

to look for the resources that the EEOC needs to deal with this terrific influx of new cases. I call upon people all across America to look at this very seriously, and realize what it must feel like to be someone who needs a job being asked at that job to do some things that go against their religion, their beliefs, their family, everything. It is outrageous and it must stop.

Thank you, Business Week.

CONCERNS ABOUT THE ETHICS PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that has always been a priority of mine since I first served in the New Hampshire legislature back in 1982, and that issue is ethics. One of my first responsibilities back then was to serve on a task force to make recommendations on the establishment of a permanent ethics committee and guidelines for Members of the New Hampshire legislature and the State senate, by the way, who are only paid \$100 a year.

As a result of this and subsequent efforts, I was pleased as a New Hampshire State Senator to author the law that established a permanent legislative ethics committee, and I served as chairman for 2 years. By the way, part of this process involved crafting the law. We studied other models in other States, including the model here in Washington that is used for Congress.

Because of the work I was able to do with Democrats and Republicans in New Hampshire, including now Governor Steve Merrill, many of the procedures that we used in New Hampshire are based on ethics standards rules that we follow here in Congress. We felt that it was critical that our ethics committee always work on a bipartisan basis and that the actions of its Members be totally above reproach. We adopted language which would require that any Member of our ethics committee recuse himself or herself from any deliberation if there was any possibility of a conflict of interest.

Last week I was surprised to read in the April 30, 1996 edition of the Washington Times an article about a possible conflict of interest involving the ranking minority member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Times be included along with my statement in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the article reveals that the same individual who drafted several complaints filed against the Speaker also helped raise

tens of thousands of dollars for the campaign of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The article also revealed that the political consulting firm header by the individual in question, Mr. Steven J. Jost, also received over \$14,000 in payments from the ranking minority member's campaign committee.

Mr. Speaker, in no way am I implying that the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has acted in an unethical fashion, but in the same manner that questions were raised by the minority whip concerning Republican Members of the committee and alleged conflicts of interest, similar questions should also be raised regarding any connection between the ranking minority member of the committee and the individual who helped raise money for him and also drafted many of the complaints filed against the Speaker.

It is vital, Mr. Speaker, that the ethics process in Congress remain fair and above reproach, and that we retain the confidence of the American people for this important process. I hope that we will receive in the coming days a full and complete explanation of the ranking minority member's association with this fundraiser and this fundraiser's dealings with the ethics committee regarding filings made against the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 30, 1996]

GINGRICH CRITIC AIDED ETHICS-PANEL
DEMOCRAT

(By George Archibald)

The top Democrat on the House ethics committee received tens of thousands of dollars in political contributions raised by a firm whose senior partner spearheaded ethics complaints against House Speaker Newt Gingrich.

Rep. Jim McDermott, Washington Democrat, who says he knew nothing of the fund raising and therefore didn't violate committee conflict-of-interest rules raised more than \$36,000 from political action committees at two receptions organized last year by Fraioli/Jost, a PAC money-raiser for congressional Democrats.

At the same time, Mr. McDermott was the point man pushing for the House ethics committee to appoint an outside counsel to investigate complaints against Mr. Gingrich.

The complaints were researched and legally drafted under the direction of Steven J. Jost of Fraioli/Jost.

Mr. Jost was the chief fundraiser for Ben Jones, the speaker's 1994 Democratic opponent, who launched the anti-Gingrich ethics complaints formally filed by House Minority Whip David E. Bonior of Michigan.

The complaints accused Mr. Gingrich of improperly commingling funds and activities of GOPAC, which helped achieve the GOP takeover of Congress, and a nationally televised political science course the speaker taught from a college in his home state, Georgia.

"We're stringing up the electric chair here, but we didn't make him guilty; he made himself guilty," Mr. Jost told the Wall Street Journal about Mr. Gingrich last year after the complaints were filed.

Documents purported to show ties between the college course and GOPAC were obtained by Mr. Jost in Georgia during Mr. Jones' 1994 campaign. "Mr. Jost decided they would be useful as a campaign weapon," the Journal reported. "So he hired a Democratic lawyer, Bob Bauer, to fashion them into an ethics complaint for \$4,500."

Mr. Bauer represents House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt of Missouri, another Fraioli/Jost client.

The Landmark Legal Foundation appraised the House Ethics Committee last year of ties between Mr. Jost and Democratic House leaders in the anti-Gingrich campaign. The panel, formally known as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, refused to look into the matter.

"Mr. McDermott had a duty to step aside when any complaint with Mr. Jost's fingerprints on it came before the ethics committee," said Mark R. Levin, Landmark's director of legal policy.

"Members of the ethics committee are supposed to consider all ethics complaints with a nonpartisan, unjaudiced eye. The record would appear to show that Mr. McDermott and Mr. Jost are joined at the hip," Mr. Levin said. "We are reviewing this information and seriously considering filing a formal complaint."

Mr. McDermott yesterday denied any conflict with committee rules requiring impartiality and lack of bias in the Gingrich case.

He also denied knowledge of filings by his political committee, Friends of Jim McDermott, listing payments of \$14,160.61 to Fraioli/Jost for last year's PAC fundraising activities.

"I don't know who did the fund raising," Mr. McDermott told The Washington Times in an interview just off the House floor. He then walked back onto the floor, where reporters are barred, to avoid further questions about campaign committee filings by Charles M. Williams, his \$106,044-a-year chief congressional aide.

Mr. Williams, who runs Mr. McDermott's Capitol office, serves as treasurer of Friends of Jim McDermott. Mr. Williams did not respond to inquiries yesterday.

Reports he filed for the campaign committee in December and February list contributions totaling \$36,000 to Mr. McDermott from 52 PACs, each of which gave \$500 or \$1,000 at Capitol Hill fundraising receptions organized by Fraioli/Jost on April 5 and July 15, 1995.

Mr. Jost, who left partner Michael Fraioli in June to start his own fund-raising company, said Mr. McDermott "first approached us" to do his fund raising in the 1993-94 election cycle. "As I recall, one of the other members of Congress referred us to him," Mr. Jost said.

Mr. Jost said his income from Fraioli/Jost, even after Mr. Jones ceased being a client of the firm, enabled him to spend time advancing the anti-Gingrich ethics campaign. "I have never been compensated for any work by anybody on any of the Gingrich stuff, except for news organizations that have reimbursed me for photocopying expenses," he said.

Mr. Jost said he saw no conflict in Mr. McDermott's reliance on Fraioli/Jost for fund raising as his own work in the Gingrich camp while Mr. McDermott was sitting in judgment of the speaker.

"It sounds like the worst thing you could accuse me or Jim McDermott of is being Democrat," Mr. Jost said. He said committee Republicans Porter J. Gross of Florida, Jim Bunning of Kentucky and Nancy L. Johnson of Connecticut, the panel's chairman had greater conflicts.

"Your're alleging . . . a conflict that is far less direct than, for instance, Mr. Goss' giving \$5,000 to GOPAC at the time the ethics

complaint is before his committee, or that Mr. Bunning and Mrs. Johnson participated in GOPAC activities," Mr. Jost said.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that Members should not make references to members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct concerning pending investigations.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any references made by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] as to pending matters. These are not matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; these are stories in the paper and not before the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is stating that as a general admonition from the Chair at this time.

SUPPORT THE ADOPTION PROMOTION AND STABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an issue of great importance to everyone who cares about children. Today, there are hundreds of thousands of children who should be thriving in the love and care of adoptive parents. Tragically, they are not. Instead they are shuttling from foster family to foster family. In fact, this year a mere 10 percent of the 500,000 children in State foster care programs will move into permanent adoptive homes. This is not something out of Charles Dickens. It is happening today—in the United States of America.

We have come to this sorry state of affairs for many reasons, but two are paramount. First, the cost of adoption for many moderate-income families is prohibitive. Second, liberal social welfare policy has made interethnic adoption nearly impossible.

According to the National Council for Adoption, as many as 2 million families could be waiting for a child to adopt. But barriers like cost get in the way. Adoption expenses can total us to \$20,000. This financial burden is a major disincentive for moderate-income families wishing to adopt children.

A second barrier to adoption is the Federal law that permits States to use race in the placement of children in foster care and adoption. This law has clearly backfired. The use of race-matching has delayed the adoption of minority children, who remain in fos-

ter care at least twice as long as non-minority children. Today, 49 percent of children in foster care are minorities. A third of foster children are black.

I ask my colleagues: Is it fair to these innocent children to trap them in the foster care system simply because of the color of their skin? The love of a family knows no race. It is unconscionable that any child needing the love and care of a family he can call his own would be denied that love and care simply because the prospective adoptive family is of a different race. That is a grave injustice to the child who needs a home and to the family who waits with open arms.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress can help remove these barriers to adoption through swift passage of H.R. 3236, the Adoption Promotion and Stability Act. This bill makes two important reforms.

First, the bill revises the Tax Code to make adoption more affordable for families. H.R. 3236 provides a \$5,000 tax credit for adoption expenses. The bill also provides a \$5,000 per child tax exclusion for employer-paid adoption assistance. I believe this provision will encourage more moderate-income families to adopt children.

Second, the bill removes barriers to interracial adoption. Currently, the law allows placement agencies to use the racial background of the child as a criterion in making placement decisions. This bill prohibits the use of race to delay or deny placement of a child into a foster or adoptive home. I believe this provision will go a long way to end the intolerable delay associated with race-matching. It will ensure that placement agencies make the best interests of children their top priority.

In addition, I must note that many American Indian children are suffering in the current foster care and adoption system. Currently, tribes can delay the adoption of a child of American Indian descent because of the Indian Child Welfare Act. This law was intended to protect the integrity and heritage of American Indian tribes. Yet the law allows tribes to interfere with adoption decisions due to its ambiguity and broad application. As a result, litigations out of control, and Indian children are not being adopted. A provision of H.R. 3286, which was stripped from the bill in committee, would have established safeguards against the arbitrary, retroactive designation of children as members of a tribe. This would prevent a tribe from invoking the Indian Child Welfare Act to interfere with legitimate, voluntary adoptions. Should an amendment be offered to restore this provision of the bill, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Children must be afforded every opportunity to live in a happy, safe, secure, and—perhaps most important—permanent family environment. The provisions of this bill help to achieve this goal. I want to thank Ms. MOLINARI and Mr. ARCHER for their leadership on this issue. I also commend Mr. BUNNING, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr.

TAHRT, and Mr. SHAW for their strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot take the hundreds of thousands of children languishing in foster care and match them with loving parents overnight. But with passage of the Adoption Promotion and Stability Act, we are taking an important step. I urge my colleagues to meet the needs of foster children across the country. I urge you to support this bill.

RENEWAL OF MFN FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is about to enter its annual debate on the renewal of China's Most Favored Nation status. The need for renewal has existed since the United States first granted MFN to China back in 1980. It has been a difficult debate ever since 1989 and the events at Tiananmen Square. There is good reason to believe that the debate this year will be very difficult. This is because of two particularly large problems affecting the debate.

First, there are the policies of the Beijing Communist leadership. That government's disregard for international obligations on nonproliferation, intellectual property rights, trade, human rights, and on Taiwan mandate an effective response.

Second, there is a lack of leadership on the part of the administration. The policy has been ad hoc, dependent on domestic pressures, as Robert Zoellick testified before our committee last week when he said:

In an effort to please all constituencies, the administration has squandered our strength, failed to achieve its aims, and demonstrated weakness to both China and to others in the region.

Because of these problems, I fear that Congress will lose sight of the critical point, and that critical point is just this: Our policy on MFN for China should take these problems into account, but it must not be determined by them.

Rather, our decision on MFN must be determined by one thing and that one thing is, what is best for the United States? It is my view, though, that there are four basic reasons why extending MFN is in the best interests of our country.

First, revoking MFN would harm U.S. workers, U.S. businesses, and U.S. investment. Changes made in China's MFN status will curtail access to the Chinese market. Huge levels of trade and investment will still occur, but it will be other nations, not the United States, that will be making the investments, and we will lose all of our control and leverage. The effect will be losses of U.S. trade, U.S. investment and, quite frankly, many U.S. jobs.

The size of this potential hardship must be recognized by us in congress as