

and despondency to independence and dignity.

By December of last year, welfare rolls had dropped by 45 percent. And that is a national average. Many of the States have much higher success rates. For example, caseloads are down by 81 percent in Idaho and over 70 percent in Wisconsin. And this is very important. Child poverty rates and overall poverty rates have declined every year since welfare was reformed. Beyond any doubt, these facts show that hope for those on welfare is found in more personal responsibility not more government bureaucracy.

So, Madam Speaker, the spirit of the American people is based on the freedom that comes from hard work and combating the odds. From the beginning of this Nation, Americans of all walks of life have fought uphill battles and won. The Republicans in Congress believe in the American spirit, and that is why we fought so hard to reform welfare reform and we should have the credit.

The President has no right to take credit. When the going gets tough, the tough get going, and the Republican Congress is responsible for welfare reform, not the President of the United States.

REVISING HISTORY

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I was constrained to rise and respond to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). The gentleman revises history. On a normal night, perhaps no one would rise to say that it was revisionist history at best, or at worst, depending upon one's perspective.

In 1992, Bill Clinton ran for President of the United States, and he put forward a document called The New Covenant. Not a contract on America, a new covenant, a new promise, a new commitment, a new cooperation, a new working arrangement with America. And in that new covenant he said that, yes, we expect government to do good things for people.

Government, in my perspective, is our community at large trying to work together trying to make lives better. But in that new covenant, that my Republican friends so quickly forget, I am sure, Bill Clinton said that we need to expect of each American personal responsibility; that they will commit themselves to use their best talents to enhance their own lives because that, in turn, would enhance the lives of our community, if each and every one of us carried our share of the load.

It was the President, in 1992, who said that personal responsibility ought to be a key word for America's revival. America heard that, and America elected him. And in that new covenant as well, when he talked about personal

responsibility, he said we need welfare reform. I guess the Republicans forget that.

They chuckle, Madam Speaker, but I will remind my colleagues of some history, for those who were not here, when every Democrat voted for a welfare reform bill sponsored by NATHAN DEAL. Does that name ring a bell? He was a Democrat at that time, but he had a bill that we worked on that demanded personal responsibility; the expectation that if we could, we would be expected to work, because the work ethic is critical to the success of a family, of a community, and of a society. That bill did not become law, but we had other bills.

Now, my colleagues, how many times have we all heard it complained, oh, if the President would only let us do this, we could have done great things? They know that they could not possibly have overridden the veto of the President of the United States. If he had not been committed, and if he had not led the fight for welfare reform, the Republicans could not have done it. And they know that. Period.

My friend, the majority whip, likes to say we did it, we get the credit. Very frankly, everybody in this House deserves the credit, and Americans deserve the credit, and governors deserve the credit, and State legislators deserve the credit. Why? Because we all perceived that there was a system that existed which did not encourage and have the expectation of work. But for the fact that Bill Clinton was president and led that effort, it would not have happened because he could have vetoed it. And all of my colleagues know that his veto would have been sustained because there were more than 146 Democrats in this House and more than 40 Democrats in the United States Senate.

Now, let me go on to balancing the budget. Frankly, my colleagues, what the Republican Party has been responsible for since I have been in Congress, since 1981, is the gargantuan deficits and debt that confronts our country. Period. Why? Because Ronald Reagan and George Bush proposed in their budgets those deficits.

Now, my Republican colleagues may say it is absurd that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) would say that. Well, look at the budgets. Presidents Reagan and Bush asked for more spending in those 12 years than the Congress appropriated. Now, if they did, obviously they planned for those deficits.

Now, were the priorities slightly different? They were. But the fact of the matter is Ronald Reagan never vetoed a bill for spending too much that was not sustained by the Congress. In other words, not a nickel could have been spent in this country that Ronald Reagan did not put his signature on. Not a nickel.

So the budget balancing came at the hands of Bill Clinton, when for 7 years in a row now the budget deficit has de-

creased, for the first time in this century.

ALL THE ARROWS ARE DOWN

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I keep a board in my office that lists the cash prices of the major commodities grown in my home State of Kansas. An arrow next to the price indicates whether the price is up or down, and for too long now, and for more days than not, all the arrows are down.

Prices for all our major commodities grown in the State of Kansas are at historic lows. The wheat crop in Kansas is worth \$500 million less this year than last, and prices for corn, soybeans, and milo paint a similar picture for the fall crops. The prices for beef and pork are depressed as well. And behind these numbers are real people. Every day, farmers and ranchers are being forced out of business and off the farm and ranch never to return.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the statements made on Friday about the crisis in agriculture and the call upon President Clinton to work with Congress to provide relief soon. I could not agree more. We need to do something and we need to do something now.

On July 21, I introduced H.R. 2568, the Market Loss Assistance Act. H.R. 2568 would provide supplemental farm income program payments equal to 75 percent of a producer's 1999 payment under the Agricultural Market Transition Act. This is the same mechanism that Congress used last year to provide emergency relief to farm country. Today, the need is greater and more urgent than it was a year ago.

I hope the House will honor my request to consider H.R. 2568 or other disaster relief before Congress goes home for the August recess. Our farm and ranch constituents are counting on us to do the right thing and to do it sooner rather than later. Farmers need assurance that Congress and this administration will respond to the crisis. Otherwise we will lose another generation of family farmers and rural America will continue its difficult struggle.

Over the long haul there are many things that Congress can and must do to get the price arrows up on the chart and pointed in the right direction. We need to open new markets and expand trade opportunities for U.S. producers. We need a farm policy that preserves flexibility and provides price protection. We need adequate risk management tools and research that enhances our competitiveness. But these are all long-term solutions to a near-term crisis.

H.R. 2568 can get assistance to farm country immediately. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. The time to respond is now, not later.

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

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

RESTORING THE HONOR OF JOSEPH JEFFERSON "SHOELESS JOE" JACKSON

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

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, this is a true story. In 1908, a textile mill worker from Greenville, South Carolina, who learned to play baseball on mill teams, made his minor league baseball debut for the Greenville Spinners. He could not read or write, but he could sure play the game. His name was Joseph Jefferson Jackson. And in my town and in my State and in baseball circles around the world, he is a legend.

During a game in his first year in the minor leagues, Joseph Jackson's feet began to hurt because of his shoes, so he took them off. He then proceeded to hit a triple, sliding into third. One of the fans in the crowd heckled him, saying he was a shoeless son of a gun. The nickname "Shoeless" stuck.

Shoeless Joe Jackson had one of the most mythical careers in baseball history.

□ 2245

He is mentioned among the greats: Babe Ruth, Ted Williams, Hank Aaron, Lou Gehrig. His 356 lifetime batting average achieved over a 13-year career is third only behind Ty Cobb and Rogers Hornsby.

In 1911, in his first major league season with Cleveland, Shoeless Joe batted 408, the highest batting average ever by a rookie. Traded to the Chicago White Sox in 1915, he led the team to victory in the 1917 World Series against the New York Giants.

Yet, while his name is mentioned among the greats, Joe Jackson is not with them in the baseball Hall of Fame. After the infamous 1919 Black Sox scandal, Jackson was suspended for life from the league by the commissioner of baseball.

Madam Speaker, this was a bad call. In 1919, a New York gambler allegedly bribed eight players of the Chicago White Sox, including Shoeless Joe, to throw the first and second game of the 1919 World Series. When the news came out the following year, the case was brought to criminal court.

A number of individuals, including local sportswriters and White Sox owner Charles Comisky, all testified to Jackson's innocence. After the trial he was acquitted. However, the new commissioner of baseball, Judge Kennesaw Landis, decided to ban all the players who were allegedly involved without even conducting an investigation.

If Commissioner Landis had taken some time to review the evidence, I be-

lieve he would have found that Shoeless Joe played no part in throwing the Series. It was obvious by the way he played.

In the 1919 World Series, Shoeless Joe Jackson batted 375, the highest of any player on either team. He set a World Series record with 12 hits. His fielding was flawless. He had six of the White Sox's 17 RBIs, and he hit the only homerun of the series.

A number of people from Senator TOM HARKIN of Iowa to the great Ted Williams have called for Commissioner Bud Selig to review the judgment made in haste 80 years ago. I would like to add the names of every Member of this House to that list.

Shoeless Joe was undoubtedly one of the greatest to play America's favorite pastime. He worked his way up through the textile mills of South Carolina and lived the American dream. He loved the game of baseball. The time has come for the commissioner to review the record and give Joe Jackson his rightful place of honor.

When the heroes of today, McGuire, Sosa, Ripken, Griffey, and when the heroes of tomorrow who are still dreaming their dreams on little league fields and school playgrounds, when they all come to Cooperstown to be enshrined with the other greats in the baseball Hall of Fame, they deserve to be alongside one of the greatest players who ever played the game.

I think they would all want Shoeless Joe there with them. The people from my district and people from all over the country have been working for years to have Jackson's good name cleared and his honor restored.

I want to do whatever I can to give him the honor that he is due and to honor the people who have been inspired by his memory to rebuild and revitalize his hometown, West Greenville, to honor his name.

On behalf of the people of my district who have worked so hard to uphold the memory and the honor of Shoeless Joe Jackson and along with the entire South Carolina Congressional Delegation, last Friday I introduced a resolution calling for Shoeless Joe to be appropriately honored. I believe this resolution is an opportunity to pay respect to one of the all-time great players of America's great national pastime.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to restore the name of Shoeless Joe.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL IS TRULY TAX FRAUD

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, after 20 years as a CPA, 6 years as a tax judge, I know tax fraud when I see it. The tax bill passed by the Republican majority is truly tax fraud.

It is a giant shift of our national income to the wealthiest one percent,

cleverly disguised as a grand expedition to the furthest reaches of fiscal irresponsibility.

Many speakers have come to this floor and explained how this country cannot now afford to lock itself into an \$800-billion tax cut exploding in its second 10 years to a \$3-trillion cut, that we should not take steps today which Alan Greenspan has cautioned us against, that we should not risk the greatest economic expansion of our lifetimes.

But after all the conversation about this \$800-billion to \$3-trillion tax cut and what it means in its fiscal effect, there has been precious little discussion about what is actually in the bill.

Well, I will tell my colleagues what is not in it. A repeal of the marriage penalty is not in this bill. They could not find a way to do it, limited as they were to \$800 billion. In fact, there is far less marriage penalty relief in this bill than there was in the Democratic alternative that cost only \$250 billion.

What also is not in this bill is any real help for school construction. The Democratic alternative said we as a Federal Government would pay the interest on school bonds so that if school districts have more classrooms for smaller class sizes, the Federal Government would help.

All this bill does is relax the arbitrage rules, inviting local school boards to invest their money in debentures and derivatives and other things that caused Orange County to go bankrupt. It does nothing more for schools than give the school boards a free ticket to Las Vegas with the bond money.

So what is in this bill? How have they managed to allocate 45 percent of the benefits to the top one percent in our society?

Well, for example, they have got the interest allocation rules, costing over \$43 billion over 10 years that turn to major multinationals and say, if you close down your factories in the United States and invest abroad, we will cut your taxes.

But there is more. There is the modification of treatment of worthless securities, certain financial institutions. There is a whole lot of stuff in here for the oil companies. My favorite and their favorite is the repeal for special foreign tax rules.

This means that if Texaco gives a ton of money to Saudi Arabia or Kuwait in return for the oil that they remove from their desert sands, Uncle Sam reimburses them penny for penny for what they pay for the oil that they then charge you and me for.

But there is more for the oil companies, like allowing a 5-year carry-back of NOL carry-forwards under a special rule; suspending the 65-percent tax limit on the percentage depletion allowance; allowing geological and geophysical costs to be deducted currently; allowing delay rental payments to be deducted currently, while modifying the section 613(d)(4) rules so that integrated oil producers can get the