

give them the clean and safe places to do so?" We need to get the asbestos out of the classrooms. We need to get children out of trailers and portable classrooms. We need to fix leaking roofs, repair plumbing facilities and ensure each student is studying under adequate light.

Ms. Lenora Starks, a constituent of mine, recently wrote to me. She was concerned that we weren't doing enough to help our public schools. "We must ensure," she wrote, "that our students have a proper learning environment. In too many schools, efforts to improve student achievement are hampered by inadequate and deteriorating facilities."

Ms. Starks can see our priorities. She sees that this Congress has not been putting children first and is worried about what that means for our nation's future.

We need to put children first by increasing spending on Head Start. Rather than giving an excess of 17 billion unrequested dollars to the bloated Pentagon budget, we could fully fund Head Start for the next five years. And this funding is critical. Because of inadequate federal funding, Head Start is only able to serve 30 percent of eligible children. Lack of federal fund also causes most children to wait until the age of four to enter the program, when evidence supports earlier intervention is more effective.

Children are also adversely affected by a lack of financial commitment to low-income families and to impoverished neighborhoods. One example is the malignant neglect of the childcare crisis in this country. The 105th Congress only provided 182 million dollars this year to improve the quality of children care in this country. This fell far short of the estimated 7.5 billion dollars needed to provide safe and affordable child care for working families. Full-day child care costs up to 10,000 per year, yet half of America's families with young children earn less than 35,000 per year. Child care in low-income communities must be a priority if parents are going to be able to seize opportunities to provide for their children.

Regarding neighborhoods, support for Community Development Block Grants, which have a long history of providing economic aid to underserved areas, is declining. In the city of Detroit, CDBG funding has declined from 130.1 million to 51.3 million over the past 19 years. For fiscal year 2000, current proposals by this Congress would continue the downward trend. With one in five American children living in poverty, cuts to CDBGs undoubtedly affect their futures. Studies show that poor children are less likely to finish school, are at heightened risk of stunted growth and other health problems and contribute less to our economy as adults. We must restore the CDBGs to their original vitality and reverse the years of cutbacks if we really want to help the youngest victims of poverty.

Congress also misdirects spending by failing to support youth employment initiatives. While increasing the Pentagon's budget over the past two years, Congress has concurrently cut youth job training by 80 percent and federal support for summer jobs for young people. Young people must have avenues to pursue their dreams.

We need to reprioritize our allocation of funds in this nation. We need to put children first. This is not a choice, this is a must.

#### TITLE IX AND ROLE OF U.S. WOMEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I raise my voice in praise of title IX and the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team.

There is no doubt in my mind that title IX has been successful in expanding opportunities for women in athletics. Before title IX, women represented only 1 percent of college athletes, and virtually no athletic scholarships went to women. Because of title IX, more than 100,000 women now participate in intercollegiate college sports.

The purpose of title IX is to provide the same opportunities for women in education as men. While we celebrate the great strides that women have made in competitive athletics, we should also recognize that title IX has made an impact and opened doors in other areas of education.

The U.S. Women's National Soccer Team, our 1999 Women's World Cup champions, they certainly made it clear that women can make a tremendous contribution to sports. These dedicated, determined, and accomplished young women make me proud to be associated with the cause of getting more girls and women involved with sports and fitness.

Title IX and the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team have changed the playing field for girls and women in athletics. But since title IX was passed in 1972, there has been a world of change in our expectations of what women can achieve.

Women like Mia Hamm and Michelle Akers on the soccer field, and Colonel Eileen Collins, who is commander of the shuttle flight Columbia, they have shown the skeptics that women can successfully participate in every walk of American life. They are all long-distance runners in the challenge and the struggle to raise the status of women in our society.

When I was growing up, most people thought that girls were not as interested in sports as boys. Consequently, girls were discouraged from participating in sports activities. Now research by the Women's Sports Foundation shows that, on the contrary, boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 9 are equally interested in sports participation. By the age of 14, however, girls drop out of sports participation at a rate six times greater than boys. Something must have happened.

Now, after the U.S. Women's Soccer Team has won the 1999 Women's World Cup, young girls have aspirational and inspiration role models that will no doubt increase their participation in sports. They are growing up and appreciating the sports skills of women, and they see images of themselves excelling in sports.

Young women who participate in sports are more likely to finish school,

less likely to have an unwanted pregnancy. The availability of athletic scholarships has enabled more women to pursue a college education and has opened opportunities for women at dozens of colleges.

Let me just point out the health benefits of regular and rigorous physical exercise are extensive. Studies show that women who participate in sports actually lower their risk of breast cancer and are 92 percent less likely to be involved with drugs. There are also psychological benefits. Young women who play sports have a higher level of self-esteem, a lower incidence of depression, and a more positive body image.

I am sure that, all over America, young girls are achieving success on the athletic field and thinking about growing up to be soccer or basketball stars. Others are applying themselves to their studies, and they are dreaming about becoming scientists or engineers or even Members of Congress.

These young women can feel safe and secure in their dreams because title IX will be there to protect them from the barriers of discrimination.

#### NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the fiscal year 2000 budget. Adoption of the budget is the most important job that Congress performs. Like a sound business or well-run household, our budget establishes our priorities for the next year.

The news of our income for the next year looks amazingly good. The President's Office of Management and Budget is estimating a \$99 billion surplus, including Social Security monies. However, without Social Security, we have a deficit. If we protect Social Security incomes, the surplus drops to \$5 billion.

OMB's 10-year projection of \$1 trillion surplus may be a dangerous phantom. There is a surplus only if we include Social Security funds. Without Social Security funds, we will have a deficit.

The available surplus is much smaller than what we think. When all of the figures are calculated in a responsible manner, our surplus is more like \$112 billion, hardly enough to afford the almost \$800 billion 10-year tax cut package that the Republicans are considering.

Two of this administration's enormous accomplishments are the substantial reduction of a deficit and a buoyant economy. In good economic times, a wise family makes certain that the essentials for a decent household is that the soundness of the physical foundations are in tact, a good roof, a good basement, sound plumbing and wiring, adequate nutrition, basic health care, excellent schools, a

healthy neighborhood, adequate infrastructure, transportation, clean air and clean water.

□ 1945

This is what we all want for our families. What a business aspires to have is a sound basis of operation, and that is what we want for our Nation.

Congress' work is to look at our income of hard-earned tax money and use this money to provide a decent and functioning Nation; a Nation which we all can be proud of, a Nation of well-educated people, well housed, well fed, healthy, with a decent regard for themselves and for each other and the common good. We must have serious priorities for the serious business of being a sound Nation.

Now, the majority cuts taxes for the rich and ignores problems that are screaming for attention. We must pay down our debts to lower our interest rates, but we must also respond to our housing problems. We have over 5.5 million households that are in sub-standard housing. In my district alone, the waiting list for housing assistance opened for 1 day in May of 1997, and 15,000 applicants stood in line for a waiting list running up to 5 years. In my county of Alameda, the wait list has been closed since 1991. Taking care of our housing stock should be one of our national priorities.

Over 43 million do not have health coverage. In California, among working families of employed single adults with children, 55 percent have no insurance. The number of uninsured children has increased by 25 percent during these amazing economic times. About 8 million Californians are not covered at all. Prescription drugs are being priced out of the reach of seniors, and I fully support the President's plan to address this need. Provision of essential prescriptions should be one of our national priorities.

There will be more students. Our classrooms are crowded. A record 52.7 million children are enrolled in elementary and secondary schools, and this number will climb to 54.3 million by 2008. We do not train our teachers sufficiently, and we do not pay our teachers sufficiently. We do not have enough teachers. We do not have enough counselors. We do not have enough school buildings, and much of what we have is aging and must be rehabilitated. Most of our schools are not connected to the Internet. The Republican tax bill is silent on these issues and all of these needs. These educational needs must be one of our national priorities for attention.

Almost 70 percent of this tax freedom bill, as it is called, goes to reduce taxes of the wealthiest 10 percent of the people, with incomes over \$204,000 a year. Only 9 percent of this bill goes toward reducing the taxes of about 70 percent of our people.

There is hunger in our cities and there is hunger in many of our rural areas. The Washington Post reported

that our military personnel and their families depend upon second and third jobs, food stamps, and cast-away furniture in order to feed and house their families. Eliminating hunger should be a national priority. Providing adequate wages for working people should be a national priority.

This is our chance to do what is right. This is our chance. Our rivers can be cleaned, our air can be improved. This is our chance to take care of the physical conditions of our environs; a program to continue our Superfund and brown fields cleanup, reforestation, and preservation of endangered species.

We have important and essential work to do together to recognize that the priorities of our country should be putting people first. It should ensure that we make our country strong, physically, socially and economically.

#### ON THE BUDGET

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to also talk about where we go on the budget and also where we have been on this budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans were elected as a majority back in 1995. For almost every year before that, for the previous 40 years, the Democrat majority in this House used every cent of the Social Security surplus and spent it on other government programs. When Republicans came in, in 1995, we came in with the enthusiasm to try to make government more efficient. We said, look, there has to be a balanced budget, and so we started cutting back on spending.

We actually had a rescission bill. We started our session in January of 1995; but already, because we operate on a fiscal year, we had gone through the first one quarter of the budget year. But, still, with three-quarters left, we decided to cut down on the spending authorized for the rest of that year. We were successful, and we held the line on increased spending.

The following year, with a great deal of effort and dedication, but also controversy, we did the same thing, because we were dedicated to the proposition that we should have a balanced budget and that Congress should live under the same logical, practical rules that every family has to live under, and that is that we had to try to pay down our debt and try to live within our means.

We took a great deal of criticism that year and through the next election and were charged with accusations such as "Republicans are taking food out of the mouths of children," and "they are radical," and "they are taking the security out of Social Security," and "they are reducing spending at the sacrifice of America and the sacrifice of our economy." Of course, that

did not happen, and we were successful in reaching a balanced budget.

Now, I think everybody agrees, the President included, that a balanced budget is reasonable. The question and the challenge is do we continue down the road we have had for so many years, the last 45 years, of moving for a bigger, more expensive, more intrusive Federal Government, really on the road to socialism; or do we set some priorities and do we say what is reasonable for taxpayers to pay in terms of the money they earn?

Right now the average taxpayer in the United States pays about 40 cents out of every dollar they earn in taxes to local, State and Federal Government. If we include the regulations that we impose on business, then it gets up to about 50 cents. So the first question is, how big should government be in terms of what earnings and income is? I say it is at its largest. Our taxes today are larger than they have ever been in the history of this country except for World War II.

Now, should we pay down the debt or reduce taxes with some of the surpluses that are projected? In the budget we passed this year, we took what many of us have been preaching for the last several years, and that is to say that we were not going to use any of the Social Security surplus for any other government spending, and we came up with this idea of a lockbox.

The lockbox is simply using every penny of the surplus coming into Social Security and using that money to pay down the debt held by the public. So it does not solve the Social Security problem, but at least it does not spend it for other government programs.

Now, the challenge is, as we look at approximately a trillion dollars coming in over the next 10 years in income taxes, and another definition for surpluses in income taxes is somebody that is being overtaxed, how much of that money should go towards paying down the debt; how much of that money should be used for expanded government spending; and how much of that money should go into tax relief, or giving back to the American people? Or a better way to say that is let the American people keep a few more dollars of what they have earned.

This tax reduction bill we passed the other day does both; it is a demand on paying down the debt as well as a tax cut for every American.

We have defined our goal of reducing the debt in terms of how much the debt service costs in this country. Alan Greenspan told our Committee on the Budget that a good way to measure the imposition of how big the debt is in this country is to measure the debt service cost. That is how much interest we pay out. That is \$360 billion a year. We need to bring that down. That interest rate is now tied to whether or not we have across-the-board tax reductions. So we set back the across-the-board tax reduction for any year that we do not reduce the interest cost.