their passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 that universal service was to be preserved no matter what else happened in the newly competitive telephone industry.

Universal service and subsidies are the big societal issues that regulators and legislators—and the telephone companies themselves—have left before them.

The legislation you passed in February said that universal service must be preserved—you were very clear about that, but you weren't exactly precise about how to do it. You left the details of implementing the legislation to those most familiar with our industry—the FCC, state regulators, and the many old and new competitors in the game.

Apparently, enacting good telecommunications law is turning out to be a lot easier than implementing it. Frankly, some of the discussions being heard about this are extraordinarily troubling. In the course of the FCC's ongoing proceedings, things are being said that would lead one to believe some either did not hear, did not understand, or did not want to understand what I feel Congress clearly intended to do in the legislation passed last February. Some of the actions that are being proposed would greatly endanger universal service.

I believe as an information services industry that we must all commit to the preservation of universal service and that government agencies must assure that we do. We have the most affordable, widely available communications system in the world now and we must all make sure that the new rules of the game do not change this.

I can assure you that BellSouth is committed to universal service. That's why we agreed to a Louisiana Public Service Commission order last March that makes us the service provider of last resort in the areas where we operate; it's why we have capped our basic residential service rates for five years so that consumers are protected during the period of change to competition in our industry; it's why we and the Public Service Commission have made our fastest data circuits available to schools and libraries at greatly reduced rates—we want to make sure no one gets left behind as telephone service providers have an economic incentive to focus on big, profitable customers.

In closing, I would urge members of this caucus to stay attuned to the debate on the universal service issue in the FCC's current proceedings to assure the rules developed will produce the kind of future for our industry that Congress envisioned last February. This is critical for the future of education, and I believe also for the overall well being of the national economy. Thank you again for having me here today and giving me an opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

THE POLITICS OF ORGANIZED LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence and the staff's indulgence. I will try not to take the entire 60 minutes, but I have something that I have to say to you and hopefully through you, Mr. Speaker, to the workers of this country. The workers of this country I want to speak to tonight, partly because this past Monday was Labor Day. As you know, the Congress was out of session. We were not here in Washington. But there were a lot of speeches given, a lot of rhetoric was passed. And I think many of the Washington labor leaders laid the foundation for what they hope will be a very successful political campaign totally in concert with the Democratic Party, both from the standpoint of the presidency and congressional and senatorial races across the country.

I want to talk about that for a moment, Mr. Speaker and, through you, I want to talk to those rank and file union workers across the country who I think have been sold a bad bill of goods or, in fact, I would say have not even been sold the case. They have been had.

What do I mean by that, because that is a very serious charge? The basis of my outrage and my concern is that last spring when the AFL–CIO leadership met in Washington, they had a vote to require every AFL–CIO member in the country, whether they agreed or not, to put up a dollar of their dues over a period of 3 years that would raise a total of $35 million. This $35 million that is being taken from the paychecks of workers in the Teamsters, in the building trades, in all the major unions across this Nation, is not going to elect just labor-sensitive Members of Congress. It is going to support one political party and one political party only. To me, Mr. Speaker, that is an outrage.

Is it an outrage to me because I am a Republican or because I hate labor unions? I do not think it is the case, Mr. Speaker, because I am one of those labor-sensitive Republicans who during my 10 years in Congress been out front supporting many of the issues important to working men and women and in many cases the leaders of my local labor unions back in Pennsylvania. So I am not someone who has been against many of labor's top priorities. But what outrages me is what a few leaders in this city have been able to force upon the millions of rank and file workers across the country and it is to their workers, those workers that I want to speak tonight, because I do not think they really understand the facts.

We would think if labor was going to assess every member of its rank and file across the country and every local labor union, that in fact that money would go to defeat those Members of Congress who do not support the priorities of organized labor. That is not the case. Because in fact, Mr. Speaker, of the $35 million that is being used to run ads, for instance, in the district of my neighbor, JON FOX in Montgomery County, even though JON FOX has supported many of labor's top priorities, that half a million dollars being used against JON FOX and being used against PHIL ENGLISH and against JACK QUINN and against a number of Republican Members across the country who have been supportive of labor's priorities is not being used against Democrats who have zero voting records on labor issues.

Now, one would wonder why the Federal Election Commission, Mr. Speaker, would not do an inquiry, if we have an organized group in this country forcibly assessing $35 million from rank and file workers and yet only targeting that money against incumbent freshman Republicans and yet that is exactly what is happening. In fact, Mr. Speaker, my office has done a study and we have looked at the voting records as determined by the AFL–CIO, and we have found that no incumbent freshman Democrats, even those from right-to-work States, even those who have zero or 5 or 10 percent AFL–CIO voting records, are being targeted. None of them. All of the money that is being forcibly collected from organized labor is being used to only support Democrats and to defeat incumbent Republican Members of Congress.

Now, why would this happen? Would it be because the national leaders and the rank and file workers across America are so unhappy with the agenda of the past several years and all of the Republicans? I would think not, Mr. Speaker. Let me go through some items point by point.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that when Bill Clinton was first running for office and the Democrat Party controlled the Congress, both houses, I was the Republican who offered the compromise Family and Medical Leave Act that is now law. Do you know something, Mr. Speaker? That bill passed the House and the Senate a year before the final conference was brought before us for a final vote. Why was that done?

It was because the Democrat leadership was not concerned about rank and file workers who wanted family and medical leave. Rather, they waited an entire year because they wanted to have George Bush veto the bill in the middle of the Clinton-Bush election. Were they concerned about rank and file workers? No, they were concerned about scoring political points. Then maybe it is because the President has been so supportive of labor's agenda over the previous 3 years.

☐ 2100

Well, let us look at the President's agenda in line with the rank-and-file labor movement's agenda over the past several years. Organized labor, Mr. Speaker, in this country, the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, had two top priorities. Their two top priorities were defeating NAFTA, the North American Free Trade zone legislation, and passing the anti-strikebreaker legislation.

Now let us look at each of those pieces of legislation and see what this President did to help enact each of those.

The President was not with labor on NAFTA, Mr. Speaker. The President lobbied hard to pass it. He passed NAFTA in the House, largely with Democrat and Republican votes, he passed it in the Senate, and he signed it into law.

I have introduced legislation in this session, Mr. Speaker, that says that

this President was not truthful with the American people. He said that when NAFTA was passed the side agreements would raise up the worker standards and the environmental laws in Mexico to avoid the drain of jobs south, and that has not happened. My bill says that each year the President must certify that progress is being made. My bill was introduced because I opposed NAFTA. I was supportive of labor's position; the President was not.

Let us look at the anti-strikebreaker bill, Mr. Speaker. Here was a piece of legislation labor said was their top No. 1 priority. That bill passed the House, Mr. Speaker, and it passed the House with Republican support. In fact, there were enough votes to pass it in the Senate. Now President Clinton says he was in favor of the anti-strikebreaker bill, but let us look beyond the rhetoric, and let us look at whether or not he really was truthful to the rank-and-file workers across America who are paying a dollar a month for 3 years out of their pay to support this President in this election whether they like it or not.

To get a bill on the floor of the Senate without a filibuster or to avoid a filibuster you need 60 votes. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it is called invoking cloture. The anti-strikebreaker bill passed the House with more than enough votes because it had Republican support. There were enough votes in the Senate to pass the anti-strikebreaker bill. But guess what, Mr. Speaker? They could only get 59 Senators to vote for cloture to cut off the debate.

Now how does that relate to President Clinton, Mr. Speaker? Neither Senator from Arkansas voted for cloture to allow the antistrikebreaker bill to come up on the floor of the Senate for a vote. Now here we have a President from Arkansas, and do we really believe that the rank-and-file workers of this country really believe that President Clinton could not convince one of those two Senators to vote yes for cloture to give the 60-vote number and then vote against the bill, because it still would have passed?

You see, Mr. Speaker, this President wanted to have it both ways. As he has done repeatedly throughout the last 3½ years, he wanted the Congress to pass NAFTA, and he wanted to say to the rank-and-file workers, ''I am for it and I am going to sign it, but, oh, by the way,'' as he told small business owners, ''it will never come to my desk for a signature.'' Why? Because he would not lift a finger to help get the votes to invoke cloture in the Senate. So again rank-and-file union workers across the country were betrayed.

Where was the Washington leadership, Mr. Speaker? Where were they on strikebreaker? Where were they on NAFTA? And let us look beyond that, Mr. Speaker, because we saw and we have heard the rhetoric coming from the national labor leadership about the minimum wage vote.

The first 2 years of the Clinton administration both the House and the Senate were controlled by the Democrats in the majority. There was not one movement to bring up a minimum wage bill in either body. And, as a matter of fact, the President is on the record as having said in the first 2 years of his administration that he thought the minimum wage increase was a mistake. But this session, with Republicans in control, he thought it would be a wedge issue.

Where were the organized labor leaders who were mandating contributions from the workers the first 2 years of the Clinton administration? Why were they not siphoning off that dollar a month out of the paychecks of those workers to support those who supported the minimum wage?

But it even gets worse than that, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will suspend for just 1 minute, please.

The Chair would like to remind all Members that it is out of order to characterize the position of the Senate or of Senators designated by name or position on legislative issues.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman, and I would just say, Mr. Speaker, the real outrage of my feeling here tonight is best expressed by what this President and his party are doing to those workers who work in the defense and science technology base of this country. Here is a President talking about job creation, and here are national AFL–CIO leaders saying, ''We are going to take a dollar a month out of your check and put it into a $35 million fund to defeat freshmen Republicans so that we can create jobs.''

Where were those big labor leaders, Mr. Speaker, when this President decimated defense spending? Over the past 3 years 1 million men and women in this country have lost their jobs. Now were these minimum wage jobs? No, they were jobs represented by the UAW, by the International Association of Machinists, jobs represented by the Electrical Workers, by the building trades who build and construct the base housing and the facilities on our military bases. They were jobs held by building trades and teamsters and machinists and boilermakers who build our ships and UAW workers across the country. This President's cuts in defense spending eliminated 1 million of those jobs. We did not hear a peep out of the national labor leadership in Washington about those job losses.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years the Congress under the Republican leadership has brought defense spending back to a sensible level of spending. Have we increased it dramatically? No. We have given the service chiefs the dollars that they feel are necessary, not what Bill Clinton's political appointee wants in terms of the Secretary of Defense, but what the members of the Joint Chiefs say they need to protect our troops.

Now here is the irony, Mr. Speaker. This President has railed publicly, and the administration has railed publicly, about the Republican Congress increasing defense spending. In fact, I was one of the few Republicans who voted against increasing funding for the B–2 bomber. I felt we could not afford it.

Now this President said he was opposed to the B–2 bomber. What did he do last year after Congress prevailed and increased funding for the B–2? Well, he took a trip out to the California plant where the B–2 is manufactured, and he gave a speech, and he said to the union workers and the management standing in back of him we are going to build 1 more B–2 bomber, and we are also going to have a study done of our joint deep strike bomber needs, and that study will come out in November right after the election is over.

Again, rank-and-file union workers have been used.

Mr. Speaker, here is the real irony of what is happening this year with the AFL–CIO, and this to me is absolutely outrageous. That $35 million that is being collected right now from every member of every AFL–CIO local in America is being used to target Members who voted for funding the jobs that many of them now hold.

Now is that not outrageous? Can you imagine being a worker at the C–17 plant where Republican Members voted to increase funding for the C–17 and now having those workers—and I totaled this up based on the number of workers at that facility, 8,000 of them—they are now contributing forcibly $350,000, not with their consent. It was forced out of their pockets to defeat those Member of Congress who supported the funding for the jobs that they now hold.

I wonder if those workers really understand what is happening, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if they are aware that a few, and it is only a few, Mr. Speaker, because the bulk of the labor leaders in this country are honorable men and women. Many of them in my district good friends of mine. Many of them here in Washington are good solid friends. But when I talk to them about this issue, they nod their heads and they say, ''We know. We know what you are talking about, but it was a decision made above our pay grade.''

So here we have a decision made by a few leaders in the AFL–CIO to siphon money off of workers, to use that money to spread misinformation and defeat candidates who in many cases have been supportive of the very jobs that those workers have. To me that is an outrage, Mr. Speaker.

And let me say this and to make this point clearly. We did not increase defense spending to create jobs. We increased defense spending because of the

threat that is out there. But when this President criticizes this Congress for increasing defense spending, and then talks about the loss of jobs in this country, and then has the audacity to go out to plants where the ships are being built, where the aircraft are being manufactured caused by that increase in spending, and cut the ribbon on those projects, then that to me is outrage, and that is what is happening right now, Mr. Speaker. This President in his political campaign is going around the country and he is boasting about jobs being created. He is going to plants where ships are being built, where planes are being manufactured, where bases are being rehabbed. He is criticizing the Congress in Washington for increasing defense spending, but he is going out across America, one State at a time, especially in California, and he is saying, ''I am here to support your job.''

And on top of that, Mr. Speaker, those Members of Congress who stood fast for increases in science funding and the technical base and the space program and in defense because they were the right decisions are now having money forcibly taken from those workers who have benefited to be used to target those Members for defeat. That is not America, Mr. Speaker. It is not America when a few people inside the Beltway can force people to put money into candidates that they know nothing about or perhaps are voting against their very interests.

Now do I rise to say all this as someone who is upset because of what the AFL–CIO is doing to me personally? Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, out of the 21 House races in Pennsylvania when the State AFL–CIO in Pennsylvania endorsed, they endorsed 20 Democrats and left one district with no endorsement. That is my district.

They are not running ads in my district, Mr. Speaker, so I am not here complaining about what is happening to me. But I cannot sit by any longer and allow my friends who are working people across this country to have their money be taken and used for a partisan political purpose, and that is exactly what is being done.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican, but I was involved in a labor movement. I was a teacher for 7 years, vice president of my association, taught in the public schools right next to west Philadelphia, served on a negotiating committee for 3 years, so I know what it is like to be active in the association. For the 7 years before that, and while teaching and going to college, I worked in a market and was an active member of the retail clerks union. I come from a large family of nine children, the youngest of nine. My father was in the textile workers union most of his life. I am sensitive to issues involving working people because I think we as a society and as a country need to be fair.

But I stand before you tonight, Mr. Speaker, and I say through you, Mr. Speaker, to all of those millions of men and women across this country who are involved in labor unions:

> Your leadership is not being fair. They have taken your money forcibly, and they're not using it for just to support what is right for you. They're using it for a narrow focus political agenda to support one party.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who analyzes the history of this institution could quickly show that no piece of legislation supportive of working people has ever been passed without bipartisan support. From family and medical leave, to anti-strikebreaker, to plant closing legislation, to any other piece of legislation that is significant, every one of those bills has had bipartisan support. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in this election $35 million was pulled from the pockets of working men and women to be used for a national agenda, in many cases to defeat those Members of Congress who voted for the funding to keep those very people employed.

My contention is, Mr. Speaker, we heard earlier some of our comrades and colleagues from the Democrat side saying the polls are showing there is a huge lead. Once the American people see through the rhetoric and the demagoguery, once they see that a few people in Washington have siphoned off forcibly $35 million to be used to misinform the American people, those numbers are going to change.

□ 2115

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. How much outrage would this country have if corporate America forced rank and file management employees to kick in $35 million to defeat Democrats across the country? You would have a national scandal unfolding. That does not happen. In fact, all the studies that have been done show that most companies allow the workers who contribute to their PACs to have a say where the money goes.

In the case of this $35 million siphoned out of the pockets from America's working people, they will not have a dime's worth of say as to where their money will go. Now, we logically should ask the question, does that mean that every rank and file labor union worker will vote Democrat? In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the last election the polls showed that 40 percent of the American unionized work force voted Republican. What happens to those 40 percent? Are they being disenfranchised? Are they having money pulled out of their pockets to be used to defeat people that they in fact are going to vote for? That is not American, Mr. Speaker. That is not right.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here tonight because I have credibility with working men and women in this country. I am not out to hurt them. I want to support them, as I have done this session, in protecting Davis-Bacon. It was a group of Republicans, largely freshmen Republican Members, who went to the leadership and said, do not strip away Davis-Bacon protection. Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? Those rank and file building trades workers across the country who rely on the prevailing wage now have been forcibly taken, had money taken out of their pockets to be used to defeat those freshman Republicans who stood up for the prevailing wage.

I am the author in this session of the modification to Davis-Bacon that has bipartisan support. At last count, 128 Members from both parties cosponsored my bill to reform Davis-Bacon, with the support of the national labor leaders of the building trades and the manufacturing groups. I will stand up for what is right, and I will be honest. As a Republican, I will disagree with my party from time to time if I feel we are not being sensitive enough. But I cannot stand by silently and see a few, and I am talking about a handful, a handful of people in this city forcibly take $35 million from the pockets of working men and women and use that money to hurt those same people.

What is the feeling of our Republican Members, Mr. Speaker? I can tell the Members, in talking to a number of my colleagues who are sensitive to labor issues, there is a feeling of absolute outrage, absolute outrage, because these Republican Members, and there are about 40 or 50 of them, have walked side by side in standing up for what is right for working people, even when right-to-work Democrats voted against every one of those initiatives.

Yet, what has the national labor leadership done? It has defied the rank-and-file worker, saying we are talking about your money, we do not care about right-to-work Democrats, we do not care about Democrats who do not support labor unions or labor's agenda, we are only going to target Republicans because we are totally in bed with the Democratic leadership and Bill Clinton, the President of the United States. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I should not say his name.

This is an outrage and I am not going to let this election go by without doing what I can to expose what is taking place in this country. I said earlier I was a teacher for 7 years, active with the education association in my State, vice president of my local association, and a negotiator. Mr. Speaker, there are 25 classroom teachers in this Congress in the Republican Party.

The NEA and the AFT, the two largest labor unions, over the past 2 years have contributed $3.5 million to campaigns, 99 percent of it to Democrats. Forty-four to one. For every $1 of money to a Republican, $44 to a Democrat. It does not matter whether they were teachers or not, or whether they support good schools, or educators. This was our Republican candidate's point, Mr. Speaker, It was not what we heard from the other side about taking on teachers. This party is not against teachers. This party is against large institutional labor union leaders who have a political agenda as opposed to an agenda for rank-and-file workers.

Mr. Speaker, that is where the battle is. The battle is not with those classroom teachers who need more support and who need decent pay and benefits. It is against those leaders who have a totally political agenda that is in many cases a personal agenda to move themselves forward, as opposed to the people they are siphoning money from.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, as this election unfolds over the next 2 months, in every city, in every town, in every county we expose what is happening to every rank-and-file worker in this country. We can have honest differences in how to increase people's economic viability. We can have honest differences in how to improve the economic lot of people who are trying to work for a living. But no one should be forcibly made to contribute to an agenda set by someone else. That is what is happening in this country right now.

To those rank-and-file workers, Mr. Speaker, across America who will see this or hear this, and I guarantee you we are going to spread this message, I say that they need to let their labor leaders know that enough is enough, they are not pawns in the game. As my local labor leaders back in my county so ably know and do, they support those who are friends to them and they oppose those who are enemies. But Mr. Speaker, the national labor leadership cannot understand that, because they only see one thing. That is a political agenda of one party.

So in effect, they sell out the millions of rank-and-file workers who want to have people represent their views. They sell them out for a larger political agenda that supports one party and one idea and agenda of bigger Government.

Our job, Mr. Speaker, is to dispel this notion and to get the facts on the record as they are. I am going to go to every district I can and provide every piece of information I can to every defense plant in this country represented by a labor union. I even heard that the administration, the President and the Vice President, wanted to come to Philadelphia, Mr. Speaker, to go to a local plant where the V–22 was built. That is nice they wanted to do that. I wonder if, when the President came up there, he would mention the fact that it was not he who supported the increased funding for that program, but rather, it was the Congress that supported that increase in funding. Why? Because the Marine Corps has it as their top priority.

I understand the President may want to travel to some shipyards where he can cut the ribbon on some ship keels. I wonder if he is going to tell those workers that it was not he who supported the increased funds for those ships, but rather, it was he who criticized the Congress for increasing funding by the level of $12 billion in this year's authorization and appropriation bills.

I wonder if when the President goes out and talks about programs, whether it is the B–2 or missile programs, he is going to be honest in telling those workers that he opposed the funds that have been requested by the service chiefs that we in this Congress, in a bipartisan way, have brought forward.

Let me make that point again, Mr. Speaker. Our funding for defense in this Congress was not a Republican base alone. In fact, the defense authorization bill, which passed on this floor, had almost 300 Members vote in the affirmative. In fact, the final conference report had over 300 Members voting in the affirmative. That is not a Republican plan, that is a bipartisan plan supporting what is good for America.

My point is that those voters, those Members of Congress who voted to support that increase in funding to provide for those new programs at the same time are having their Washington handful of labor leaders siphon off $35 billion to defeat the very Members who have supported their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let this administration have it both ways, as they try to do all the time, as this President did when he went before APAC, the largest association of supporters of Israel in this country. He want to their national conference and he said how supportive he was of Israel. He said, furthermore I am going to increase the funding for the Nautilus program, a new missile defense initiative that will protect the people of Israel from the Katyusha rockets being fired into Israel.

What he did not tell the people at APAC, Mr. Speaker, which we have now put on the record many times, is that in fact this administration zeroed out funding for the Nautilus or high-energy laser program for each of the last 3 years. They tried to kill the program. But this year, because, I guess, the President felt it was a good political time, he went before APAC and said, we are going to move this program forward. If it had not been for the actions of this Congress in a bipartisan way, that money would not have been there for that decision to be made. But again, this President was able to have it both ways.

As we just recently saw with the debate over terrorism, it was this Congress that increased funding for antiterrorism initiatives long before the downing of the TWA flight, long before the killings in Saudi Arabia of our troops. It was this Congress over the past 2 years that held hearings and put additional funding in for anti-terrorism initiatives to the extent of $200 million above and beyond what President Clinton said he needed, but well in line with what the service chiefs said was important for the security of our country and our people.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged tonight, this, the week of Labor Day, when we celebrate the rich history of this country, where those of us in both parties can support the right of people to work and have decent paying jobs, and even to join and be involved in labor unions, I am outraged because in this week, a week that we celebrate the rich history of this country and the labor movement, I have to go through you, Mr. Speaker, to tell the rank and file workers across America that their interests now are being circumvented by those who have a larger political agenda, not based upon voting records, and I say, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that our workers across the country are listening, remember that, not based upon voting records.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, JON FOX, in suburban Philadelphia, is not being targeted because he is insensitive to working people. To the contrary, JON FOX voted with labor on many of their issues. He is being targeted because the leadership of the presidency and the Democratic party has gotten totally in sync with the leaders of the labor movement down here, and their goal is to defeat freshmen Republicans all across the country.

At the same time they are spending half a million dollars, the AFL–CIO, in targeting the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, JON FOX, they are letting other incumbent Democrats who have zero voting records on labor issues go scot-free. Why? Not because they care about issues that the labor unions are concerned with, but because they happen to have a D after their name.

I cannot stand by and let that happen, Mr. Speaker. As someone, again, who has supported the labor movement in this Congress over the past 10 years, who has no target aimed at me this time, but I am not going to sit by and let my rank and file union workers and my members of the UAW and the Teamsters, and the building trades and the firefighters union have their money siphoned off and forcibly contributed to defeat those Members who in many cases I have had to go out and get the support from, to support the initiatives those very workers think are important. That is what is happening in this country this year.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that as we get closer to election day, more and more rank and file workers across this country would begin to ask questions. Because I can tell the Members, Mr. Speaker, there is going to be an election in November, and we may have the Republicans keep control of the House and the Senate, we may have the Democrats take control of the House and Senate, but I can tell the Members this, it is not going to be by a large margin. It is going to be by a close margin.

I can tell the Members, we will remember. Those who have been supportive of issues that are important to working people will remember. I hope that those workers across America who are listening to this debate tonight, who are listening to the message that I am bringing forth tonight, will remember also that they are being forced to contribute in many cases to a national political party's agenda that has nothing to do with the security of their job.

In fact, the ads that are being used running against the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JON FOX, have nothing to do with labor. They are saying JON FOX voted to cut Medicare.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, those are the same ads they are running across the country. Why? Not again because these Members have supposedly voted against working people's interests, but because they happen to be Republicans and they feel the best way to defeat them is to run false ads scaring senior citizens. It is called Mediscare. So they are running these ads, even though we are increasing Medicare spending by a significant amount over 7 years, they are running these ads in the hopes that senior citizens will become alarmed enough to go out and vote straight Democratic. That is not what is in the interest of those workers who every day form the backbone of this country. I cannot be a Member of this Congress and let this outrage continue without speaking up for what I believe to be the most ridiculous, the most unfair and I even think the most illegal action that any single group of leaders could take to harm the interests that they are supposedly representing.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Times dated Sunday, September 1, and the results of a study done by the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution on AFL–CIO contributions to congressional candidates, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Sept. 1, 1996]

EDUCATORS OR LOBBYISTS?

With many school systems across the country opening for the new school year last week at the very time the Democratic Party was convened to crown Bill Clinton and Al Gore, no doubt many public-school teachers faced a difficult dilemma. Should they attend the convention, or should they report to their schools? Evidently, they decided to visit Chicago, the home of what former Secretary of Education Bill Bennett once described as the worst public education system in the nation.

Once again the National Education Association (NEA), the 2.2 million-member teachers' union, flexed its muscles in the Democratic Party, comprising more than 10 percent of the Democratic delegates—405. The other large teachers' union, the 875,000-member American Federation of Teachers (AFT), accounted for another 4 percent. Amazingly, nearly half of all unionized delegates were teachers. The NEA delegation, about the size of California's, again represented the largest special-interest block, a distinction it has prized for each of the last six Democratic conventions. No wonder Mr. Bennett, referring to the NEA, has said, ''You're looking at the absolute heart and center of the Democratic Party.''

The NEA delegates did not merely attend the convention. One of their alumnae literally ran it. Debra DeLee, the former executive director of the Democratic National Committee who served last week as the chief executive officer of the Democratic National Convention, easily made the understandably smooth transition to the Democratic Party from her previous positions as head of the NEA's political action committee, NEA–PAC, and chief NEA Washington lobbyist. According to the Center for Responsive Politics (CRP), a non-profit, nonpartisan campaign-finance research organization, during the 1994 election cycle, NEA–PAC gave $2.26 million, 98.5 percent of it to Democrats. CRP reports that AFT political contributions to congressional candidates totaled $1.29 million in 1993–94, 99.1 percent to Democrats.

Combined, the two national teachers associations' PAC's donated more than $3.5 million to congressional candidates, nearly all them Democrats. But even this sizable sum is dwarfed by the total contributions from the NEA's state- and local-level affiliates. After studying four representative states, Forbes magazine extrapolated its findings and calculated an astounding $35 million for the two-year period. An analysis of Indiana's one state and 31 NEA-affiliated local PACs revealed they alone raised nearly $700,000 and spent nearly $500,000 in a single year. According to John Berthoud of the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution, ''The NEA spends $39 million a year on 1,500 field organizers across the country to promote their political agenda.''

In the unregulated, so-called ''soft-money'' category of political donations to national party committees, which ostensibly use the funds for ''party-building activities,'' the NEA contributed $600,000 to the Democratic Party in the 1993–94 cycle, reflecting a 44 percent increase from the 1991–92 cycle. The AFT chipped in $236,000 in ''soft-money,'' a 53 percent increase over 1991–92. Given the high growth rates of ''soft-money'' contributions in the past and the fact that 60 percent of the NEA's and 72 percent of the ATF's 1993–94 ''soft-money'' contributions arrived during the final six months of that two-year period, it remains to be seen how generous they will be in 1995–96, especially since the national conventions occurred during this period. Nevertheless, a Common Cause study released this month covering the first 18 months of the 1995–96 cycle has already tallied ''soft-money'' contributions to the Democratic Party: $305,000 (NEA); and $263,500 (AFT). The trend seems unmistakable.

Considering that the Clinton and Gore families have both forsaken—for good reasons—the failure-plagued public school system in the District of Columbia in favor of two of its most elite private institutions, causing considerable embarrassment for the public-school establishment, one would think that some teachers might be reluctant to support Clinton-Gore '96. Then again, studies have shown that large majorities of big-city public-school teachers send their children to private schools, too, boycotting the very institutions that employ them. So of course the NEA enthusiastically endorsed the Democratic ticket—as it has since Jimmy Carter. To celebrate the return of Democratic control of the White House, in January 1993 the NEA mailed posters to more than 25,000 junior high and middle schools. The subject? ''Bill Clinton's and Al Gore's Most Excellent Inaugural.''

What do the teachers' unions expect in return for all of the financial and in-kind support to the Democratic Party? After losing both houses of Congress in 1994, the unions clearly want the Democrats to regain control of the legislative branch. As Mr. Berthoud has observed, ''If every item on the NEA's legislative agenda for the 104th [Republican] Congress were adopted, federal spending would increase by at least $702 billion per year. This translates into a tax increase on a family of four of more than $10,000 per year.'' Talk about leverage.

But the nightmare scenario that most frightens the NEA is not only failing to recapture Congress but losing the White House as well. Consider their horror at the prospects of dealing with a president who believes as Bob Dole does, that ''at the heart of all that afflicts our schools is a denial of free choice,'' which Mr. Dole declared in July when he announced his modest school-voucher program. ''Our public schools are in trouble because they are no longer run by the public. Instead, they're controlled by narrow special interest groups who regard public education not as a public trust but as political territory to be guarded at all costs.'' Any guesses whom he had in mind?

Mr. Dole predicted the issue of school choice would evolve into ''a civil rights movement of the 1990s.'' Indirectly referring to the Clintons and Gores, Mr. Dole observed that ''some families already have school choice . . . because they have the money.'' Just as the G.I. Bill expanded both opportunity and choice to millions of World War II veterans, many of whom would otherwise have been unable to attend college, Mr. Dole has proposed a four-year pilot program that would provide 4 million children low- and middle-income families educational choice and opportunities their families otherwise would never be able to afford.

The experimental program would cost a relatively miniscule $5 billion per year, which is less than 2 percent of annual public expenditures for elementary and secondary schools, but it would make choice available to nearly 10 percent of the 45 million students in our nation's public schools. Most important of all, targeted as it is to low- and middle-income families, the program would offer a lifeline to millions of poor students confined to the worst schools in our large cities.

The money would be split equally between the federal and state governments. It would provide vouchers worth $1,000 for elementary schools and $1,500 for high schools. The vouchers would be redeemable not only at public schools but at private and parochial schools as well. Combined with family contributions, partial scholarships and other private financing, the vouchers would clearly meet a demand and fill a niche to provide immediate opportunities to children most in need. Because vouchers would introduce competition for the taxpayer's education dollars, the teachers' unions fear them like the plague, knowing full well that vouchers would jeopardize their monopoly power.

That there is a link between America's failing inner-city schools and the terrible circle of poverty is indisputable. As David Boaz of the Cato Institute recently observed, ''Education used to be a poor child's ticket out of the slums; now it is part of the system that traps people in the underclass.'' What is so tragic is that it doesn't have to be this way. But as long as President Clinton, the Democratic Party and the special-interest teachers' unions stand in the way, blocking educational opportunity the way George Wallace once did in Alabama more than 30 years ago, yet another generation will be sacrificed to satisfy the demands of the special pleaders.

If rhetoric would solve the problems of inner-city schools, the Democratic convention would have been part of the solution. Unwilling to do anything to immediately address the crisis, Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle piously pronounced, ''Every child should have the freedom to go to a good school.'' Current Democratic Party Chairman Don Fowler, quoting Thomas Jefferson, rhapsodized about the benefits of ''a free public education for all our citizens.'' Public education may be free to its young consumers, but to their parents and other taxpayers it clearly is not.

All the more ionic was the fact that this fatuous rhetoric emanated from Chicago, of all places. After observing the Chicago public schools for the Chicago Tribune, Bonita

Brodt wrote in 1991 that she found ''an institutionalized case of child neglect. . . . I saw how the racial politics of a city, the misplaced priorities of a centralized school bureaucracy, and the vested interests of a powerful teachers union had all somehow taken precedence over the needs of the very children the schools are supposed to serve.'' What was that about the benefits of ''a free education for all our citizens?'' Benefits for whom, Mr. Fowler?

''ADTI RELEASES NEW STUDY: ''A FISCAL ANALYSIS OF NEA AND AFL–CIO CONTRIBUTIONS TO 1996 CONGRESSIONAL RACES''

ARLINGTON, VA.—The Alexis de Tocqueville Institution (AdTI) today released a study of the contributions by the political committees of the National Education Association and the AFL-CIO which reveals that each group's stated fiscal agenda of simply stopping ''draconian'' cuts in government is misleading.

The study concludes that the Members of Congress that the two unions are opposing have voted to cut government, but only by rather modest amounts—about two percent of federal spending. The Members that these two unions are contributing to, however, have not supported the status quo but rather have been voting to increase the size and scope of the federal government.

The size of the net cuts voted for by union-opposed Members roughly equalled the size of the net increases voted for by union-backed Members. Thus, the study concludes that if the cutters have been ''radical,'' the union-backed Members have been just as radical in their record of support for larger government.

Through the end of April 1996—half a year before the election—the two unions combined had already contributed in excess of $850,000 to 1996 congressional candidates. The study cross-indexed campaign contributions made by these unions for and against Members with all votes to increase or cut spending in the first session of the 104th Congress. The tool used for analysis of these Members' votes was the Vote Tally database of the nonpartisan National Taxpayers Union.

The candidates for the Senate and the House that the NEA is supporting voted on average to increase annual federal spending by $30.4 billion and $28.9 billion respectively. The Senate and House candidates that they are opposing voted to cut government by $31.8 billion and $32.4 billion respectively.

The profiles of Members that the AFL–CIO is supporting and opposing closely resemble the profiles of Members that the NEA is supporting and opposing. The candidates that the AFL–CIO is backing for the Senate and the House on average voted to increase federal spending by $33.7 billion and $32.2 billion respectively. Senate and House candidates opposed by the AFL–CIO voted to cut government by $29.9 billion and $33.6 billion respectively.

Study author John Berthoud said the work provides an illuminating profile of the politics of each group which would probably surprise union members. ''Many union members are probably being told by their Washington offices that these unions' objectives are just to fight radical cuts, but the facts simply don't support such claims,'' Berthoud observed.

Copies of the complete seven-page study are available from the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution, 1611 North Kent Street, Suite 901, Arlington, VA 22209, (703) 351–4969. E-mail: adtinst@aol.com.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of airline travel problems.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and September 5, on account of his son's wedding.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of official business.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of personal business.

Mr. GANSKE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HINCHEY) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MICA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes each day on September 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. ROTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, on September 5.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HINCHEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KLECZKA.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. REED.

Ms. MCCARTHY.

Mr. MILLER of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MICA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. BAKER of California in two instances.

Mr. ZELIFF.

Mr. RADANOVICH in two instances.

Mr. LAUGHLIN.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

Mrs. CUBIN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. FORBES in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1130. An act to provide for establishment of uniform accounting systems, standards, and reporting systems in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight;

S. 1735. An act to establish the United States Tourism Organization as a nongovernmental entity for the purpose of promoting tourism in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned;

S. 1834. An act to reauthorize the Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources;

S. 1873. An act to amend the National Environmental Education Act to extend the programs under the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities;

S. 1931. An act to provide that the United States Post Office and Courthouse building located at 9 East Broad Street, Cookeville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the ''L. Clure Morton United States Post Office and Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to recognize and encourage the convening of a National Silver Haired Congress; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 782. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to allow members of employee associations to repesent their views before the United States Government;

H.R. 1975. An act to improve the management of royalties from Federal and Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2739. An act to provide for a representational allowance for Members of the House of Representatives, to make technical and conforming changes to sundry provisions of law in consequence of administrative reforms in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3103. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve portability and continuity of health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets, to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in health insurance and health care delivery, to promote the use of medical saving accounts, to improve access to long-term care services and