the brain controlling thought and memory and language Dr. Alzheimer observed are hallmarks of Alzheimer's disease.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Alzheimer's disease is the most common cause of dementia in older people, affecting an estimated 4 million people in the United States. And while every day scientists learn more about this disease, after almost a century's worth of research, its cause remains unknown and there is no cure.

Unless scientific research finds a way to prevent or cure the disease, 14 million people in the United States will have Alzheimer's disease by the middle of the 21st century.

Despite this, we have learned much about Alzheimer's disease during this century of research. We know that Alzheimer's disease is a slow disease starting with mild memory problems and ending with severe mental damage. At first the only symptom may be mild forgetfulness, where a person with Alzheimer's disease may have trouble remembering recent events, activities, or the names of familiar people or things. Such difficulties may be a bother, but usually they are not serious enough to cause alarm.

However, as the disease progresses, symptoms are more easily noticed and become serious enough to cause people with Alzheimer's disease or their family members to seek medical help. These people can no longer think clearly; and they begin to have problems speaking, understanding, reading or writing.

Later on, people with Alzheimer's disease may become anxious or aggressive or wander away from home. Eventually, patients may need total care. On average, a person will live 8 years after symptoms appear.

Let me pause at this moment, Mr. Speaker, because the fact that so many Alzheimer's patients may need total care in the future is so very important. Congress must take a long hard look at the way we finance the future health care needs of the Nation's elderly.

With the aging of our population, we can expect an increase in the number