MORE OVERSIGHT OF IRS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I agree 1,000 percent with the former speaker, the gentleman from eastern Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] and share in that message. Where the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] says that Congress cannot control the policy within Mexico, nor for that matter any other foreign government, I wholeheartedly agree.

But what bothers me today is Congress can control the policy of the United States of America and that is why we were in fact elected. We were not elected as a Member of the British Parliament or the Israeli Knesset or the Japanese Diet. We are in fact Members of Congress.

An issue I want to talk about today is a bill that I have sponsored, H.R. 390, that is a very straightforward bill that deals with the IRS, I believe an agency of our Federal Government that the U.S. Congress has not only failed to control but has allowed to proceed without oversight in establishing not only policy which is clearly within the province of the United States of America, but rules and regulations that in fact impound and impact upon that policy and everybody seems to just be silent. Nobody wants the IRS on your back.

I am not going to go into the whole litany of Watergate, but if there was a real downside to Watergate, it was not that snooping. That happens all the time. The Nixon people happened to get caught. What bothered me, though, is reading the White House transcripts on the targeting of enemies of the White House, where the President is quoted in White House transcripts as saying, ''That Congressman is on my back and I've had it. You get the FBI and you get the IRS out there and you get this guy out of the way.''

We know that that goes on. We believe that it is relatively small. Most IRS agents are regular Americans like we are and they try and do a good job.

But there is a fundamental problem here. In their zeal, there are some overzealous agents. There have been Americans that have been ripped off and Congress continues to be silent.

The Traficant bill is right to the point. In certain civil proceedings, the only agency of the Federal Government that can waive the Constitution and its Bill of Rights is the Internal Revenue Service, because in certain civil proceedings in courts of law, the burden of proof is on the taxpayer to prove they are not guilty and they are in fact innocent. That is unheard of. How did this thing evolve?

Just on a matter of fairness, if there were not cases that speak to this dilemma that we face, how could this have evolved, Congress?

□ 0950

Where are rules and regulations being promulgated behind closed doors by bureaucrats without congressional oversight able to basically change the basic tenet of our Constitution?

I want to give my colleagues one example, David and Millie Evans of Colorado. IRS said you owe us $40,000. We are going to lien your property unless you pay. David and Millie Evans said we do not believe we owe that money. About a month later the IRS called back and said we made a mistake; it is $100,000.

The Evanses got together at the IRS, they came to a settlement agreement, $22,000, and the Evanses wrote the check for $22,000. Another group in the IRS said we did not receive the check. It is a moot point. We want the $100,000.

The case went to court. They lost their business, their home was liened. They spent a ton of money on attorneys, and finally a court said the Evanses are in fact innocent.

The IRS appealed the case by saying the judge wrongfully instructed the jury. He told the jury that the burden of proof in this case was on the IRS to prove their case, but under this proceeding the burden of proof is not. The IRS said the burden of proof is on the Evanses and the case should be overturned and vacated, and it was.

The Traficant bill was not getting looked at too much because most Members want to say, ''I can't believe the IRS has that power; come on now.''

That was a court case. We have documented cases of suicide, we have documented cases of Americans that are simple told, ''Prove it.''

I think it is very simple, ladies and gentlemen, if the IRS has a case, and IRS has money coming, taxpayers of America want the Internal Revenue Service to collect that money. But I think we have created an agency that is a little bit out of control and too much for those people, including Red Skelton, who said we have a gestapo unit in Washington known as the Internal Revenue Service. I think Red Skelton an awful long time ago was trying to tell Congress about something that was building in our country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, average Americans are frustrated with our Government. Many cannot articulate it, but one thing they know for sure, they know that the Internal Revenue Service has gone beyond the control of Congress. I hear many Members that say, ''Look, Jim, I don't want to get involved in that case.''

Well, your taxpayers are. Congress should be.

VOTING ON THE ISSUES AMERICANS DEMAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is an exciting time in America's history. The Congress has been moving quickly on the contract. It has been interesting, as just a regular person out in the world until this point, I have always had the perception that Congress talked and did not do.

We have watched this Congress step up and make major congressional reforms from its very first day. And just last week we did what voters have been asking for as long as I can remember any political debate. We passed a balanced budget amendment. And we required that Government operate in the Black for the first time by 2002.

We have to have a balanced budget. This was a major part of the commitment that we made to the people in the contract. Again, we took another step to keep our commitments, something that seemed to be again to me as an outsider looking in something Congress did not do in the past that was on Thursday.

On Friday we took a much-needed second step. I, along with other freshmen and leadership, announced plans to introduce a second constitutional amendment, one that would restrict Congress' ability to raise taxes. This is what the Barton amendment would have done if it had passed last week. Unfortunately, not enough lawmakers would vote for it.

Seven percent of the Republicans voted for it. It needed a supermajority vote, and only 16 percent of the Democrats would vote for it.

I want to tell my colleagues I do not think what the people want has changed just because we refused to do it last week. The American public wants a balanced budget amendment. They also want the peace of mind that Congress is not going to pass a balanced budget on the backs of the taxpayers, reaching into their back pocket again for all of the wonderful things that we think should be done for them.

They want us to make the tough fiscal decisions, clean house, get rid of inefficiencies, downsize, and yes, even the unspeakable, get rid of some of the agencies that are just bureaucracy.

For that, we are going to have this amendment up for a vote next April 15, and I think by then the American public can make sure that that happens, if constituents put pressure on their legislators.

THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP AND NEWTSPEAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, we obviously have entered the world of ''Newtspeak.'' Unlike some of my colleagues, I do not have lapses in how to pronounce important messages.

But the Speaker of the House has decided to drag the Medicare system into the world of Newtspeak and is suggesting a program that would rethink Medicare from the ground up.

If I were going to cut $200 billion out of Medicare I would have to rethink it from the ground up too because I would have destroyed it, and that is exactly what the Speaker suggested in a speech over the weekend. He said that Medicare is the opposite of how America works. And I suspect that is true, if you are a Republican American.

America does not work by having Golden Rule Insurance Co., be 1 of the 10 largest donors to GOPAC and then have the whole structure of the American Congress in its first 100 days deciding to revise the Medicare system for the convenience of certain insurance companies.

I would like to bring the discussion of Medicare back to earth because it is the finest system in the United States. It has less than a 3-percent overhead.

And the Speaker, in his speech, suggested we ought to give American seniors more choice. There is no program in the United States that gives its beneficiaries more choice than Medicare. If you are Medicare beneficiary you can go to any physician or any hospital in the United States if you can walk, ride, hitchhike, or have the bus fare to get there.

And there are hundreds of managed care plans which are available to Medicare beneficiaries. As we speak today there are three or four dozen applications for new Medicare managed care programs to be opened to seniors. There is no insurance policy in the country that gives greater choice.

Why are we discussing at this point the idea of turning Medicare into a voucher program? I submit it is political payback time, and it is a way to finance 200 or 300 billion dollars' worth of the cuts.

The first hearing we had in the Committee on Ways and Means was a proposal on the first day of Congress to take $70 billion out of the Medicare Trust Fund. For what purpose? To finance tax cuts for the very 2 or 3 percent of the richest Americans in our country.

This is Newtspeak. This is not how America operates, giving money to the rich, and taking it out of the trust fund that supports a medical care delivery system for the most fragile, needy people in the United States.

Ladies and gentleman, Medicare is one of the wonders of our Government. Maybe many things do not work well and maybe many things are not efficient, but understand we have fewer than 4,500 bureaucrats serving 5 million people, and there is no insurance company in the country that comes close to that efficiency.

CHILD SUPPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, each year, over $5 billion in child support goes uncollected. This is a national disgrace that is punishing our children and bankrupting our welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, I know personally just how important child support is because, in 1968, I was a single, working mother who never received a penny in child support. In order to provide my children with the health care and child care they needed, even though I was employed, I was forced to go on welfare to supplement my wages. Today, millions of American families rely on welfare for exactly the same reason.

Mr. Speaker, currently, almost 1,500 State and local agencies are charged with collecting child support. Consequently, less than $1 for every $10 owed in interstate child support is collected.

A comprehensive welfare reform plan must recognize that the failure to collect child support is not a State-by-State problem, it is a national crisis demanding a national solution.

Mr. Speaker, let us make sure that families—families like mine—are not forced to go on welfare because they have not been given the child support they need and deserve.

We must insist that child support be front and center in the welfare reform debate.

IMPROVE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the streets of America, as the Halls of Congress, have been filled with calls for young mothers to be more responsible, not to have children when they cannot take the responsibility for those children, to certainly cooperate and establish the paternity of the child's father. We hear this and we agree with this, but we really want to know, particularly in the contract, where are the demands for fathers to be responsible?

We must clearly say that both parents have an equal and unavoidable responsibility to provide for their children. The taxpayers want to provide for their own children, not for other people's children.

We have to insist that we have both parents responsible, because if we do not collect child support, we will have more people on Aid to Families with Dependent Children rather than less people.

Recently the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CLAY SHAW, has come forth and said yes, we will take up the issue of child support enforcement. He was reacting to the strong suggestions by many people who have worked on this issue for years, particularly the Women's Caucus, to see that child support enforcement travels along with welfare reform and we look forward to seeing these provisions in print.

But we have to be very careful we do not just say do a block grant for child support enforcement. The very strength of child support enforcement these last few years is having a Federal approach. The way in which a young father or father can get away from the responsibilities to his children is merely to move, go across State lines and then it is almost impossible, unless you have a Federal directive to be able to get the individual to pay their support responsibilities to their children.

So I certainly hope child support enforcement travels along with welfare reform. I hope we can accomplish both, but to do this we must do it in the right way.

We have had a National Commission on Child Support Enforcement that has come forward with some marvelous suggestions about interstate tracking of where the father is working. So I would suggest to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] that he look at the Commission's recommendation about interstate child support enforcement. There are wonderful suggestions there. Suggestions that will work and have been put into bill form.

The work has been done. Let us put it into law as we do child support enforcement along with welfare reform.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S EXCELLENT LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, today I continue my endeavor to refresh and remind my Democratic colleagues of the excellent legislative record we have created over the past 40 years.

Last week, I began this series of floor speeches with the 84th Congress. Ike was President and the Democrats had just taken control of the House of Representatives.

The 84th Congress raised the minimum wage, ratified the Southeast Atlantic Treaty Organization, established peace with Austria, and freed Germany from allied occupation. The Democrat Party did this and more.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Democrats are often chastised as the party of intrusive government and personal dependency. Today, I will cite examples from 85th Congress and provide historical evidence that counters these misconceptions.

Between 1957 and 1958, our country was rebounding from fighting World War Two and the war in Korea.

The United States was able to do this while engaged in the cold war with our Communist adversaries. Also during