

the ministry took him to higher education at both Princeton Theological Seminary and the Free University in Berlin. During the height of the cold war, Dr. Jung served as an adjunct chaplain and administered to the spiritual needs of our men and women in uniform in the divided city of Berlin and frontline between East and West. In addition, Dr. Jung worked as a senior pastor at several German churches where he was also founder of the first Special Olympics for the mentally impaired.

I am also pleased to welcome Dr. Jung's wife Ruth, who has been at his side in marriage for 43 years. They have three grown children, one of whom is David, who works on our Committee on International Relations and does some outstanding work for us.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will take the opportunity to meet this distinguished American citizen, and I would like to thank him for taking the time to be here today.

REGULATION OF POLITICAL EXPRESSION

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a hearing will be conducted that will be eerily reminiscent of the era of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Committee on Government Reform will hold hearings on a proposal that would, believe it or not, regulate political expression in this country, the so-called McIntosh-Istook-Ehrlich proposal.

If anybody has any doubt that this is a calculated effort to intimidate many groups and individuals from full participation in American political life, then imagine the chilling effect of receiving the following demand for information from the chairman of a congressional committee: "In the past five years, has your organization engaged in political advocacy as defined in the attached legislation? If so, provide a description of the type of advocacy and an estimate of the expenditures on each such activity."

The idea that any Member of this House would dare—would dare—to call on free citizens of this Nation to account for their constitutionally protected activities should offend every one of us. It constitutes an outrageous abuse of authority.

SPENDING TAXPAYER MONEY ON PAC CONTRIBUTIONS

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I could not sit back and listen to the previous speaker without responding to the American taxpayers. There are 40,000 organizations that receive over \$39 bil-

lion in taxpayer funded grants and so forth, and they are not subject to public disclosure or records of where the money went.

One group received 97 percent of its budget from the Federal Government and turned around and gave \$405,000 to congressional candidates through their PAC. I do not think that is what the taxpayers want. There are plenty of good organizations who will continue to get funding and will continue to have political input. What we want to do is stop the abuse of taxpayer moneys for political purposes.

I have cosponsored an amendment to this bill that says that if you spend less than \$25,000 a year on political activities, you are exempt from it. There is also a provision in the bill that exempts you if 5 percent or less of your money is spent on it.

This is not going after the small groups. This is going after the big political business groups. I urge my colleagues to support the Istook-McIntosh amendment.

HERSHEY FOODS MOVING CANDY PRODUCTION TO MEXICO

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, from Mars to the Milky Way, all of America has experienced the Kiss, the Hershey Kiss. Now, after the State of Pennsylvania gave them tax breaks, now, after workers gave them concessions, Hershey is moving its factory that makes the Kiss to Mexico; from Mars to Milky Way to Mexico. Tell me, Mr. Speaker, will the Hershey Kiss become known throughout America as the Tijuana Kiss?

Take it from an old Pitt quarterback who is kissed off. We have let NAFTA and GATT take our jobs. Where are our constituents going to work? In McDonalds and Wal-Marts? My God, when Hershey of America becomes Hershey of Mexico, we had better reconsider our economic policies in America.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of these Kisses.

MEDICARE, THE GOP'S WELL-MEANING RESCUE SQUAD

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, that is a tough act to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read this morning from an editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Star Tribune. Anyone who is from the Upper Midwest would never say that the Minneapolis Star Tribune is a Republican propaganda organ. But I would like to read what they had to say last Sunday in an editorial entitled "Medicare, the GOP's Well-Meaning Rescue Squad."

Supporting the elderly already swallows up one-third of the Federal budget. Unless shifts

are made soon, baby boomers will face a grim and threadbare old age.

There's no mystery to all this, of course. President Clinton knows that Medicare is going under, and so do the Democrats in Congress. You'd think the witness to such a calamity might be moved to join the rescue team—or at least yell helpful comments. No such luck. Uninclined to get their feet wet, the Democrats seem content to play on the vulnerability of the 37 million Americans holding on to the Medicare lifeline. Their chief contribution to the discussion is the accusation that Republicans are trying to "wreck Medicare."

Surely the Democrats have more to contribute than potshots like that.

The looming dangers for Medicare should revive the reform effort and spur earnest attempts at compromise. Instead of sniping from the safety of the shore, the Democrats should wade in and help with the rescue.

OPPOSING CUTS IN MEDICARE

(Mr. HILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed cuts in the Medicare Program by the Republicans. I am incensed that after months of talking on this issue, the Republicans are still hell-bent on making cuts in Medicare, so that they can give their rich supporters a tax break and balance the budget at the expense of senior citizens.

To ask one segment of our society to suffer unnecessary pain so that the wealthy can receive an undeserved gain is just wrong. It is un-American. It is unfair.

The elderly must not be perceived as an unnecessary drain on this country's economic resources. Let us not forget that Americans who are now 60 years of age contributed to the largest economic boom in the history of this country. In short, they have paid their dues.

Mr. Speaker, please do not break the backs of our senior citizens by doing away with Medicare as we know it today, merely to give your rich supporters a tax break. The elderly deserve compassion, not vengeance. Leave Medicare alone.

REPEAL DAVIS-BACON ACT

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, today, the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee will mark up its reconciliation package—that includes the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Budget Committee has already acted on this, and included it in the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution.

Davis-Bacon needs to be repealed not only for budgetary reasons—but for commonsense reasons.

This law serves no practical purpose in today's world.

This law has been protected for many years because it takes Federal taxpayer money and puts it in the pocket of a small, but powerful interest in the form of a wage subsidy.

The repeal of Davis-Bacon will open up the Federal construction market to fair and open competition and will eliminate the current monopoly on Federal jobs held by a few large companies.

It will open up more construction jobs to semiskilled workers who wish to break into the construction field but are now prevented from doing so.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is the repeal of Davis-Bacon will give all American taxpayers a break on Federal construction costs.

The Budget Committee has acted on this mandate. It is time for the rest of Congress to do the same.

THE GINGRICH STANDARD

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, both Common Cause and I insist that "in order to carry out the responsibilities of an outside counsel effectively, it is necessary for the counsel's authority and independence to be clearly and publicly established." The special counsel must have the "authority and independence necessary to conduct the inquiry in an effective and credible manner." The House of Representatives, as well as the American public, deserve an investigation which will uncover the truth. At this moment, I am afraid that the apparent restrictions placed on this special counsel will not allow the truth to be uncovered. "The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House. Clearly, this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity." Prophetic words, indeed, Mr. Speaker.

These are the words of the current Speaker of the House in 1988 referring to the investigation of a former Speaker of this House. This House cannot and must not tolerate a double standard. The Ethics Committee must follow the standard set by Speaker GINGRICH.

We need an outside counsel to investigate Speaker GINGRICH and we must not restrict the scope of that counsel's investigation.

□ 1015

MEDICARE GOING BROKE

(Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is going broke. The trustees tell us that in 7 years, Medicare funds will be completely depleted. This fact cannot be disputed.

Some 61 percent of the American people want us to do something about this, now. So why is it, how is it, that liberals fail to understand the urgency of this issue? The citizens are sick of Congressmen playing politics with vital programs such as Medicare. But still the Democrats engage in blatant demagoguery, or medagoguery as the Washington Post calls it.

Contrary to the liberal distortions, the Republican plan increases spending per beneficiary from \$4,800 to \$6,700. It gives seniors real choices in health care management by providing for medical savings accounts. But the liberals do not want the people to know that.

It is time to stop the half-truths, the fibs, and the fabrications. It is time to stop the scare tactics and demagoguery. It is time for honest debate to take place. It is time to save Medicare.

NEW JERSEY STATE LEGISLATORS SEEK TO SHIELD MEDICARE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to report how more and more conservative Republicans at the Jersey shore, which I represent, are coming out against Speaker GINGRICH's Medicare cuts. If I could read from the Asbury Park Press in my district yesterday: State Senator Leonard T. Connors and Assemblyman Jeffrey W. Moran and Christopher Connors, all Republicans from Ocean County have written to BOB DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH to ask them to back off on the proposed cuts because of the impact they could have on senior citizens, and I quote: "Americans want Congress to cut the pork, but balancing the staggering Federal deficit or financing tax breaks for the rich on the backs of our elderly is morally bankrupt," the lawmakers stated in their letter.

Mr. Speaker, they also said, "Jack-ing up Medicare part B coverage from \$552 annually to \$1,100 under your announced plan is signing a death warrant for millions of senior citizens across America. To save electricity, the seniors live in darkness. Their diet is poor. They scrimp and save for goods and services middle-class Americans often take for granted. A \$564 increase in their Medicare premium is a stake in the heart," the Republican legislators wrote.

DEMOCRATS THREATEN VIABILITY OF THE PROGRAM THEY CREATED

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote another publication this morning. This is the Washington Post, and this is written by our former colleague, who was with us last year, Mr.

Tim Penny, former Democratic Representative from the State of Minnesota, and he says:

Medicare has been a success, helping to provide health care to millions of Americans who otherwise could not afford it. Yet today, with Medicare facing a financial crisis, Democrats are playing politics instead of coming up with constructive solutions. As the architects of Medicare, we have a responsibility to shore up the program before it collapses.

He goes on to say that:

Members of both parties should work together on this important issue, just as Republicans joined Democrats in voting for Medicare in 1965. Unfortunately, Democratic leaders in Congress have decided otherwise, choosing to attack Republican Medicare plans rather than offering an alternative. By politicizing the issue, Democrats are threatening the viability of the very program they created.

Mr. Speaker, this is from former Representative, Democrat, Tim Penny of Minnesota.

What I would say, on top of that, is that not only is it bad policy what is being done here in terms of the Democrats attack, it is also bad politics. It is not going to work.

PRESERVE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday eight Democrats remained steadfast listening to the hogwash in the Ways and Means so-called Medicare hearings. I regret to say that as the hearings ended there was a paltry three Republicans remaining expressing how little sincere interest they have in this so-called document that preserves Medicare.

Today I have just heard from my Republican colleague, the prior speaker, saying that Republicans joined Democrats in the 1960's to put Medicare forward. Let me tell Members that my historians tell me there was not one single Republican vote that helped past Medicare legislation, but yet there are today a whole bunch of votes to undermine it by cutting \$270 billion from Medicare in order to put the blame on our senior citizens.

What is in this so-called Medicare preservation package sponsored by Republicans. Well, I will tell Members, it is to dispossess and put out senior citizens, who need long-term care in nursing homes. It is the blame game on doctors and hospitals in rural and urban communities. It is high premiums for senior citizens who have to make choices between frequent prescription drugs and the ability to keep the lights on and the doors open in their residences.

Do we want to save Medicare, Mr. Speaker? I do and I am ready to discuss with my Republican colleagues any time they want to the elimination of \$270 billion in draconian Medicare cuts.