

the implant concealing breast tissue and difficulties in getting health insurance to pay for the high costs of repeated surgeries. The cost of faulty implants is paid by all of us in the system even if it is not covered by insurance.

The Institute of Medicine estimated that by 1997, 1.5 million to 1.8 million American women had breast implants with nearly one-third of these women being breast cancer survivors. The American Plastic and Reconstruction Surgeons cited breast augmentation as the most popular procedure for women ages 19 through 34. In 1998, nearly 80,000 women in this age bracket received breast implants for purely cosmetic reasons. By 1999, an additional 130,000 women received saline breast implants.

In spite of the escalating numbers, very little is known about the long-term effects of silicone or platinum in the body. Few patients understand that even when they opt for saline breast implants, the envelope of the implant is made of silicon.

Following the FDA's decision to approve saline breast implants, the agency did warn women of the potential risk. FDA officials called upon implant manufacturers and plastic surgeons to ensure that thorough patient information is provided to women before they undergo the surgery.

Mr. Speaker, with the FDA approval process behind us, the only course of action to safeguard the future of women is that of an informed consent document. Somehow, a piece of paper cannot make up for a manufacturer's insufficient data or the retrieval analysis. It cannot make up for inaccurate labeling and even risk estimates.

There is so much we do not know, and yet the one government agency mandated to safeguard the public's food, drug and medical devices is moving so slow on this issue that could jeopardize women with a medical device that has alarmingly high failure rates.

In spite of the agency's call for post-market studies, the FDA approval of saline breast implants provides no incentive for the manufacturers to make data better or a safer medical device.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully the FDA will continue their research.

REASONS FOR ECONOMIC PROSPERITY IN AMERICA

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my special order, I would like to address the remarks of one of my colleagues just previously on a 5-minute. He made a statement that Governor Bush would replace Medicare with insurance companies. I have never heard something so laughable. Are the Democrats so desperate that they have got to spin something that is absolutely not true?

Mr. Speaker, I have never heard something so ridiculous. The gentleman may speak of his own opinion, but I would say that the gentleman is factually challenged. First, 70 percent of Americans have insurance, both for healthcare or for prescription drugs, and they want to keep that. Unfortunately, there is a large portion of the American population that has neither healthcare nor prescription drugs.

Governor Bush wants to make sure that those people are taken care of. But if the Democrats can demagog insurance companies or biotech companies, then what is left to pick up the void? Only big government, Hillary Clinton-type of healthcare and prescription drugs, and that is exactly what AL GORE does.

He has a one-size-fits-all, big government solution. Now, I have traveled all over the country with Governor Bush, and I know not only what he says, but I know what is in his heart. While the Democrats increased veterans healthcare by zero in the last budget, Republicans put in a \$1.7 billion increase.

Governor Bush not only wants to keep the promises to our veterans for healthcare that has been given for many, many years, but he wants to also make sure that that percentage of Americans who do not have healthcare have supplement to their Medicare. What does the Federal employee have? And that is FEHBP, the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, which is a supplement to Medicare. That is what he has said, that is what he talks about in every speech, nothing about replacing Medicare with insurance companies, at least do not demagog, at least do not make up stories that are absolutely not true.

If my colleagues want to talk about facts in the Social Security Trust Fund and Medicare trust fund, do we remember the Clinton-Gore budget, they said well, we want to take 100 percent of the Social Security trust fund and put it for Social Security and all of the surplus.

Mr. Speaker, weeks later, they came back and said oh, not so fast we want to take 62 percent and put it into Social Security, we want to take 15 percent of the surplus and put it into Medicare. What they did not tell us is that the Clinton-Gore budget took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund, put it up here for new spending. They increased taxes \$241 billion for new spending, to justify their budget and their balanced budget.

We said no, Mr. President, no, Mr. Vice President, that we are going to put the Social Security trust fund into a lockbox so that politicians cannot touch it, that you cannot keep increasing the debt and you cannot keep spending it. So if my colleagues want to talk about facts, that is a fact.

Another fact is that Republicans brought that budget to the floor to show what a sham it was. Mr. Speaker, do we know how many Democrats

voted for that budget, because we wanted them to vote for it, to show that they supported increase in taxes, to show that they supported raiding the Social Security trust fund, to show what a sham that the budget was. Do we know how many Democrats supported it? Only four.

Yet, AL GORE uses that budget as the basis, and I quote AL GORE, I use this budget as the basis for my plan, which spends every cent and more of the surplus. It dips in and raids the Social Security trust fund. It increases the taxes on the American people. And when my colleagues want to talk about facts, that is a fact.

The reason that I stepped up from my special order was that I was in Los Angeles for the Democrat convention. I was on television. I was on radio to see the spin, and it is probably the reason why there is an article in the Washington Post, which is not exactly a conservative paper, about, it is still the economy stupid, by David Broder. And it says that during the past 8 years LIEBERMAN said in the convention, we have created more than 4 million new businesses, 22 million new jobs, the lowest inflation in a generation, the lowest African American, Hispanic unemployment rate in history, the strongest economy in a 224-year history of the United States of America. He could have added that real incomes for even the poorest Americans began to improve and poverty rate declined.

□ 1730

But what David Broder goes on to say is, "But it wasn't until the Republicans took over Congress in 1995 that the goal of a balanced budget came into view, that the economy increased at a much higher rate than under the 1993 tax increase."

The Democrats in their convention said, well, if you loved the last 8 years of the economy, you need to put us back. That is what I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), went to see the Vice President and the President last night. They asked if the President would set aside 90 percent of the surplus to reduce the debt. We pay nearly \$1 billion a day on the national debt, Mr. Speaker. The President agreed.

They walked away saying, hey, we will take the other 10 percent, we will debate in Congress, we will work back and forth as to how the 10 percent of the surplus is spent, whether it is for tax relief or increased spending in other areas, like prescription drugs.

But when he got away, and I will quote here, now when Republicans say we want to lock away 90 percent of the next year's surplus, according to today's edition of the New York Times, "Mr. Clinton told Republicans he viewed paying down the debt as a priority, but said he was not sure it could be done in the 2001 fiscal year."

Does that sound like the balanced budget? It could be done in 12 years, it

could be done in 2 years, it could be done in 4 years, it could be done in 8 years, and now already the White House is reneging on putting the money in to pay off the national debt. I think it is ridiculous.

The point is, when the Democrats claim that economic prosperity is due to their efforts, I reject that, Mr. Speaker; and I set out to show the reasons why from fact, from budget legislation, and the lack of budget legislation.

First of all, not a single White House or Democrat budget since the Republicans took over the majority in 1994 has ever passed either the House or the Senate. As a matter of fact, we brought the Democratic White House budgets to the floor just to embarrass the Democrats, to show what a sham the Clinton-Gore budget was.

In 1993, they did pass their budget, because they had control of the House, the Senate and the White House, and I will address that in just a minute. In 1994, the House voted 223 to 175 and the Senate 57 to 40 to pass their budget. But in 1995, Republicans took over and talked about balancing the budget for the first time.

In 1996, the budget from the White House failed 117 to 304. In 1997, in the Senate it failed 45 to 53. In 1998 there was no vote. There was a vote on the Democrat budget; and the Blue Dogs, and, by the way, I would say that the Blue Dogs, against the liberal leadership of the House, had some pretty good ideas and some ideas that we could accept unanimously; but the President would veto it, and the Democrat leadership would fight against it.

In 1999 we brought the budget forward from the White House, and only two Democrats supported it, because, again, it raided the Social Security trust fund, it increased taxes, it broke the budget, and it increased the national debt.

I would say that when the Democrats claim that they are responsible for the economy, and not a single one of their economic plans or budgets ever passed, I would say that that is a sham, Mr. Speaker. Yet the Democrats will go back and say, well, it was the 1993 tax increase. They refer to it as their 1993 economic package.

But after I go through this, I will also show in this newspaper article and every newspaper article within the country, liberal and conservative, it says the Al Gore economic plan would spend all of the projected Federal surplus of more than \$4 trillion and run up a deficit of \$900 billion over 10 years, no cushion at all, \$900 billion in the hole.

Does that sound familiar? It sounds familiar to 40 years of Democrat control of the House, in which in 1993 the President's budget projected deficits of \$200 billion every year throughout and beyond, and also increased taxes every single year and raided the Social Security trust fund every single year.

I would say that the 1993 package that they claim, they say, well, Repub-

licans, not a single Republican voted for the Democrat tax package. Again, they say "economic plan." Why did we not, Mr. Speaker? I think the American people need to know.

First of all, the 1993 Democrat tax increase was the largest tax increase in history, across the board. The first tax they promised a targeted tax relief plan, and does this not sound familiar with what they are doing today on the liberal leadership of the Democrats? They said, we want a targeted tax relief plan for middle-class Americans.

First of all, this body should never use the term "middle class," because there are no low class, there are no middle class, and there are no upper-class citizens in this country. There are low-income citizens, there are middle-income citizens, and high-income citizens; but the other side continually uses the term "class warfare" to get their point across. I think that is wrong.

But they promised a middle-income tax cut, and they could not help themselves. In 1993 they increased the taxes on the middle class. Why? Because it means power, Mr. Speaker. It means power to rain down more and more money to their districts so they can come back here and get reelected and maintain the majority like they did for 40 years.

But finally the American people had enough, and in 1994-1995 they said we are going to let the Republicans try and let them for the first time in 40 years control the House. Now we control the Senate as well.

The tax increase in 1993, why did we not support it? Because it took every cent out of the Social Security trust fund, just like they had for 40 years prior, to use up here for additional spending. In all the budgets, even after Republicans took the majority, the Clinton-Gore budget raided the Social Security trust fund, put it up here for new spending, increased taxes for new spending, and then put a little bit back into the Social Security trust fund or put in an IOU.

What did that do, Mr. Speaker? It increased the national debt, at the same time making the Social Security-Medicare trust fund insolvent. Republicans said, No, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President. We are going to put the Social Security trust fund into a lockbox, to where it accrues interest. Instead of increasing the debt, it is going to pay down the national debt by the year 2013.

Now, AL GORE in his budget tries to take claim for this. They did in the Democrat convention. It is not true. They fought it tooth, hook and nail, every single part of the way, because they wanted to use that extra money for spending. I think that is wrong.

Why did we not vote for the 1993 tax increase from Clinton-Gore? Because it cut the veterans' COLAs. You want to talk about priorities? Our veterans that served this country, in many cases departed from their families, not

knowing if they are coming back, their families are penalized. They have to move several times during their career, they cannot invest, their children are ripped out of schools. But yet to balance the budget, or to put their budget plan into effect, they even cut the COLAs, which is a tax increase on our veterans.

If that was not enough, they cut the military COLAs for our active duty military, the people that need it the most, that are getting shifted around all over this country. Then they cut defense, \$127 billion, after Colin Powell and Dick Cheney told the President that a \$50 billion cut would put our military into a hollow force.

Why did we not support the Clinton-Gore 1993 tax increase? Remember that it increased the gas tax? They even had a retroactive tax. Most people forget about that. Remember the First Lady changed their income tax form so she could benefit from the retroactive tax?

Remember the gas tax went to a general fund? Why, instead of a transportation fund? So that they could take the Social Security trust fund, they could take the increase in taxes, including the 18 cents Federal tax into a general fund and use it for new spending. And we said, No, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President. We are going to take that gas tax, and we are going to put it into a transportation trust; and many Republicans and Democrats and States have benefited from that, because the money, instead of going to new social spending, failed social spending, has gone to improve our roads and highways in this country, including my own California, which is a donor State when it comes to taxes, and not the general fund.

But remember in 1993 also the Clinton-Gore team tried to pass government controlled health care. It was rejected by all Americans. Remember the \$16 billion pork-barrel package? I do. I was here. It had payback for people that had voted for the Clinton-Gore team. It put parking garages in Puerto Rico, swimming pools in Florida. I mean, it was ridiculous.

In that, the deficits were projected at \$200 billion and beyond forever. Did we vote for it? No.

First of all, the Social Security tax increase, we rescinded that and did away with it. The tax for the middle class, we have given education IRAs, we have given education savings accounts, we have given R&D tax credits, we have given capital gains tax credits, which the Democrats said were all for the rich. They fought tooth, hook and nail. Yet at the convention I see the Vice President claiming credit for education IRAs, when they fought against them tooth, hook and nail. They said it was a tax only for the rich. The \$500 deduction per child, remember that side, it is only a deduction for the rich, just like the death tax and the marriage penalty. It is only a tax break for the rich.

Tax breaks they cannot stand. Why, Mr. Speaker? A tax break is a sense of

power, money in the Federal Government. A surplus that is not given back to the American people is power to spend, power to spend for constituents, whether you are a Democrat or Republican, down to your district, so you can get reelected; and they will resist tax breaks in any single way. Even the promise of middle-class or middle-income tax workers and Americans, they rejected it. They increased the tax. They just cannot help themselves in that.

The Social Security trust fund, we said no. Lockbox. Veterans' COLAs, we restored that, on a bipartisan basis, by the way, against Clinton's and GORE's wishes. The military COLAs, we reinstated that. We have replaced somewhat of the defense. The increase in taxes at the highest level in history, we have done away with much of that. The gas tax, as I mentioned, we put into a trust fund. We took the health care plan and we benefited many Americans, but we have still got a long ways to go.

So, for the Democrats to say that they are responsible for the economy, first of all, when not a single one of their budgets or economic plans have ever cleared the House or the Senate, outside when they controlled this body, and the 1993 tax increase that most of it has been rescinded, it is a little bit ridiculous for them to claim credit for the economy.

□ 1745

It is impossible. It is illogical.

Economic principles. We say well, what has not and what has, in my opinion, and 99 percent of the economists contributed to a better economy for all Americans.

First of all, when we took the majority, in our 1995 budget, even before that, with the Contract With America, we said we are going to balance the budget. Do not listen to me or to the Democrats, or to any of the leadership; listen to what Alan Greenspan said. He said, and I quote, just by speaking about balancing the budget and the potential for the Congress of the United States to balance the budget will reduce interest rates across the board. And what do interest rates mean to the American people?

I have a family, a young man that just got married. He is looking into homes. Here is a chart I pulled out of the Washington Post, and it is on home-buying, Mr. Speaker. Take a \$140,000 house, and most people would like to find a \$140,000 house today. But at 5 percent interest, one's payments are about \$1,000. If one has 8.5 percent, which is about what the prime is today, one is paying \$1,400 a month for one's payment. If it is 10 percent, one is paying almost \$1,600 a month. That is real savings to the American people, when one is buying a home.

I just sent my daughter off to Yale. I cannot tell my colleagues how expensive that is. She scored a perfect 1600 on her SAT, and she wants to be a doc-

tor. But if interest rates are important to the American people, and the balanced budget is the primary cause of interest rates going lower, according to Alan Greenspan, the head of the Fed, then that is an economic principle that we want to adopt.

Who fought against it, Mr. Speaker? The Clinton-Gore administration was here in this House fighting day by day to fight against the balanced budget because it limited the amount that they could spend and to regain a majority, and that is just wrong. But in 1997, after 2 years of demagoguery, the President finally came to the table with Republicans, against the wishes of the liberal Democrat leadership on this side. They still fought it tooth, hook and nail, fought a balanced budget, because their leadership saw that, well, that will take away their ability to retake a majority, and that was more important to them than a balanced budget and the economy of this country. The President signed a budget agreement. I give him credit for that.

A second principle is that the government should keep its books in order and cut wasteful spending. In the Washington Times today, it listed 4 government agencies responsible for \$21 billion, actually \$20.7, close enough, of fraud, and one-half of that fraud was in Medicare. I would say, whether it is the Education Department that only gets about 48 cents less than half of the dollars down to the classroom because of the bureaucracy, and that the IRS and GAO have been unable to audit; as a matter of fact, it is unauditible, that there is fraud, waste and abuse there. We look at food stamps or HUD, and yes, Mr. Speaker, Defense. I can go through and point out fraudulent and wasteful spending in Defense, which I am a hawk; well, maybe a dove that is fully armed. But there is wasteful spending, and that should be part of the principles of reducing and helping this country to economic prosperity.

Tax relief for working people. Mr. Speaker, if someone has a \$500 deduction per child or they can have an IRA in which they can set aside \$2,000 a year, which the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) set forth so that working families could set aside money. If one has a child, when he is born, by the year he is 10 years old, at \$2,000 a year, well, we would say that would be \$20,000, but with compound interest, it is almost \$40,000 a year by the time that child is 10 years old. One can use it for special education, for special needs, one can use it for books, for tutoring, or one can leave it in the trust fund for higher education.

But yet, that was rejected by the Clinton-Gore administration, and now the Vice President is trying to say it was his idea, when they rejected it, and that is wrong. But tax relief for working families, they get a little more money in their pockets, and maybe they can go out and buy a car, and car dealers like that. Maybe they go out and buy a double cheeseburger, double

fries, to spread the money around a little bit. It is called micro and macroeconomics, that one has more money and they will spend it or at least set it aside and save it.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side have never seen a tax increase they do not like, or will they ever support a tax decrease? No. At least some of my colleagues will, but the liberal Democrat leadership on that side fights it tooth, hook and nail every single day.

Less government spending. If we have less bureaucracy; for example, about 4,000 workers in the Department of Education, and we only get less than half of that money down to the classroom because of the bureaucracy, Federal education spending. I used to be the chairman on the authorization committee. Only about 7 percent of funding from the Federal government gets down to the States for Federal education programs. But yet, in most States, it takes more than half of the States' administrative body to manage that 7 percent of Federal education dollars. And the other paperwork, by the time we go back and forth with all of the different requirements, then we have even less than that to spend on the classroom, whether it is for construction, whether it is for teacher pay, whether it is for technology, or whatever it is.

So another principle should be not just to cut wasteful spending, but those items in which we have priorities for, Social Security, Medicare, prescription drugs, education, that the maximum amount of dollars should go to those groups that we are trying to help, not a bureaucracy in Washington. But the era of big government is not over. In AL GORE's budget plan we see government with 48 new government agencies in the Clinton-Gore budget last time. In the one prior to that, it was 115 new government agencies. They cannot bring themselves to cut the budget.

When they say, look at the number of government officials that have been reduced, we know that 90 percent of those Federal employees are defense and defense-related industries, not the civilian workforce.

Another principle should be to pay down the debt. Paying \$1 billion a day, nearly \$1 billion a day is robbing our children of their future and putting a debt burden on their backs that we as adults and Members of Congress should not do. We have paid down, in every single year, the debt when again, the Clinton-Gore budgets have increased the deficit by over \$200 billion, including the present Gore plan. Just read all of the papers, look at all of the economists. He spends every bit of the Social Security trust; he spends every bit of the surplus and increases taxes at the same time, and guess what? The debt goes up again.

Budgets for education. People say, look across the land. My wife was a teacher, a principal, and now she is a district administrator for the school

district. My sister-in-law, Carolyn Nunes, is the district administrator for all of San Diego city schools for special education. Allen Buerson, who was a Clinton employee before, is now the superintendent of San Diego city schools. Guess what? He is in the real world and now he is fighting for Republican principles of getting the dollars down to him so that he can make the decisions, so that the teachers, the parents and the administrators can make a decision on what happens to their dollars.

We passed a bill on the House Floor called Ed Flex. The liberals over here fought against it, because again, they want government control of health care, they want government control of education, they want government control of private property; they want the highest taxes possible so that they can keep that power and have bigger bureaucracies. But yet, Allen Buerson says, we need the money more down to the classroom, and I support Allen Buerson who is a Democrat and also the superintendent of schools for San Diego city schools, and I think he is doing a good job.

But let me give my colleagues an idea, Mr. Speaker, of the sham that the Democrats run and why it is so difficult for the American people to see the differences.

First of all, we have talked about the President's budget. Democrats did not vote for it. But yet, they will use the President's budget number of \$1.1 billion for special education. When the Democrats had control of the House, the most money ever spent on the authorized amount was 6 percent for special education. If one includes the money for Medicaid, that has gone up to about 18 percent for special education. In this budget, the Republican budget, we increase special education by \$550 million. But yet, the budget that none of the Democrats voted for because it increased taxes, stole Social Security trust, and the only way they got up to the \$1.1 figure was to use that, those gimmicks, and say that Republicans are cutting special education, when we have actually increased it more than they ever did and increased it by \$550 million over the amount. I think that is wrong, to use that kind of smoke and mirrors.

In education, for many, many years they put trillions of dollars into education programs. When I was subcommittee chairman on the authorization committee, I had 16 groups come in before me and testify. Every one of the 16 had the absolute best program that could be envisioned for their district. It worked. It was helping children to learn or it was helping special needs children or even at-risk children. Even Bishop McKinney, who has a Catholic school for abused children and at-risk children, came in and testified.

After the hearing, I asked each of them which one of the other 15 had any one of the other programs in their district. They looked at each other, and not a single one. We said, that is the

whole idea. We are trying to get in a block grant the money to you so that you, if you live in Wisconsin, this program may work best for you, but yet, the teachers, the parents, the principals and the community can make the decision of how that money is spent. We believe that with all of our hearts, that those dollars are best served by not a bureaucrat here, not a union boss telling them how they have to spend those dollars, but that it gets to them in the classroom.

The second thing was the education flex bill, the President wanted 100,000 teachers. We said 100,000 teachers, but the first half of that, there was not the quality, because many of those teachers were not even certified. As a matter of fact, in the State of California, many of them, after they were hired, have to be fired, because they could not teach in the subject that they were supposed to be trained in. We said no. To hire new teachers, first of all, with Federal dollars, there has to be quality associated with it. We think that is right too. That decision again should be made at a local level in how to do that.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, the principles of a balanced budget, lower interest rates, lower inflation, making sure that the Federal government puts its house in order and its books in order, making sure that if a government is wasteful, that it is eliminated, or at least fixed, they are important.

A good example is Head Start. Just like those 16 programs, many of my liberal friends would say, let us do all 16 programs, let us do them; not mean, not malicious. But in doing that, they would put all of those programs under the Department of Education. Each one would have a bureaucracy. Like Head Start and Easy Start and many of the programs, there was underfunding. They were doomed to fail.

We think that the best decisions should be made at the local level. We think that is right, too. Under a balanced budget, if Alan Greenspan says that interest rates are largely the reason for economic advancements in this country, that low inflation is important, that capital gains reductions have stimulated the economy and created jobs, then I think that is good.

But if we have liberal leadership on the other side that fights those issues in both their budgets and in the 1993 tax bill, then I think that we need to make the analysis of who is responsible for the economy.

Again, I would say that the Blue Dogs, and my colleague here on the budget has worked. I want to go through this. I have fought for 2 weeks on this. But I would say, my colleague on the other side has some real good ideas, and ones that I personally accepted. The overall budget I thought was bad, but I would say that many of those issues that the gentleman brought forward were very valuable.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, would my friend yield for a minute? Any minute that I take from the gentleman, any minute I take I will be happy to give to the gentleman afterwards.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman for his compliments. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman now, but I would sincerely say, whatever time I take, I hope the gentleman would stick around and use a part of my hour, because I think a little dialogue between the two of us might be helpful.

I know the gentleman does not mean to misrepresent. He believes what he is saying, just as I would believe what we are saying. I think we could clear up the record a little bit if we have a dialogue. I will yield some time to the gentleman when my hour comes in a moment, and hope the gentleman will stick around.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman, we have the Sportsman's Caucus dinner tonight that I am going to hustle over to, but I will stick around maybe the first 5 minutes.

I would say again, many of my colleagues on the other side, especially the Blue Dog budgets most of us on this side could adopt, but we could not go along with the liberal leadership from the gentleman's party or the White House. As a matter of fact, most of the gentleman's people could not vote for them when they were brought forward on the House floor by Republicans.

The President, as I mentioned, in 1997 signed the balanced budget agreement, but each one of those budgets following they increased taxes, they took money out of the social security trust fund, and they increased the debt by using false assumptions.

I would be the first one to say that there were many of the assumptions in the Republican budgets that we disagreed with. That is the way it worked.

But I think the overall factors of a balanced budget, tax relief for working families, social security, tax reduction so people could have their own money, not taking the money out of the social security trust, education IRAs, a \$500 deduction per child, capital gains reductions, and even my own 21st century bill that allowed businesses to donate their computers to a nonprofit, that company then took that computer, which is still in effect, by the way, they take that computer to a military brig or a prison system, they work on it, they hand that computer over to the school as a full-up round. It is a win-win for the budget, it is a win-win for education, it is a win-win for our penal system, and it sure is for our businesses, because they get to write off the tax and invest in new computers and then cycle those computers back into the education process.

I think the Republican budget strategy has been clearly successful: balancing the budget, tax relief, cutting wasteful spending.

If Members will look at the economist, Lawrence Kudlow, he says, "Declining inflation has been a pervasive tax cut for all Americans. The effect throughout the economy is in boosting real incomes."

Alan Greenspan said that long-term interest rates have declined drastically since the balanced budget and have enabled us to stimulate the economy. "It has been the first decline in long-term interest rates which, perhaps more than anything else in our economy, has been a factor which has been driving this reality quite extraordinarily, economic expansion."

That is a direct quote by Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Alan Greenspan also credited this decline largely to Congress's determined effort to balance the Federal budget. He often advised Congress that financial markets would respond favorably to credible deficit reduction.

Greenspan said, "A substantial part of the very considerable decline in long-term interest rates has been a function of the decline of budget deficits, because it has removed pressures on the Federal government borrowing from the marketplace." That is where our debt goes up, as well; the reverse of what has happened with President Clinton's 1993 tax bill. A year after his tax increase was enacted, interest rates have moved up about 2½ percent, percentage points. The trend for real economic growth slowed.

Interest rates peaked November 7, 1994. The next day, the national board set a new direction. They said that they wanted to stop the raid on the social security trust fund, they wanted to stop increased deficits and an increase in the debt.

If we look at Vice President GORE's budget proposal, that is exactly what he goes back to. Look at the newspapers, look at the budget analysts. He spends every single penny of the surplus. We think that is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan had predicted that credible spending restraint would be rewarded with falling interest rates. I have already showed in the real estate market what that means to a young family that wants to buy a new home.

Real wages actually declined after the 1993 tax increase, and I think quite often we speak too much of numbers, but 0.5 percent. Is a balanced budget just numbers?

We speak that a lot here on the House floor: deficits, budgets, numbers, increases. But what it is is for real families. If a family has more in their pockets to spend, then they are going to set that money aside for their children. Unfortunately, in this country there are many of those families that are not responsible.

When we have someone that is irresponsible, and let me give the Members an idea, in welfare reform, I had a doctor come into my office. He said, Duke, I had a lady come into my doctor's office. She had a 12-year-old daughter. She wanted to know what was wrong with her 12-year-old daughter, that she could not have a child. The mother had a 13-year-old and a 14-year-old each with children. She wanted the extra welfare money.

My father and my mother, I lost my dad about 5 years ago, the best dad in the whole world, but I never got a nickel allowance. I had to work for it. My father and my mother never missed an academic or an athletic event that either my brother or I attended, either at home or away. I had to go to church, like a lot of us, when I was young. I would have a lot rather been on some Sundays out with my buddies riding around, having a good time, but I had to go to church.

I had to do my homework before I got to go out and play or be with my buddies when I got older. My mother and father that never had a chance to go to college said, you and your brother are going to college. You have no choice. Because my father said, his small definition of the American dream was that "If we teach you the value of a dollar, that you have to earn it, we do not just give it to you, like government gives to many people in welfare; if we teach you a sense of the family, that we are there for your education, we are there for your events, that we care; if we force you to do your homework so that you can qualify for college and you get a college education," my father's small definition of the American dream is that, "With those tools, you can make tomorrow better most days than it is today; not every day, but most days."

I would ask the Members, what chance at the American dream does that 12-year-old, that 13-year-old, or that 14-year-old or their children, what chance would they have because the mother wanted more welfare money?

The Clinton-Gore administration fought tooth, hook, and nail welfare reform. Governor Engler from Michigan, Tommy Thompson, from Wisconsin, had models. They brought them to us, on the Republican side. They said, this will work.

Can Members imagine a parent coming home with a paycheck instead of a welfare check, what that means to a child in school? Guess what, those families, and the President takes credit now for welfare reform, and half of the people off of welfare rolls. But guess what, instead of welfare money being spent out of the government or unemployment, those people are working.

Guess what, those tax rolls, they are paying money into the government by paying taxes instead of drawing from that. We think that is good. Has there been enough in that area? No. Is there enough training? No. There needs to be additional training. We agree on some of those issues on both sides.

Yet, Clinton and GORE fought welfare reform tooth, hook, and nail. The liberal leadership on that side of the aisle fought welfare reform tooth, hook, and nail. Why? Trillions of dollars they put into welfare. The average for a welfare recipient was 16 years. In my opinion, many of our inner cities with the drug problems we have, the no hope in the inner cities, is from generations of people trapped in a welfare system with no hope on where to go.

Yes, it is better to give a person a pole and teach them how to fish instead of giving them the fish. Yet, we are looking at an election where a contrast of a Governor that has balanced these budgets, working with Democrats on both sides of the aisle, to where in education he went into the school systems and said, "What is wrong? Do you not have the technology? Are your teachers not trained? Why are my Hispanic and African-American children dropping out at high rates?"

I think it was fair for him to go into the schools and say, "Why? Whatever it is, our administration in Texas is going to fix it."

If we take a look at all the press accounts, the education, the educational system for minorities, is going up the highest of any State. I do not think it is fair, where the Democrats had control of Texas for 100 years, and looking across-the-board in the State of Texas. But I think it is fair to look at the differences between the time Governor Bush took over the education systems in Texas and what he has done for the State of Texas.

I was on *Heraldo* with Al Sharpton, that was fun. I told *Heraldo*, I said, Mr. *Heraldo*, you spent your whole life reaching out, making sure that minorities have equality. Where you have someone like Governor Bush in Texas that has gone into the education system, and in my opinion education is the savior for a lot of things, for anticrime, for the economy, and for a child's benefit and a family's benefit. But I said, you have got someone that has proven in Texas what they have done, and they want to do the same thing for this great country. At least I would expect you to reach out and embrace that. Cut the cards, doublecheck what he says, but I have traveled with Governor Bush and I know he means it from his heart, and he has not only talked the talk but he has walked the walk.

I would challenge all of the Members to reach out, especially in education, and get the bucks down to the classroom.

Since we have had a balanced budget and Republicans took over, we had the second largest stock market boom in this century; we had 39 million new jobs, 11 million new business start-ups; the creation of \$25.7 trillion in new household wealth.

I reject the Democrat convention where they say that the last 8 years they are responsible for the economy. The Greenspan policy of disinflation

has neutralized the Clinton tax increases. Low inflation has lowered capital gains, has led to an information technology explosion, fueling even more productivity, growth, and wealth creation.

Nearly half of all Americans own at least \$5,000 worth of stocks, bonds, or mutual funds. We should not tax those annuities.

□ 1815

We should reward work. We should reward savings, Mr. Speaker, unlike the Gore budget.

American families treasure their ability to improve their condition throughout their own efforts. I think in our history there is no country in the world that has out-produced our workers if we give them a chance.

On a sense of equal opportunity, is there in this country? Absolutely not. Has it gotten better? Yes, it has. Do we need to work in that direction? Yes, we do. Economic growth is not just about numbers; it is about the values on which America and its people thrive.

Let me go through some of the things that I think have hurt our chances for the economy: first of all, by spending the Social Security trust fund; secondly, 149 deployments for our military in which our military was at a pretty sad state.

We put \$3 billion into Haiti. Go to Haiti. I challenge any Republican or Democrat to go there. Look between the airport and the embassy. There is an average of three murders a day on that highway, and carjackings. One can drive a semitruck into the holes; but yet we put money into Haiti. Do my colleagues know where the money is? Take a look at Arastide's bank account. But yet we have not done a thing in Haiti. But, yes, we lost some people there. We got kicked out of there.

In Somalia, the same thing. We cannot fight a Kosovo and fly 86 percent of all the missions just because the U.N. and NATO do not have the aircraft and the technology. Either they need to upgrade their aircraft and technology for standoff weapons or they need to pay the United States those billions of dollars that it costs us: \$16 billion for Bosnia, the four times going into Iraq, bombing an aspirin factory. At the same time, General Ryan told me we put a year's life on every one of our aircraft, a year's life, and which we have parts.

What is happening today? We are only keeping in 22 percent of our enlisted into the military. I talked to the SEAL team commander yesterday. He has right the opposite. Those kids are motivated. They have increased their recruiting and retention; but yet they have problems in research and development and procurement. But when we only keep 22 percent of our enlisted, think about our experience level in maintenance.

The average fighter in the Air Force is 18 years. Our bombers are 39 years

average age. I have got Marines carrying World War II radios. Yet, Mr. LIEBERMAN says that our military is the best in the world.

If we tell these kids to go somewhere, they are going to do it; and they are going to try and achieve. But that is not the point. A, they need the training.

Do my colleagues know that, in Kosovo, the two helicopters that crashed, and one helicopter crew was killed, all of them, that those helicopter crews had never had a flight in a combat-loaded helicopter because they did not have the money to train with a combat loaded? They had never trained with night goggles because they could not get the goggles into the squadron. Both those helicopters crashed.

Do my colleagues know Captain O'Grady that was shot down was not air combat qualified when he was shot down over Bosnia because they did not have the money for the training?

Do my colleagues know that in the Navy and the Air Force we have no more adversary aircraft? The reason that I am alive today is because, when I fought against the MiGs in Vietnam, I had better training and better equipment. But the training today is substandard. We do not have those adversary aircraft.

I just spoke to the COs in the fighter weapons schools in both services. The FMC rate, the full mission capable rate of our aircraft and our equipment has gone down. If we had to meet the minimums of a quadrennial review or bottoms-up review, we could not do it today. I think that is wrong.

I think for the Clinton-Gore White House to drag our military through 149 deployments, depreciate our men and our women and our equipment, cut their military and then the veterans' COLAs I think is wrong.

I stand before my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, tonight. Are we perfect on the Republican side? Absolutely not. We have got a long way to go, I think, with our own budgets and everything else.

But I do think the principles of Ronald Reagan of less taxes and smaller government, of making sure that government that is wasteful is eliminated, those principles are sound and go forward a long way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like first to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks as he has discussed the defense needs of this country and the needs that we need to follow through. I certainly want to join with him.

But by the same token, I think it is important, and I say this now, anytime one starts pointing fingers, I was reminded that anytime one points one's finger, there are always three pointing back at one.

The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has been doing a lot of

finger pointing at this side of the aisle, talking about liberal leadership.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, in talking about the liberal leadership, many of my colleagues support some of the same things we want to do, including defense. But the leadership along with Clinton-Gore has fought welfare reform, they fought a balanced budget, they fought a lot of the initiatives we think are responsible for the economy.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, Presidents do not spend money. Congress appropriates.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. True.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the shortages that we allowed to happen in the defense needs of this country have originated in this House of Representatives, not the President. We both agree to that.

Therefore, my concern about the current budget implications today is that, when my colleagues base their entire budget on a tax cut, and the newest one now that they have proposed, the gentleman's leadership has proposed, not the gentleman, there is no money left. If we take 90 percent of the total unified budget and apply it to the debt, there is no money left this year to increase defense spending in those areas where the gentleman from California and I would agree. That is my problem. If my colleagues take it out 10 years, there is no money.

Let me go back. The gentleman from California mentioned the Reagan years. I happen to be a Member that served here during that period of time. I happen to be a Democrat on this side of the aisle that helped pass much of the Reagan revolution.

But I think it is important that we set in proper perspective, when we start comparing total outlays in spending as a percent of gross domestic product during the Reagan years was 21½ percent. It increased to 22 percent in the Bush years. It has dropped to 20 percent in the Clinton years, which the gentleman's side of the aisle had deserved some credit for bringing down the spending.

But when one counts administrations, it is not correct to say that government has grown in the last 8 years. It has not. Federal employment has dropped from 2.1 million Federal employees during the Reagan years, went up to 2.2 million in the Bush years, and dropped to 1.8 million in the Clinton years.

I do not say that in defense, because I am much more interested in the future than I am in the past. I rejoice in the fact that we now have a surplus, that we are, in fact, discussing how we shall spend the surplus. During my hour, we are going to talk about this surplus is fictional. We cannot spend it like it is real money. It is projected.

But discretionary spending, defense, defense spending, let me make this point to bear out what the gentleman has been saying as regards to defense. The Johnson years, oh, how we have

heard about those. Discretionary spending as a percent of gross domestic product was 12 percent. The Reagan years, it dropped to 9.5. The Bush years, it dropped to 8.5. The Clinton years, 6.8. Nondefense, though, 3.7. Johnson. Reagan, 3.5.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my 5 minutes that was yielded to me earlier in the evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCARBOROUGH). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not if the gentlewoman from Ohio will agree with this. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has just spoken. I would like to make maybe a 1- or 2-minute comment. I have to run to a dinner.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I can yield from my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with that.

ONGOING SAGA OF BUDGET SURPLUS

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

REASONS FOR ECONOMIC PROSPERITY IN AMERICA

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. First of all, I agree with the gentleman that it is Congress that spends money. Congress is responsible for the budgets that go forward. The President and the Vice President make recommendations. My point is that those recommendations have not been wise. The recommendations that we have made have been fought, whether it is welfare reform, balanced budget and so on.

Secondly, the defense, we spent the money. I believe that, without the 1993 defense cuts, without the additional cuts, without the 149 deployments which has mostly come in, and the gentleman from Texas I think would agree, comes out of operation and maintenance for the military, those cuts have come deep.

There is also, fraud, waste, and abuse within DOD. We need to eliminate that as well, and I will work with the gentleman on that. But when it says that we are responsible for the state of the military, I disagree in the fact that we have been unable, whether it was extension of Somalia or Haiti or Kosovo and Bosnia, all of those different things, that that has put an additional toll on our military that we would not have had if we had not been forced into

those peacekeeping missions. That is all I wanted to make a statement for.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for that comment. Again, in that area, he and I are going to find that we agree a heck of a lot more than we disagree. But I wish he could stick around for the remaining hour because I would love to have a good honest discussion about where we might differ on some of how we get to that point. But maybe next time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to arm wrestle with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) or even the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) in the future.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

MARKETING OF VIOLENCE TO CHILDREN BY ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the kind gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me a few brief moments here. I will not encroach on his time. I know he has been waiting. No one has been a finer leader on the issue of balancing our budget and getting the long-term debt and the annual deficits down than the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). He has been a leader for all of us. So for him to yield me a few moments of his time this evening is a great privilege for me, and I thank the gentleman so very much.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to enter some remarks in the RECORD here concerning the recent ruling by the Federal Trade Commission that was highlighted in the New York Times yesterday and in every major newspaper around the country with the headline: "Violence in the Media is Aimed at the Young, Federal Trade Commission says. Report finds pervasive and aggressive marketing of films and video games to our youth."

I am so concerned about this I will be sending parts of my remarks tonight to the gentleman who represents the motion picture industry here in Washington, Mr. Jack Valenti, along with the heads of all of our three major commercial networks, along with the heads of those that sponsor MTV in our country, to say that we are the most affluent society in the world; and yet we witness constantly school shootings, teens committing murders, first graders carrying guns into our schools to shoot fellow students.

We can all ask ourselves what is happening deep inside this society and why do we have to read about children committing crimes, violent crimes almost on a daily basis. With all the national reports indicating major crime is coming down in our country, why is it that parents in my neighborhood feel that they cannot allow their children to ride their bicycles more than two blocks away from the house because they fear for their lives and for their health?

We live in a very, very working-class normal community in our country

where people go to work every day, where seniors reside and so forth.

Following the terrible events at Columbine High School last year, President Clinton ordered the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the role that the entertainment industry played in promoting youth violence. The report that came out by chairman Pitofsky of the Commission says, and I quote: "For all three industry segments, the answer is yes. Targeted marketing to children of entertainment products with violent content is pervasive and aggressive. Whether we are talking about music recording, movies or computer games, companies in each entertainment segment routinely end run and thereby undermine parental warnings by target marketing their products to young audiences."

I bring this up also because we did a recent survey in our office of constituents in our district asking them about television.

□ 1830

Seventy-three percent of the respondents graded the impact of television on America's youth as unwholesome with a negative impact on youth development. Moreover, when asked to list three major concerns facing our country, constituents in Ohio's Ninth District responded television, radio, and movies contributed to the moral debasement of our youth.

If that is not bad enough, and that is the reason I am down here tonight, I received this letter from the country of Ukraine this week from a religious leader in that country who says to me, "Congresswoman, you know, there is a deep economical crisis in our country today. Social wounds are opened like crimes, alcoholism, prostitution, drugs, and much of the humanitarian help coming from all over the world is in the form of clothing and food and medical goods. But, please, there is a lot of bad, immoral, wild nourishment," and he puts those words in quotes," that comes here as an ultra modern one.

"All this stinking mud that comes to Ukraine comes from America and from Europe. The cult of violence and pornography just fell as locusts onto our children's souls and their schools, their houses, and on the streets.

"The television today is working for hell, straight. Children are unprotected as no one else."

So I say to those in charge of the visual images put before the people of the world, when a Member of Congress receives a letter like this from a citizen in another country, I have to tell you, it is a heavy burden that we carry of true embarrassment.

How do we defend this not just here at home, but abroad? It is defenseless. You cannot be happy about any of this.

Do my colleagues know what he asks? And I am going to ask Mr. Valenti, I am going to ask the major media moguls of our country. He says, "We need help with ethics in our schools. We need help with printing