

to keep their focus on the real task at hand—to determine how we can prevent campaign fundraising scandals from ever happening again. I realize that we all would like to bring to justice anyone who has knowingly and willingly broken our laws. But we cannot allow the integrity of the Asian-American community to be sacrifices in the name of a misguided pursuit of justice. Asian-Americans have proven themselves exemplary citizens and deserving participants in the American democratic process.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1998

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as we begin work this week, the week after the Senate failed to pass campaign finance reform legislation, many in the media are proclaiming campaign finance reform dead. I disagree, there is still a chance if the House of Representatives passes our own bill. I hope Mr. Speaker that you do not use the vote in the Senate as an excuse for failing to act in this House.

A majority of the Senate supported the McCain-Feingold campaign reform bill. A majority of the members of the House, as judged by those who have signed on to campaign reform legislation, support campaign finance reform. The will of the majority in the Senate was denied because of Senate rules which requires 60 votes to end debate and pass a bill. The only way the will of the majority in the House can be denied is by your failing to schedule a vote on this issue.

We have been promised a vote on campaign finance reform before the end of March. The people of this nation have demanded that we act to clean up our broken election system. They will be watching to insure that the vote this month is a fair vote without poison pills. Mr. Speaker the people of my district refuse to take "no" for an answer. Do not let them down by denying the will of the majority.

BEST WISHES TO JAMES R.
ADAMS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1998

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the employees of Texas Instruments, Inc. in honoring and congratulating James R. Adams on his upcoming retirement on April 16, 1998 following the company's annual meeting of stockholders. Mr. Adams is currently Chairman of the Board of Directors, and while he will remain a director of the company and serve on various boards, his direction and leadership in the capacity of chairman will be missed. He is deserving of this retirement, which will actually be his second. Originally, Mr. Adams came out of retirement in June 1996 to serve as TI Chairman following the untimely death of Jerry R. Junkins, who had been TI's chairman, president and CEO since 1985.

Under Mr. Adams' leadership and vision, TI was formed into a more successful company

for the future, specializing in digital signal processing solutions, the fastest-growing segment of the semiconductor industry. During Mr. Adams' tenure, TI's digital signal processor and mixed-signal/analog revenues almost doubled over the past two years, improving TI's financial performance and increasing shareholder profits.

However, as Chairman, Mr. Adams was just as focused in having TI serve its surrounding community as he was focused in have the company increase its financial earnings. I know Jim Adams as someone who made sure that his company had a civic duty and responsibility of contributing and volunteerism in the community. He knew that a company should invest in students and schools in addition to investing in stocks and semiconductors. While ensuring this his company knew the benefits and good business of assisting education, he commits his personal time in doing the same, as a member of the Baylor University Hankamer School of Business Advisory Board, the University of Texas Engineering School Advisory Council and the Texas A&M Capital Campaign Steering Committee. As his successor, Mr. Thomas Engibous acknowledged: "His experience, counsel and outreach to the community have contributed significantly to the new realization of the new TI." Because of that outreach, he made TI, not only a corporate giant, but one with a giant care and concern for the community.

Before his association with TI, Mr. Adams had an extensive career in the telecommunications industry. He joined Southwestern Bell Telephone Company in 1965, the same year he earned his MBA in statistics and business finance from the University of Texas at Austin. He began his career as a computer supervisor in San Antonio, and, after holding many influential positions throughout the country with Southwestern Bell and AT&T, he became president of Southwestern Bell in 1988.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to those active professional tasks, Jim finds the time to participate in many activities in business, government, civic affairs and education, most notably serving on the board of the Dallas Citizens Council, the Telecom Corridor Technology Business Council and the Dallas Symphony Association.

I wish Jim the best of luck as, once again, he embarks on a new phase of his life in the form of retirement. I hope that this time, he gives himself an official retirement after a lifetime of achievement for Texas Instruments and the greater Dallas community.

OPPOSING THE PLANNED MERGER OF MCI COMMUNICATIONS AND WORLDCOM

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1998

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1998, the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr., and the Rainbow/PUSH Coalition filed comments with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in Washington, opposing the planned merger of MCI Communications and WorldCom. The Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO (CWA) also opposed the merger, but this was not well covered by the mainstream media.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the points which Reverend Jackson and the CWA have raised with the FCC deserve serious consideration and debate. At \$48 billion, this will be the largest corporate merger in this Nation's history. It involves two companies which have historically opposed the right of their workers to organize and belong to labor unions. It also involves two companies which historically have limited their investment in many of our Nation's under-served communities.

In February 1996, President Clinton called for the American telecommunications industry to expand its capital investment, to expand its hiring, and to expand its efforts to build a stronger, more connected America.

Since then, MCI and WorldCom have channeled virtually all of their investment to serving business and upper income communities. They have made no investment in America's inner cities. In fact, when you look at the leadership of these two massive companies, Mr. Speaker, it reflects virtually none of today's rich American tapestry of diversity.

Only one of 14 members of the MCI board of directors is not of European American descent, and WorldCom's board of directors is the only major telecommunications company in the U.S. whose board of directors is made up of only white men, with no race or gender diversity.

Mr. Speaker, we all hear and read about how these giant corporate mergers are going to help, but how will they help issues of job creation and greater opportunities for All Americans?

I would like to commend Reverend Jackson for addressing this important issue.

ADDRESS OF SPEAKER GINGRICH TO THE WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1998

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1998 House Speaker Newt Gingrich addressed a Joint Session of the Washington State Legislature in my home State of Washington. In his remarks, he suggested four goals for the country. First, that we as a society focus on being drug-free. Second, that we need to emphasize education and learning. Third, that we should talk about rethinking retirement. And fourth, that we ought to reduce the total amount of taxes the citizens owe their government. Mr. Speaker, these are nobles goals and I ask that the full text of his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

I am delighted to be here. Let me start by saying to all of you, we share a common future, that it is important to build better abilities to communicate, and we are working very hard, both with the governors and with the leaders of state legislatures, to learn how to share what works, what does not work, what the federal government is doing right, what it is doing wrong, and whether we have a common, general direction we are trying to go in. To recognize, in a country our size, that there is an enormous difference between Washington, D.C. and the state of Washington, just as there is an enormous difference between Washington, D.C. and Georgia.

And so, how do we have a common, general direction while maximizing our decentralization, maximizing local leadership and maximizing local initiatives? I want to share with you, for a few minutes if I could this morning, what we have done and where we were going. But frankly, it is exciting to me to see what you have done. You have implemented Welfare Reform in a very practical way. You have begun to take advantage of the opportunity to help people move out of poverty and into work, in what I think is a very, very important step in the right direction. You are working on Education Reform in a way that is very practical, and which is going to increase the chance of learning for all the children of this state. You recognize how much your state is connected to the world market, whether it is through Boeing or Microsoft or Weyerhaeuser or wheat farming; that, in fact, what happens in Jacarta does matter in Spokane and Seattle and Olympia and across the whole state.

We are, in a sense, entering a new era together. In the Capitol, in Washington, we tried to reach out. Let me say, first of all, I think the Western Governors' University is a very exciting project. I commend all of you who have voted to have your state participate in it; the notion that you are really now becoming pioneers for the whole country, in telecommunications, in the use of distance learning, and in making available to all citizens across an eight-state region an opportunity to share educational resources. That is a very important development, and it is ultimately going to allow you to lead, not just the United States but the entire world as people tie in and then learn from these experiences.

I also have to say that the Western States Coalition that Speaker Ballard talked about, I found last summer to be very helpful. We brought a number of eastern members out, and as you know, the West is different. It is bigger. It is more complex. In some parts of the West, water problems are dramatically different. We in Georgia never quite experience the same water situation as in Eastern Washington. We are in a situation where we have a huge surplus of water most of the time. We do not understand Western water laws compared to Eastern law.

To be in situations where we can look at the coming together of modern urban civilization, because in every Western state there are urban areas, and in fact, some of the Western states are more urbanized than some of the Eastern states in terms of the way people are, to look at that next to the environmental concerns, next to the agricultural, mining and forest concerns, to see it first hand, is important. I have already told the Speaker that I will be back, hopefully, in August for a visit to Washington state to look at the Columbia River Basin, to look at other concerns, and to get a better briefing on the issues that matter. And also to fly to Alaska, and look at our largest state and what their unique concerns are.

I commend those legislative and other leaders who began to develop a Western state coalition to talk through what we should do at the federal level to increase flexibility within a framework of still getting to a common, general direction. I think the information age, with Microsoft and many other developments here is going to give us some opportunities that are enormous. I think the world market gives us opportunities that are enormous. And as the state that houses our most successful exporter of manufactured goods, Boeing, you know how important the world market is. But I think they also offer us opportunities to work together.

One of the things I hope to do is to introduce the spirit of Peter Drucker and Edwards Demming into the whole way we think about

government. Peter Drucker is the leading management consultant of the Twentieth Century, and Edwards Demming developed the concept of quality and taught that concept to the Japanese. In fact, the prize for the best company in Japan is the Demming Prize. They are really talking about a way of thinking that is a powerful, information age modernization over the bureaucratic model we have all inherited at every level. From school board, to city council, to county commission, to state government, to federal government, we have a model of structures that needs to be thoroughly rethought.

I will give you a simple example. I know this is true in Georgia; I will let you decide if it is true in Washington. My wife, Marianne, went to spend \$15 last fall. She did not go to a place like Nordstroms because she waited in line an hour and a half. She was not buying Beanie Babies or some fad that justifies that. She was getting her driver's license.

I suggest to you that you have two clocks in your head. You have been acculturated to have these two clocks. One clock has a second hand and you use it every time you go into the private sector facility. When you go to McDonald's, when you go to a department store, when you stand waiting to be served, there is a second hand which you watch prior to getting impatient. The second clock has fifteen-minute increments and you use it when you walk into public buildings. You will inherently wait longer and be less impatient. Now, in both experiences you are paying money. In one case, it is taken from you in taxes and in the other case it is voluntary. You are a customer in both cases. But we have allowed, over the last 50 years, the private sector to modernize, to rethink what it is doing, to maximize its customer orientation, while allowing the public sector to find excuse after excuse to avoid rethinking its development.

Part of what I hope we can do together is think through what a Twentieth Century information age, customer-oriented model of governance would look like? How would you design it? How would you staff it? How would you reward people who were effective, and retrain people who were ineffective? Or dismiss them if they refuse to learn? And how can we think that process through so that people 20 years from now have the same expectation of efficiency, customer orientation and modern performance out of the public sector that they have out of the private sector? And that would lead to a revolution in the structure of our governments.

I think it has to be done together because the truth is, and this is a message I have for every state legislature as well county commissions, school boards and city councils, there are things we do in Washington, D.C. which make it harder for you in Washington state to be effective. One of the things I would encourage you to do is to identify in literally every one of your legislative committees, and report back to us, those things we should change which are stopping you from modernizing the government of the state of Washington. I think I can speak for all three of the members here with me today—for Jennifer Dunn, who is now the highest-ranking elected woman legislator in the U.S. Congress as the vice-chair of our conference; for George Nethercutt, who is doing a tremendous job on the Appropriations Committee; for Linda Smith, who has been working very, very hard on reform issues—I think they would say the whole delegation is prepared to try to serve as a bridge to come back and say to us, "The following 37 laws are pretty dumb. The following 600 regulations do not work. The following micro-management is making it impossible to reform."

I want to extend to you an open door, to say we would like to learn from you, at the grass roots, what you are experiencing that you think makes it harder for you to do the job for the people of the state of Washington.

We have had an impact in the Congress. When we were sworn in in January of 1995, the Congressional Budget Office was projecting a \$320 billion deficit for the year 2002. They are now projecting a \$32 billion surplus. Now you are legislators. I would suggest to you that any legislative body which, in three years, can move a system from a \$320 billion deficit to a \$32 billion surplus has begun a process of fairly dramatic change. Some of that was the economy. But we also saved \$600 billion in entitlements, we passed Welfare Reform which, as you know, has had a dramatic impact. In New York state alone there are 509,000 fewer people on welfare today than there were three years ago. They have moved from the public sector, where they were taking money from the taxpayer, to the private sector where they are paying taxes. It has been a major factor on what has happened with the budget turnaround.

Because we are committed to a balanced budget, we have lowered interest rates by at least two percentage points over what they would have been otherwise. That has had a huge effect on farming, or purchasing cars and buying houses, on paying off student loans, and on all the different things people pay interest on, including what governments pay in interest.

We think we have begun. But we have a lot to do, and a long way to go. I want to propose to you that there are four major goals, lots of things we need to do together. I could talk today about the ICE T bill in transportation, because I know it is an important issue. I could talk about a wide range of issues that matter. But I want to focus on four today. Although, before I do, I do want to commend you for your rainy day fund. I was calculating based on the size of your budget; if we had a comparable rainy day fund, it would be about \$90 billion. I will let you imagine a Washington, D.C. that would allow \$90 billion to sit there without having approximately \$400 billion of new ideas! But I do commend you because it is the right direction and it is the way we should be moving.

I want to suggest four goals to you. First, that we become a society that focuses on being drug-free and, therefore with dramatically less violence. Second, as you are already doing, we really emphasize education and learning. Third, we have now come to a point in our history where we should talk about rethinking retirement. And fourth, that we ought to talk openly about what is the total amount of taxes the citizens should owe their government in a peacetime environment. Let me briefly talk about each. Let me be candid and say these will only work in collaboration. They will only work if we work together.

I think the number one goal we should establish is to break the back of the drug trade and the back of the drug culture. To insist that our children deserve to live in a drug-free society where they are not threatened with addiction and where they are not threatened physically. I believe, as a historian, we can do it. We have done it before. We did it in the 1920's. Other countries have done it. It is a matter of willpower, focus, resources and management.

I came today to ask you and your governor to work together to tell us, from the state of Washington, what you need from the federal government as your highest priority to enable you to have a drug-free Washington state. What do we have to do to do our share of the job? And then ask you to do your share of the job and make a genuine commitment.

I will just give you one specific statistic that I find staggering. If you are a woman, you are 27 times more likely to be killed if you are in a home with hard drugs than if you are in a drug-free home. Not 27 percent, but 27 times. That is 2700 percent more likely to be killed. And when we talk about violence in America, I do not think we can talk about the future without realizing how much of that is tied to drugs. We realize that in New York City alone, there are 32 drug-addicted babies born every week. The human and financial cost of not taking on drugs is horrendous.

We are challenging General McCaffrey to produce a World War II-style victory plan. I think we need a decisive, sharp, two- or three-year effort to break the back of the drug culture, to make it too expensive to use drugs. And to recognize that the problem is not in Colombia. The problem is not in Mexico. The problem is in the streets, the neighborhoods and the schools of America, and in the professional sports of America and among some of the rock stars of America. If we are not buying it, they are not going to be shipping it. We have an obligation to start in America to win the war on drugs—to be the model country for everyone else, to not just lecture Mexicans and Colombians on what we wish they would do because we do not have the guts to do it here at home.

If you will let us know, whether by resolution, by report, or by letter, what we need to do to help you win the war in the state of Washington, and if we can get every state legislature engaged and every state government engaged, I truly believe, in three or four years, we will be a drug-free country. And I can imagine nothing, nothing that will do more for children's health than to be able to win the war on drugs and save them from that kind of a future.

Second, I want to pledge to you our commitment to work with you on Education Reform. I want to draw one distinction between education and learning. I think we want the best education system in the world, and I think we want the best system of learning in the world. They are not necessarily the same. Here again, I want to thank Microsoft, where I will be spending part of the afternoon studying. We have an education system that is teach-focused. A learning system is student-focused.

We have the potential in the next decade to build a seven-day-a-week, 24-hour-a-day learning system available for a lifetime, which you can access from anywhere at anytime at your convenience and learn as much as you are capable of learning. We should make it a national goal to really encourage the development of that kind of learning system. To some extent, your Western State Governors' University is a step in the direction, but we are only scratching the surface. We have the potential for everyone to learn, and to do it at their convenience. Now, this is not a panacea. It is not a replacement for an education system. But it is an important enhancer, and it will allow us to leapfrog, not catch up, not match up with, but leapfrog the Japanese, Germans and others in providing the best system of learning in the world, which is essential if we were going to have the best economic competition in the world. Because, if you do not have good learning in the information age, you cannot produce the technology you need in order to have the best jobs in the world. So this is vital to our entire future.

In addition, we need the best education system. I favor scholarships, so that in really bad neighborhoods parents have the right to choose. But this is not going to solve the problem. Most children in America are going to learn in public schools for the rest of their lifetimes. I am a product of public schools.

My wife is a product of public schools. Both of our daughters went to public school. I taught part-time when I was a college teacher. I also taught in the public high school. Most schools do pretty well. But every one of you knows that there are some schools in this state you would not send your children to, just as you know there are some schools in my state that I would not send my children to.

And here is the test for us. We say in our Declaration of Independence that we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We have to take that passionately and apply it to education reform. This means that every child of every ethnic background in every neighborhood has been endowed by God with the right to pursue happiness. In the information age, if you are not learning how to read and write, and you are not getting an education, you are more likely to go to prison than to go to college, and you are not being given the true opportunity to pursue happiness. I think that is how we ought to approach education reform.

We ought to say first of all to a school system, let us start writing into the contract that if your school is in the bottom 20 percent in scoring, the contract does not apply any more, as of that date. Not "Let us slowly modify tenure." Not "Let us have a study commission." You would not leave your children in those schools. We have too many of our friends who are very big passionate supporters of the worst public schools, but their kids go to private school. We have too many teachers who pay the union dues and they want to make sure that we do not reform public schools; but their children go to private school. There are some big city systems where 40 percent of the public school teachers send their children to private school because they know better. We have an obligation to be passionate about this. Winston Churchill had a phrase for World War II. He would pass a note that said, "Action this day." This should be our attitude across the board to the system.

I want to suggest three reforms that are very specific. Two of them we are not going to do at the federal level, one we have to. But I am here as a citizen sharing ideas; I am not here to say we are going mandate any.

I do want to suggest as a general principle that we should have a passionate, deep commitment to every child in American learning how to read by end of the fourth grade. We should focus overwhelmingly on learning how to read and write in the fourth grade. I am going to be very direct: we should learn how to read and write in English, because that is the commercial language of the United States, and they are having their future crippled if they cannot read and write by the fourth grade.

Second, I think that the federal government should modify the bilingual education law to make it local option. You at the state level and the school boards at the local level should have the right to decide for your children what is the most effective way to make sure that they are capable of reading and writing in English at the earliest possible time.

And third, I would really like to suggest you consider, and I say this upon the state with some trepidation, but I would like you to consider mandating that, once a year, at every grade level, a day be spent looking at the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. I say this for two reasons. First, as a historian, I actually think it is kind of good for Americans to learn how they became American. We are multi-ethnic, but we are one civilization. We are bound together by this thing of being American. We

signed a contract with ourselves. We the people of the United States, we issued a declaration that says "we hold these truths to be self-evident." And if our citizens do not grow up learning these things, how can we expect America to continue?

But secondly, the Declaration says, "We are endowed by our Creator . . ." Now, I want to see the ACLU lawsuit that explains why the teacher cannot explain what the Founding Fathers meant when they used the word "Creator". I think it would be a very edifying moment in American history.

America is radically different than Europe. In the European model, power went from God to the king and was loaned to the citizens. This is why Brussels is worse than the IRS. In the European model, the citizen only has those rights loaned to them by the state. In the American model, from our opening date of our first document, we said power goes from God to the citizen, and you loan it back to the government. It is a very different model. And I just think if we spent one day a year from the first grade to twelfth grade studying that model, coming into contact with the great people who created this country, we would be a healthier country. We would be a country with a better sense of where our rights come from. We would be a country with a more serious sense of why being a citizen matters. And so I want to commend that to you.

Our third goal is to look at retirement. A lot of that is federal. But I also have a proposal that I think you will find interesting at the state level. And this is very simple. We are moving from 60 years of deficit spending. We were about to move to a generation of surpluses. This is not like 1969, the last surplus. We had lots of deficits, one year of surplus, and then lots of deficits. If we were disciplined in Washington, and if we avoid war, we will be in a position to have twenty or thirty years of surpluses.

This gives us for the first time a chance to talk seriously about retirement, to recognize that Social Security is a very powerful and tremendous system developed in 1925 when there were no computers. But Social Security is neither personal nor modern. In fact, in one study that Congressman Mark Sanford of South Carolina put out, he looked at his 20-year-old son. He said "You know, Einstein was asked, 'What is the most powerful thing in the universe?' And he said, 'Compound interest.'" If you simply take the FICA tax a 20-year-old will pay today and invest their FICA tax over their lifetime, in an average market basket investment, not buying Microsoft when it is young, but an average market basket investment, they will make \$975,000 for their retirement. If you give them the current government payment, they will make \$175,000. So, we are condemning 20-year-olds to lose \$800,000 by the way we have designed the system.

I am proposing a National Commission on Retirement, made up of one-third baby boomers, one-third older than baby boomers, and one-third younger than baby boomers. I suggest to my colleagues in the House and Senate that they set up a citizens committee in their district tied in by the Internet to the National Commission. I think we ought to look at the totality, because I believe that by using a good part of the surpluses intelligently, we can make the transition to a personal, modern social security system, tied into the development of better pensions and tied into the development of better savings. And we can leave our children and grandchildren a dramatically better retirement in a much wealthier country with a much higher savings rate with much lower interest rates and much more capital investment. And that is a much healthier America in the future.

And I know it takes some courage for elected officials to raise the issue, but I just think we are at a magic moment of transition. I believe the grandparents, as long as they are secure in getting the current system, will want their grandchildren to have the best possible future. And I believe we can have an honest, adult, dialogue about this without the kind of mudslinging and the kind of 30-second commercials that so badly weaken our political structures. So, I encourage you to look at it, to offer us advice, but I also encourage you to look at the state program. I do not know the details of your program, but I will tell you that Michigan has now adopted a new, personal pension system that vests within two years, where the new employees are controlling their own money in a way that is a very dramatic departure from the way we have done pensions in the last 60 years.

Finally, I want to ask a very touchy question, and you are the first group of legislators I have done this with. So I will be very curious to see your reaction after I leave and you no longer have to be polite because I am around. I want to raise a serious question: In peacetime, in a free society, how much should your government be allowed to take from you?

I was fascinated when I read Paul Johnson's new History of the American People. He is a former socialist in Britain turned conservative and he has written a wonderful history of the American people. And he said that in 1775, we were probably the lowest-taxed people in the history of the world and we hated every penny. And he said we were so grateful that we were so low-taxed as to say, "How come you need this?" And the part about how much freedom, in part, is a function of how much time you have. How much money do you have? Not how much does your government have to give to you. How much do you have? And it turns out that when you study it that the American people said for forty years that they believe, in peacetime, the most their government should take from them is 25 percent. We currently—federal, state and local—take 38.

And what I would like to propose is that we set a goal over the next ten to fifteen years to get to 25 percent taxation. The feds currently take about 22 percent. I propose we go down to 14 percent. So we lose 8 percent. State and local currently takes about 16 percent, I propose state and local goes down to about 11 percent. So we will drop by more than you will have to drop. But, I think it is fair for you to come back to us and say, "Fine, how about block-granting education money rather than having 700 little programs? How about dropping this kind of red tape?" I think it is a two-way dialogue.

But, if we take Demming and Drucker; if we are prepared to prioritize, modernize, downsize and privatize, we can create, over the next ten to fifteen years, a country where people have more take-home pay, a better retirement system, a lifetime learning system, and an education system that either works or is changed rapidly when it starts to fail. People will be competitive in the world market, having the highest technology and the greatest entrepreneurship to produce the best goods, giving us the highest incomes with the greatest economic security and the capacity to lead the world.

Yes, this is big. Yes, it is a lot. But, frankly, the Contract With America was pretty different when we started and I am very proud that at the key moment in the fall of 1994, we bought a two-page ad in TV Guide that did not attack anybody, did not have any pictures. It just said, "You hire us and we will try to do these ten things." And I think the time has come as citizens, across the board in both parties, to talk about for

the next generation, "What are the goals worth doing? Let us work together to do it."

I accept fully the responsibility today that I have come here and said, you come up with ideas on the drug war; we have to listen to you and at least try to help. You come up with what we need to do to get out of your way in education; we have an obligation to listen and try to help. You tell us what we are doing wrong about pensions that make your job harder, let us know. And you tell us how you think we should change federal pension law. It would be very helpful and we would listen to you.

And finally, if we are going to get there together, we have an obligation both to shrink the federal government and to shrink the burden the federal government imposes on you. But, I think for our citizens, the America I just described would be a vastly better place.

And let me just close with this thought. Every time I come out here, I have to tell you, I just love coming to this state. I think part of it relates to the fact that I was here—some of you will be able to identify this—a few years ago on a stopover and went down to the fish market and bought a geoduck and took it to my mother-in-law, who promptly chopped it up and made stew out of it. I have to say, also, that I just brought back a very wonderful salmon that they identified with much more immediately and ate immediately.

But, it is a fabulous state. You sort of have this sense, I always have this sense, when I come here what Lewis and Clark must have felt. As an easterner, when I fly in and look out at Mt. Rainier, when I look at Puget Sound, when I see the weather, even on rare days like yesterday—again, for a Georgian, it was very exciting—I think we lose, sometimes, the romanticism of what this country is about. This country is a romance. This country has the most magical way of saying to the whole planet, "I do not care what your background is, I do not care what your religion is, I do not care what your ethnicity is. If you have a big enough dream and you are willing to pursue it, come to America and try it out." And the result has been to put together the most exciting opportunities for people in the history of the world.

This is a great country filled with good people and given a chance to achieve remarkable things. I believe we can work together in a partnership—not us dictating to you—but in a partnership. And we can give our children and grandchildren an even greater America with an even greater future. And through that, we can give the entire human race an opportunity to live in freedom and prosperity and safety.

Thank you for honoring me by allowing me to come here today. Thank you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1998

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, on February 11 and 12, 1998, I was granted a leave of absence and according missed Roll Call votes number 12 through 17. Had I been present I would have voted No on Roll Call number 12, and Yes on Roll Call number 13, Yes on Roll Call number 14, Yes on Roll Call number 15, Yes on Roll Call number 16, and No on Roll call number 17.

HONORING THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN HISPANIC CHURCH

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1998

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to recognize the First Presbyterian Hispanic Church.

The Cuban patriot Jose Marti once said: "We need temples of love and humanity that free everything that is generous in man." Marti's vision was one shared by Reverend Ernesto Sosa, a constituent of my congressional district. Reverend Sosa, along with a group of dedicated leaders, founded the Primera Iglesia Hispana Prebysteriana, the First Presbyterian Hispanic Church on March 2, 1958, in Miami, Florida. This group of dedicated community leaders who for many years had fought for freedom and democracy in Cuba, returned to there in the hopes of establishing the church in their homeland. Their dreams were shattered, however, when the Castro dictatorship set itself on a course of religious oppression and persecution.

The group returned to this great country where individual freedoms are not only valued but protected and when they would be free to complete their generous and noble task. The church began by establishing a center to assist new refugees, a place where regardless of race or creed, people were offered food, clothing and medicine. A year after the establishment of the center, a clinic and nursery were developed to provide additional services to the community. The center not only offered resources to the public, but spiritual guidance at a time when many of these families were suffering through the difficulty of being separated from their loved ones and adjusting to life in their new country.

The Iglesia Prebysteriana Hispana de Miami eventually built a new temple to accommodate their growing congregation. The current pastor, Reverend Mardoqueo Munoz-Castillo, continues to lead the congregation in weekly Sunday masses. Today, after celebrating the fortieth anniversary of their founding, the church provides a variety of support resources to the public and, as always, important spiritual guidance.

NATIONAL MIDDLE SCHOOL MONTH

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1998

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to stand before this great legislative body during Education Week to acknowledge the positive educational initiatives that are taking place in the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts.

This month is National Middle Level Education Month, and I would like to take this opportunity to commend Mary E. Wells Junior High School in Southbridge, Massachusetts for the strides they are making in promoting academic excellence to all of their students. Mary E. Wells Junior High School, under the