

and in turn increase productivity. It requires the Drug Czar's office to tell us how to streamline the effort which is so important. We now have 54 agencies and departments involved in drug prevention in our Federal Government. We have got to do better and we can and we are requiring under this legislation that they do that.

The revolving door with violent crime and drugs has got to be stopped. We have got to get prevention into our prisons, into our jails. This legislation does this on a model basis, the first time this Congress has really taken a step in that regard. Finally, it doubles the funding for the Drug Free Communities Act, something this Congress passed. We are now stepping up to the plate and saying again we have got to get parents involved, school administrators involved, we have got to get the business community involved, religious leaders involved, everybody at the community level.

□ 1845

And we are saying we are not going to solve this problem here in Washington, it is a community problem, it has got to be solved at that level. But I want to thank the gentleman for letting me talk a little about the demand side and say that I am very excited, it is not the end of the road, we have got a lot more to do, but this is a darn good start to reducing the demand for drugs in this country.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, I yield briefly to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Again, Mr. McCollum, I want to commend you for the parts of the bill that you did pass. I also want to point out that we had an opportunity, since the gentleman from Ohio mentioned demand, to require drug testing for all Federal employees. If I recall, the gentleman from Ohio did not support that.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, I must say that I wanted to see the drug testing, too, but this is a very excellent bill, and we very, very much want to see this bill pass. It will make a big difference in the War on Drugs and make a War on Drugs, and I thank all the supporters.

PAYING FOR IMPROVEMENTS

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us tonight is vastly different than just even 2 days ago. The dollar fights willed the liberal Democrats to spend \$150 billion more above the balanced budget and increase fees and taxes by \$130 billion, is what this whole fight has been about. The hundred thousand teachers that the Democrats debated in support of last week is a totally different bill today. Why? Why are Republicans now supporting it? Be-

cause it is political thing to do? No. Because the President demanded it? No. But because it is paid for, it is paid for. It is paid for out of the other priorities that the President wanted, not out of increased taxes, not out of the surplus, but it is paid for, and that is all the Republicans ever asked for so we can come to the table and agree on that today.

I would ask that the public take a look at what we have funded. Special education has gone from 6 to 12 percent just in the last 2 years. Impact aid for Native Americans and Federal employees, the President totally zeroed that out, and we put in \$250 billion in impact aid. Head Start we increased, student loans we increased by 50 percent, and not a cost to the Federal Government, but because they were done with private firms. Pell grants for poor children we increased. But the President wanted to increase his priorities \$1.1 billion above the balanced budget, and Republicans said no, we want you to pay for it. In the negotiations he had choices. He could pay for it out of the surplus, but he already said he was going to support Social Security with that. He could increase taxes, which he asked to do, \$130 billion to pay for it, and Republicans said absolutely not, no taxes or fees.

School construction. They could have saved 35 percent by waiving Davis-Bacon just for school construction, billions of dollars. And would they do that and support children? No, they choose to support their union bosses. They could pay for it out of the balanced budget and pay for it, which they refused to do. But tonight the President has agreed to pay for it, and now Republicans support it.

Why else? Because there is local control, not federal control that the Democrats wanted. There are local regulations, not Federal regulations, in the bill. There is no Federal paperwork. It is based on the local level. The elementary schools can hire special education credential teachers, not just regularly credentialed teachers, and that is a big difference. But that is based on the local decisions and their needs, not some bureaucrat here in Washington, D.C. So we support that.

And there is no national testing. It is arrived by both State and local. So this is a win-win. A hundred thousand teachers; who is going to be against improving education? My Democrat liberal colleagues say, well, the Republicans do not want to improve education. That is a joke. They had 40 years of control of this House, we are fifteenth of industrialized nations in math and science, fifteenth, and almost last in literacy, and we are trying to make a change. We are trying to send the dollars down to the local classroom.

I had a hearing when I was chairman of K through 12 education. I had eight different witnesses, some half Democrat, half Republican; did not limit it as a chairman. In those districts every-

one thought they had the greatest program, and I asked them at the end, I said how many of you, any of you, have the other 7? And they said none. And I said that is our entire Republican issue by giving you a block grant and not mandating that you have all 8 programs in your district, but you take the money and make the thing work, the program that works in your district because Wisconsin may be a lot different than New York or San Diego. And I want to tell you Atlanta is a lot different after the Padres beat them this week.

But I want to tell you the whole Republican agenda is local control where parents and teachers, administrators and the community can make those decisions, and to have the bills paid for not out of increasing the balanced budget, but by paying for it, the President has agreed to do that. Totally different than my colleagues debated just a couple of days ago, and now they say Republicans now support our agenda. We always supported 100,000 teachers. It was how you paid for it. The President has agreed to do that with no federal control, local control, and we support it a hundred percent.

COMPROMISES

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

Mr. SOUDER. For those of us who grew up in the late 1960s and early 1970s in the conservative movement, Ronald Reagan was our hero along with Barry Goldwater and William Buckley and a few others, and I actually was one of these conservative right wingers who came to Congress who was inspired originally by Ronald Reagan's speech for Barry Goldwater when I was merely 14 years old and formed one of the earliest high school YAF chapters and Americans for Freedom chapters the country, and, as you look at what we are about to face, this is what Ronald Reagan faced for 8 years.

I am not going to stand up here and say that I like this budget agreement any more than Ronald Reagan, as President, liked the budget agreements he was given in 8 years in Congress. Yet he signed those budget agreements. The first year he got tax cuts, the other years he did not even get tax cuts. He got increased defense spending because he knew Congress wanted to spend more, and did we.

One of the questions conservatives have to ask themselves as they vote on this budget is why are they so much better than Ronald Reagan, who they admire, if they vote "no" on this budget? Compromise is an unfortunate part of the political process. There are going to be many things in this bill that I am appalled by. I cannot believe that Members of Congress continue to take advantage of the legislative process when we are all under tremendous pressure to get special things for their

friends and their district that might not be able to withstand scrutiny. I am very disappointed we do not have tax cuts in this bill.

I cannot believe that we cannot even get an effective limitation on taxpayers' dollars being used to fund referendums overseas to overturn laws that are protecting innocent children from being aborted. American tax dollars are being used to fund pro-abortion referendums around this world. We have it tied to funding for the U.N. and for State Department reauthorization, but that to me seems like a no-brainer. But as long as we have the President we currently have in the White House, that becomes a very difficult victory.

So I am not going to stand up here and say I like everything in this bill, but there are some things that in fact are important changes, and that is the art of compromise, and the President did give some ground, the Democrats in the House and Senate gave some ground, and we had to give some ground.

In the education area in fact we made a lot of progress. The President will stand up and say he got 100,000 teachers or 40,000 teachers or whatever, but the fact is it moved back to the state level. We gave flexibility, and as the chairman of the Education Committee, Mr. GOODLING, keeps pointing out, that in fact is what we were driving towards. We also have a ban on national testing so kids around this country are not slammed in under one major test.

We have level funding on the National Endowment for the Arts, number of other things they worked with in the Education Committee.

In addition to that, there are many of us who are very concerned that we have not developed an adequate missile defense in this country, and since we knew we were going to spend more on domestic issues, we wanted to make sure that the preparedness and the readiness of our Armed Forces, that the development of our missile defense systems, were going to be funded as well as the social spending.

I am very concerned in this country about the expansion of pornography along with the expansion of Internet. We all know that whenever we have an expansion of technology, whether it be television, or whether it be computers, that that opens up things to our children and our families that we hoped would be, they could be protected from. Yet these advantages of technology have been wonderful for our country, but we need to the best we can, limit the pornography and the perversion from getting into our homes and making sure that minors do not have access to that. That was one of the last points negotiated in this bill. It is something that Dr. James Dobson in Focus on the Family has battled for for a decade, working on the Pornography Commission. We finally have a victory in the area of Internet porn.

We have a number of extensions on tax extenders for self-employed busi-

nesses and for farmers that were very critical to many small businesses in my district and throughout the country. We have a whole range of what would be termed more minor issues relating to gun registries, relating to language on certain bills where in fact conservatives won, and that is how this process works.

One last comment:

Anybody who says that they are going to put aside money for Social Security, this is one more proof the only thing that government can do is either spend it or give it back to you. We have once again seen the fraud of using senior citizens as a shield to cover real motives. In fact, we are spending 19 to 20 billion extra dollars, much of that will be in the baseline and be spent for future years, too. We have basically spent a big chunk, if not the majority, of the so-called surplus, and it did not go to seniors. That started when the President came up here with the State of the Union address, said I want everything put to Social Security, and then detailed for 20 pages new programs to spend that. Today we are seeing that come through. I am disappointed in that, but in the end this is a bill worth moving.

THE OMNIBUS SCORECARD—WINS AND LOSSES

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

Mr. SESSION. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise with my colleagues. We have been at work in Washington now for an extra week. Many of us did not go home as we normally do. I have gone home every weekend for the last 2 years. But it was important for us to be here. It was important for us to be here because we are working on the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, just several weeks ago I addressed schools all over the Fifth District of Texas during a very important time, the 211th birthday of the Constitution of the United States, and at the time I addressed these students I talked about that our country was engaged in an experiment. The experiment is that of constitutional government. And this experiment will only last as long as people have faith and confidence not only in the Congress and the constitutional guarantees which are contained in the Constitution, but also in the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, we have been working this week extra, what I would call overtime away from our families, away from our districts because we deeply believe in what we are doing. We, too, are engaged in an experiment.

Tonight I would like to speak for just a few minutes about the importance of this extra week, the importance of doing work that is important for people who are not here in Washington but are back home. Some of those people are people who live in the country.

Some of those people are people who are God-fearing people who care deeply about what we do here. The work that we have done, we need to let them know what that is, and I would like to spend just a few minutes in enumerating some of those better qualities of what this experiment is all about.

What we are going to do is to pass an omnibus bill tomorrow when we have an opportunity to vote on it, and what it is going to do is it is going to bring about tax relief for financially strapped farmers and ranchers, and what we are going to include is income averaging and also an AMT deferment. We are also going to have tax relief for farmers and self-employed people in vigils, and what we are going to do is to bring back in time from the year 2007 to the year 2003 whereby self-employed people will be able to deduct 100 percent of their insurance premiums.

You have heard earlier this evening us talk about the plan for education. I will tell you as a parent of a 4½-year-old Down's syndrome little boy, Alexander Sessions, I am pleased and proud of what my Republican colleagues and the deal that they have cut with the President of the United States because I knew when I came here that Washington, Washington required school districts to give education and opportunities in the classroom for Down's Syndrome and other disabled children, but Washington did not fund that, and it made it very difficult for school districts to comply. I am proud to say that now Washington is going to give these school districts the opportunity to fund these programs. It makes a difference for my family and myself. It makes a difference for hundreds of thousands of other parents who have loving children who need the opportunity to be in those mainstream educational systems and to have teachers who do not go back and forth but are dedicated directly to them.

I am proud of that also. I am also proud of one part of this bill which I brought to Congress as a promise to the people of the Fifth District of Texas, that I would attempt to pass, and that is a bill that became known as the Speed Trafficking Life Imprisonment Act of 1998. It used to be the Speed Trafficking Life Imprisonment Act of 1997. It could not be done last year but it fit this year, and here is what it does. It says very plainly that those people, those drug thugs, that are involved in the manufacture and distribution of methamphetamines will now face the same penalties as those who are involved in manufacturing and distributing crack cocaine and heroin.

It is about time where we in this country recognize that the children of this country need to be protected. It is time for drug thugs to spend their time behind bars. I will vote aye.

RELIEF FOR AMERICAN FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr.