of Regents of Oklahoma State University, was the former director of the University of Oklahoma Research Center, was a member of the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, and had been a trustee of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame.

As a cow calf operator from western Oklahoma, a former member of the Oklahoma State Legislature, and now a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I had the opportunity to deal with Ladd Hitch on many different issues both business and legislative. He was a man of integrity, drive, and vision. Ladd died on July 29, 1996, while attending the Oklahoma State Cattleman's Association in Oklahoma City at the National Cowboy Hall of Fame. The site of his death memorializes many of the greatest aspects of life. Ladd will be missed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TEEN DRUG USE SKYROCKETING UNDER CLINTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House once again, and I have been before the House before, to talk about the problem of drug and substance abuse and the problem with our young people in this country, and the problem of the drug epidemic across this Nation.

Tonight I want to again call to the attention of my colleagues these absolutely startling statistics that have come out within the last month about teen drug use skyrocketing, particularly in the years since 1992 to 1995, under this administration.

If we look at the overall drug use and abuse, particularly, again, among our teenagers, 12 to 17 years old, it is up 78 percent. Marijuana use, 1992 to 1995, is up 105 percent. LSD use, up 105 percent also. Cocaine use is up 166 percent.

Even in my area, a wonderful, calm, traditionally family-oriented area of central Florida, heroin use and abuse is skyrocketing, particularly among our young people. I am alarmed as a parent, I am alarmed as a father, and I am alarmed as an American about this trend.

It is easy to trace this trend. In the Clinton years, from 1992 to 1995, we saw the steps that led to this. First we saw the firing by the new President of two-thirds of the drug czar's staff. Then we saw the appointment of Joycelyn Elders, the chief health officer for the Nation, who said: Just say maybe; just say maybe try it.

We saw the dismantling of our drug interdiction efforts to stop drugs, cocaine and heroin, at the borders and at their sources, almost a total dismantling proposed by this administration.

And then finally, a great insult, we saw the lowering of the standards in the highest office in this land, the While House. The White House, which is supposed to set the standards, in fact, lowered the standards, and we saw the records of people being employed that were so bad that they had to institute a drug-testing program at the insistence of the Secret Service.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. This is the situation. What do we do about it? This Congress, this new majority, and I, as a parent and an American, think we must act. This Congress is taking steps. Under the leadership of this new majority, we are restoring money to the drug czar's office. We are working with a new drug czar to see that that is an effective office.

We know that we must fight drugs on four fronts: by education, interdiction, enforcement, and treatment; that we cannot, as this administration has said and proposed and done, just treat the wounded in battle. That is what we are doing by putting all of our sources and resources in treatment only.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to restore those funds, and we are going to make a four-pronged approach. We are going to lick this problem, but it is going to take everyone from the White House to the courthouse, every parent, every concerned citizen, and every Member of Congress to join this effort, because we are losing a generation. We cannot afford to lose our young people in this war on drugs. We must band together. This Congress must act in a positive fashion. We must approach this in a bipartisan manner. Then we can take back our children, we can take back our streets, we can take back our neighborhoods.

We have 1.6 million Americans incarcerated in this land. Seventy percent of them are in jails and prisons because of drug use and abuse. This is the problem we have created. This is the problem we need to address. We must join together to start with our young people and bring this drug epidemic facing our Nation and our youth under control.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your cooperation in this effort, and that of my colleagues.

DOLE-GINGRICH ECONOMIC PLAN CONTAINS TAX BREAKS MOSTLY FOR THE WEALTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The same folks who brought us the Government shutdown, the two Government shutdowns earlier this year and late last year, are back. Former Senator Dole and Speaker GINGRICH are bringing us a $500 billion economic package, have proposed a $500 billion economic plan tax break package, mostly for the wealthy, that will result in more cuts to Medicare, more cuts to student loans, more cuts to Medicaid, and more cuts to environmental programs.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at a bit of history as we discuss this Dole economic plan, and as we discuss the cuts in Medicare and what all of that means, and what that meant last year.

Last year the plan of the Speaker, the Gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], and Senator Dole was to give some $245 billion in tax breaks mostly for the wealthy, and they planned to pay for this plan by making $270 billion of cuts in Medicare and several billion, about $180 billion cuts in Medicaid, several billion worth of cuts in student loans, and several billion of cuts in environmental protection.

This $245 billion tax break mostly for the wealthy, which would result in the $270 billion in Medicare cuts, was the beginning of the unraveling of the Medicare Program. Let me quote what Speaker GINGRICH said about Medicare, and let me quote what then-Senator Dole said about Medicare.

Last October Speaker GINGRICH, speaking to a group of insurance executives, all of whom would benefit greatly from this dismantling of the Medicare Program, said, ''Now we didn't get rid of Medicare in round one, because we don't think that is politically smart. We don't think that is the right way to go through a transition. But we believe that Medicare is going to wither on the vine.''

The same day, speaking to another group, a group called the American Conservation Union, then-Senator Dole, who was leading the fight for the Medicare cuts in the Senate, said, ''I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, one of 12, because we knew it wouldn't work in 1965.''

Since that time, the same people that tried to, on the one hand, say they are here to try to defend Medicare and save Medicare, are attacking Medicare under their breath, attacking Medicare behind closed doors in Republican caucuses, and occasionally letting it slip and attacking Medicare in public.

One prominent member of the Committee on Ways and Means called Medicare socialized medicine. The majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], said that in a free society Medicare would not exist, whatever that means. Other prominent Republicans have labeled Medicare a program of socialism, a program that does not make sense for people, a program that we simply do not need.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that this crowd, GINGRICH, Dole, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ARMEY, the leadership of the Republican Party, not mainstream Republicanism, which most people in this country that are Republicans I think are more likely to believe in, and not the mainstream Republicanism that supported Medicare

in past decades, but this new extremist crowd of GINGRICH and ARMEY and the gentleman from Texas, TOM DELAY, and some of the other leaders in the other House are simply opposed to Medicare. They wanted it to wither on the vine. They bragged about voting against it.

It is pretty clear that this $245 billion tax cut they proposed last year and paid for by the $200-some billion tax cuts in Medicare are the way they can end the program of Medicare, end the programs of student loans, end some of the environmental protection measures.

□ 1615

That brings us to the point today, to the Dole program today he has proposed in the Presidential race. I might add that Senator Dole and his running mate, Mr. Kemp, came to the Republican Caucus today to talk about how they were going to pay for the major tax break, mostly for the wealthy, and talk about how they were going to do the Medicare cuts.

A few Republicans have stood up and been honest about what the Dole economic plan means. If you are going to provide $500 billion in tax breaks, mostly for the rich, then you are going to have to cut Medicare even more than then-Senator Dole and Speaker GINGRICH proposed last year. That simply means that if it was $270 billion in cuts in Medicare last year, they are going to propose even more cuts this year, once they are honest with the public.

What that really means is those senior citizens that are now paying $46 a month for Medicare premiums will have their premium at least doubled, to $90 or $100 or maybe $110 a month to pay for their premium. It also means that deductibles will be higher. It also means that copays will be higher. So that this party, this GINGRICH-Dole party that says they are against tax increases, clearly want to put this senior citizen tax on Medicare beneficiaries. It is not $46 a month, which is what it used to be, or $5 or $10 copayments, what it used to be, or $50 deductible, what it used to be. All of a sudden it is probably going to be double that in order to pay for this huge $500 billion in tax breaks, mostly for the wealthy.

At the same time they are going to go right at the heart of student loans and end the student loan program that students in this country have been accustomed to, raise the prices on other kinds of student loans and student grants, cut student grants and raise the prices on other student loans, and in order again to pay for this $500 billion boondoggle, mostly for wealthy taxpayers, to go after programs that protect the environment, something the American people clearly will not stand for.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to visit with the gentleman tonight and talk about this $548 billion tax cut that has become a political issue around the country. In fact I know the gentleman mentioned that Senator Dole was here today talking to the Republican leadership, and during that time I heard that he had mentioned that this whole campaign is about trust. I thought it was appropriate in that trust is important, whether you are running for the White House or Members of Congress or whatever elected office you have. But I noticed he wants us to believe that the $548 billion tax cut will not lead to higher budget deficits and increased interest rates.

The gentleman mentioned earlier that the tax cuts will not work without getting into social programs like Medicare and maybe Social Security. But let us look at history. The gentleman mentioned the $245 billion tax cut last year where Medicare was on the table to be cut. This year, at least this fall, nobody is talking about it on the Republican side because they want to wait until after the election before they come back and put that on the chopping block.

But since Senator Dole talked about it, this campaign is about trust. It is really kind of hard, with what you have said, to talk about trust when you see what happened last year with the $245 billion tax cuts and the $270 billion, even using their terminology, the $270 billion cut in growth in Medicare spending.

But again let us talk about that growth in Medicare spending. If you have 10 million, for example, people receiving Medicare today, and 5 years from now you have 25 million that may be expected, these are numbers we pick out of the air, and we are not planning for that growth, then it is a cut.

I know it is sometimes hard to explain that to folks. But let me mention today I saw in the New York Times the architect of the Reagan tax cut plan in the early 1980's, Murray Weidenbaum, said of Senator Dole's proposed tax cuts: Cutting income taxes alone is not going to energize the economy sufficiently to prevent a rise in the budget deficit.

This last Sunday on ''Meet the Press,'' another architect or budget adviser, Richard Darman, who worked under both Presidents Reagan and Bush, reminded us that Reagan had to raise taxes five times after enacting the very popular 1981 tax cuts to make up for that lost revenue, and we still had our debt and deficit mushroom in the 1980's, even after five tax increases, after 1981.

If my colleagues are building a campaign on trust, then let us look back at the past decade or two decades and see where that trust would be. I think the gentleman mentioned it, Senator D'AMATO mentioned that under the Dole plan, funding for such programs like Medicare would definitely be affected. In fact his quote is, he went so far as to say: ''I'm not running this year so I can say it and tell the truth.''

I do not think that is what people in America want when they talk about trust, when they talk about all of us want a tax cut but we also want to balance the budget.

Let me even quote another former U.S. Senator. Senator Warren Rudman from New Hampshire agrees when he says, ''Unless you are willing to do some major reforms in entitlements, there is no way you can do this.''

What is an entitlement? That is a word in Washington we use but in our districts, entitlements are Social Security, they are Medicare, they are programs that people depend on to make sure they can have the quality of life that they should have.

My concern is why is Senator Dole not telling the American people that that is what he wants to do for $540 billion in tax cuts, when they got burned last year by trying to do $245 billion, so they doubled it almost? And they are still going to attack Medicare, education, student loans. If you are building a campaign on trust, let us talk about that. Let us talk about it before November 5, instead of waiting until after a new Congress comes in, and then making those cuts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Retaking my time for 1 moment, to my friend from Texas, that is exactly the point. Last year they proposed $245 billion in tax breaks, mostly for the wealthy, and the way they wanted to pay for those tax breaks, cuts in Medicare, going right to the heart of cutting student loans, and cutting environmental programs, they could not do because the public rose up in opposition to it. This year Senator Dole, former Senator Dole, wants to give a tax break, again mostly to the wealthy, of twice that amount, but they are not telling us how they are going to pay for it. It is clear the only way they are going to pay for it is go twice as hard at Medicare, twice as hard at student loans and twice as hard at the environment. But they look at us and say, ''Trust me until after the election is over, we'll tell you after the election.'' It is clear what they are going to do, go after the same programs the public would not stand for in 1995 and 1996 which they shut down the Government over, saying if we cannot have our Medicare cuts we are going to shut down the Government. What is this crowd going to do? If Senator Dole wins the election and GINGRICH and the Republicans in the Senate take control, how are they going to run the Government then? Go right after Medicare, student loans, and the environment one more time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Going back, let me say something else about budget cuts, obviously Medicare and student loans, but they have to go to discretionary spending if they do not do entitlements. Some of that discretionary money is Border Patrol, the FBI, crime control, airline safety. There are a lot of programs that would be on the chopping block. But again they doubled the tax cuts they wanted

in 1995 and 1996, they could not get them, and in Texas we call that a pig in a poke. Our folks are not going to buy it, and that is what this is. This proposed $500 billion tax cut is a pig in a poke.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] was here in 1965 when Medicare was created. At that time, half the senior citizens of America had no health insurance. Today only 1 percent of senior citizens have no health insurance because of Medicare. Medicare clearly has worked. You look at what Speaker GINGRICH has said about Medicare, that he wants to see it wither on the vine, and those are his words, not mine. You look at what the next top-ranked Republican in Congress has said, Mr. ARMEY, that in a free society you would not have Medicare. You look at what one of the top Republicans in Ways and Means has said, he calls it socialized medicine. You look at what Senator Dole said. He said, ''In 1965 I was there fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, 1 out of 12, because it wouldn't work.'' It is clear when 99 percent of the elderly in this country have health insurance and can live the last years of their life with dignity knowing that most of their health care will be taken care of that it is a program that works. I resent, as I think everybody on this floor resents, the kind of talk that Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. ARMEY and some of the others have said when they belittle Medicare and belittle what it has done for people in this country.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. First of all, this is a very important discussion. Let me say as one who was here, as the gentleman said, when Medicare was created, one of the unintended results that has come out of Medicare is that old age is now much kinder than it used to be. It is much more humane than it used to be, and Medicare itself has lifted millions of older folks out of poverty. But one of the unintended results that we never dreamed would happen is it has created in the American economy an infrastructure that can take care of the particular needs of old people. That is what has done so much.

Medicare is going to have to make some changes to make sure that it is fiscally sound and in place for the people in the future. Those changes do not need to be radical. Essentially we need to get tough, effectively tough on cutting out the waste, fraud, and abuse. Then after we have done that, if there is any need to change the financing system, it should be changed. But we have a good program, it is very important that we maintain it, and it has really helped many millions of people in the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Florida. There have been efforts by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and me in the Committee on Commerce, and by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] to deal with the fraud questions, because we can save $80 or $90 billion in the next 7 years simply by attacking fraud, waste and abuse in a systematic way. That is the first step, not making these major cuts in Medicare in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments and for taking this special order out and for my friend from Florida, Mr. GIBBONS, who has been a champion for Medicare and for elderly people in this country today.

I would like to embellish a little, if I could, on what SAM GIBBONS has talked about and how important this is, and comments you made about how important this is to our seniors and what a difference it has made over a period of time since 1965 when it became law.

One of the things that has aggravated me in this debate the most was the fact that most people in politics and in the country do not seem to understand what the income level is of the people who are receiving Medicare today.

The Department of Labor study that Secretary Reich released about a year ago, within the last year, indicated that 60 percent of our seniors have income of $10,000 a year or less. That includes their Social Security and their annuity if they have one. Ten thousand dollars a year or less. That is why this is such an important and, as it turned out, volatile issue in American society today.

I have got a woman in my district, and she is a good friend of mine. I do not want to mention her name in this special order, but let me just put it this way. Margie is her first name. She was a riveter and made the B–29's that helped us win the Second World War. She is close to 80 years of age now. She worked all her life, helped us win the war and now she lives on her Social Security. After she gets done paying her rent, her Medicare, her medicine and her MediGap insurance, she has got $130 left for that month and that has got to go for food, for heating, for all her utility bills.

That is why we have fought so hard to make sure that people like her do not have to pay an extra $700 a year in the next 4 or 5 years for Medicare, because they cannot afford it. It is a huge part of their annual income.

Now we have got this proposal that Senator Dole and Mr. Kemp and Mr. GINGRICH have put together that would cut taxes 15 percent. But the problem with that is, besides most of it going to the folks, very folks at the top, is that it would either blow a big hole in our deficit, and we have brought this deficit down from $290 billion 4 years ago to $116 billion now. We have brought it down by 60 percent.

□ 1630

It is going to blow a big hole like we did during the eighties when we spent on defense and then cut the revenue out of the Government. Or the other option is you are going to have to cut from education and programs like Medicare.

So the approach that the President has suggested and we are suggesting, where you target your tax relief to education, $10,000 tax deduction or $1,500 credit for years 13 and 14 in school; you target it on kids; or on the sale of your home, so the middle class gets a capital gains relief. Those things are more modest, although each in themselves is a rather large component, but they are much more modest than an across-the-board cut, and they target people who need it.

So I thank my colleague for raising the issue of Medicare and how it fits into this debate. We are going to be there, protecting it, making sure it is solvent, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has talked to us about, and making sure that it is there for people. There is no reason why we cannot make sure that this program is there in the future.

We, as you have correctly pointed out, have taken two generations out of poverty when they became seniors because of Medicare in 1965, and your numbers are absolutely on the mark: 30–40 percent of the people in this country who became seniors went into poverty, before Medicare. Now that number is down considerably from that figure, and it has been a wonderful program for many, many people. We are going to do all we can to maintain its viability, its solvency, and make sure it is there for future generations.

I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would add, before yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], that it is important to keep in mind what he said when he talked about Marjorie in Macomb County, or I talked about people that I know in Lorraine or Medina or all over my district, that the proposal last year would have raised premiums, the monthly premium, from $46 to $85 or $90. It would have raised the deductible, now $250 a year, somewhat higher, and would have raised the copays, which are typically $5 or $10, to some higher amount.

What is important about that is that they were cutting Medicare $270 billion to pay for a tax cut of about that amount. Senator Dole proposes twice the tax break, again, mostly for the wealthy. Does that mean the premiums are going to go up from $46 to $110 or $120 or $130 a month? Does that mean that the deductible will go from $250 to $400 or $500, or the copays will go to $15 or $25? We do not know that. They are not telling us.

In order to pay for a tax break of $550 billion, it is pretty clear the Medicare premium is going to go well over $100 a month, and you are talking, what Mr. BONIOR said, that 60 percent of Medicare beneficiaries are living on less than $10,000 a year. While going from

$46 to $100 a month might not be very much for Mr. ARMEY, who talks about Medicare being socialism, or Mr. GINGRICH or Mr. Dole or a Member of Congress, it is a lot for somebody living on $10,000 a year.

I yield to my friend from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has done more to protect Medicare and fight these cuts and NEWT GINGRICH's ''wither on the vine.''

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentleman for what he said. I just wanted to follow up on what he and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] said.

It is amazing to me how the other party, the Republican leadership, keeps trying to talk about these changes in Medicare and these cuts in Medicare as if they do not really have an impact on real people. But they do.

When both of you were talking about some lower-income seniors, I had the best experience with that when I had a senior forum in 1995, at the time when the Republican leadership was talking about eliminating the Medicaid payment for Medicare part B. In other words, if you are below a certain income so that you are eligible for Medicaid, right now Medicaid pays your part B Medicare premiums, which is for your doctor bills, to pay for your insurance so your doctor bills are covered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, that $46 payment, if you are especially poor, that $46 payment the government will help you with so you can qualify for Medicare.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly. These were people that could not even afford to pay the $46 that the average person pays now for Medicare part B to pay for their doctor bills. Under the Republican proposal that was considered by this House, and actually passed by this House in 1995, that money would have been taken away. So essentially those really low income senior citizens would not have had Medicaid paying for that Medicare part B premium.

I was talking to people who could not afford to pay another $7 or $8 a month.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it is important to remember that the people that need help on paying their Medicare premium, the $46 a month, are not usually people that have been on welfare all their lives. They are usually people that have been working all their lives, that never made a lot of money, that want to live their last year in dignity.

I remember in the Committee on Commerce the gentleman and I and others worked on an amendment to at least, as bad as the Medicare bill overall was, to at least put that part of the Medicare law back into place, that Government would help those people that worked all their lives in perhaps minimum wage or slightly above, to help them with their Medicare premium, so they in fact would qualify for Medicare. If I recall, that was voted down on a party line vote because Speaker GINGRICH did not want it in the law.

Mr. PALLONE. Not only strictly party line, every Republican voted against it, but if you remember when it came to the floor, Speaker GINGRICH had said he was going to correct it and he never did. He actually came here one day in the well and said he was going to correct that, and it was not going to be in the bill when it came to the floor, and he never did.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I recall, he said he had corrected it initially. Then a staff person said, ''NEWT, come over here,'' and he explained he had not. And he ignored it and said, ''We will take care of it later.'' It has not been. Fortunately, a Presidential veto stopped it from happening.

Mr. PALLONE. We are primarily talking about widows, elderly women whose husbands had passed on and who did not have any pension or anything to pay their way, and were therefore eligible for this, what they called qualified Medicare beneficiaries.

I only mention that again by reference to the comments that the two of you have made, which is whenever you have these Medicare cuts, there is no free lunch. Essentially what it does is drive up costs in every other way.

You mentioned about the higher premiums for Medicare part B that were proposed by the Republicans in 1995. You mentioned the higher deductibles. You mentioned the higher copayments. But we also had this year, in 1996, actually as part of the budget that the Republicans passed in the spring, the idea of eliminating balanced billing.

In other words, essentially, if you decided you wanted to stay in traditional Medicare, you did not want to go into an HMO or managed care, under the present Republican budget for 1996, the one that passed in 1996, you could actually be charged an unlimited amount by the physician over and above what Medicare could pay.

So if it is not a question of a higher premium or a higher deductible then there are going to be overcharges. They basically have that right on the table now as we speak in 1996, that doctors can charge unlimited amounts over and above what Medicare could pay, now pays, if you stay in your traditional Medicare plan.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, taking back my time for a moment, the changes that Speaker GINGRICH and Mr. Dole put into the Medicare and Medicaid bill, will go the exact opposite direction of where we wanted to go in detecting fraud, waste, and abuse, rooting it out and eliminating it.

There is the balanced billing issue, there is the issue that allows a doctor, which is prohibited now under the law, but which they want to allow a doctor to be able to refer a patient to an MRI facility or some other diagnostic or clinical facility that the doctor owns, and then go ahead and charge the Government for the referral and the original visit, and then the diagnostic equipment and treatment at that center. It was one issue after another issue that they opened up to more fraud, waste, and abuse, in a system that already has 10 or 15 percent fraud, waste, and abuse.

The first thing we need to do with Medicare and Medicaid is not make cuts to pay for a tax break for a relatively small number of very wealthy people. The first thing we need to do is root out the waste, fraud and abuse. Then we can deal with the fiscal issues with Medicare. But do not charge senior citizens, raise their premium from $46 to $110 a year, and raise the deductibles and copays.

Mr. PALLONE. I wanted to raise three other instances. It is not just seniors that are going to end up paying more because of these cuts; the general public will as well. First of all, the fact, I do not think you mentioned it, you may have, the fact when you cut Medicare, and it is already happening, those that have supplemental insurance, most seniors carry supplemental, Medigap type insurance, the cost of that keeps going up.

I see the gentlewoman from Connecticut is here, who has been so much involved and taken a leadership role on this issue. In our States, New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut, Medigap insurance costs have gone up from 11 to 14 percent every year in the last few years, all time highs. A lot of that is attributed to the cuts in Medicare. If you cut Medicare, then you are going to see higher costs for your Medigap insurance.

Also in New Jersey, let me give you an example, most of the hospitals that I represent in my district rely on Medicare and Medicaid for a majority of their reimbursement, a majority of the money they are taking in. When there is a shortfall, either they close or they find some other way to pay for things. We have seen arise in uncompensated care. We actually have a tax, if you will, on uncompensated care, that we end up paying.

So the general public ends up paying for the difference too. Taxes and costs go up for the general public, because the hospitals are not getting the reimbursement rate they were previously getting. So it is not just seniors that are going to pay more. Everyone is going to pay more, and they are going to pay it in various ways that maybe are not as obvious, but they still end up paying.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I really am delighted to join with my colleagues tonight, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership on this effort. Just in listening to the conversation, there is not anyone who has suggested that we should not be looking at making the Medicare program a stronger program, a better program, in a variety of ways. No one has their head in the sand to say that hey, it is good. It was started in 1965, we have now insured 99 percent of seniors. In the past that was 46 percent of seniors

who had health insurance. But how do we go ahead and make it better?

My colleagues were talking about the issue of fraud and abuse. There is in the system, I have introduced legislation, others have introduced legislation, to try to correct that problem. We did not remove the monitoring mechanism and the way to make sure that these restrictions on fraud and abuse would be lifted, rather than to look at them and refine it, the whole issue of holding down the costs, because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say they are trying to hold costs down.

What is amazing to me is they only want to hold the costs down for America's seniors and for working families. You can hold the costs down, but in order to hold the costs down all over in the health care system, you have to hold the costs down in insurance companies, on hospitals, on doctors, on pharmaceutical companies, and everyone else. Why are we just singling out seniors to do that with, and thereby increasing their premiums and deductibles? They are not talking about doing anything about holding costs down in any other place in the system.

Also, another point, where they held up their trustees' report and talked about how the trustees said we had to fix the program, that was $90 billion. We voted here for a democratic bill that talked about $90 billion, the difference now between $90 and $270 and that tax break of $245 billion for the wealthiest Americans. Now Mr. Dole comes up here and he says to us that he wants a tax cut, and he is going to look at $600 billion in a tax cut, and we know through CBO and others about that potentially $300 billion in a cut for Medicare?

My point is that we know there ought to be changes, but the question is, and I know my colleagues have talked about this already, but the litany from the leadership on the other side of the aisle about fixing this program ought to put the fear of God into the public and give a sense of who can they trust on this issue? Mr. Dole, who talked about being proud of being 1 of 12 that he voted against Medicare because it was a program that did not work? Our colleague, BILL THOMAS, who not just a month ago on this floor talked about Medicare as a socialist system? The majority leader on the other side, saying that this is a program that he would not be part of in the free world? Mr. GINGRICH, talking about it withering on the vine? Mr. D'AMATO, from the other body, talking about how with this new Dole tax plan, that he believes and knows that there are going to have to be drastic cuts in the Medicare program?

It is a question of who do you trust to fix the program, a good program that could be made better. That is what this is about. And that is why I think it is an education process for the American people to understand this debate and truly know who wants to fix it, and who ultimately would like to see it done in to their peril.

So I thank my colleague for giving me the opportunity of having this conversation with all of you tonight on this issue.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank my friend from Connecticut, who has done such a marvelous job in showing leadership, in not just protecting Medicare against major budget cuts from Speaker GINGRICH and Mr. Dole, but also offering alternatives to strengthen Medicare and make it work for the next generation.

I would add on one thing to what the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, when she talked about holding down costs. Mr. GINGRICH, in talking about Medicare withering on the vine and Mr. Dole saying it would not work when he voted against it 30 years ago, and Mr. THOMAS calling it socialized medicine, and on and on and on, they want to increase costs to senior citizens. They want to double the premiums and copays and deductibles. But they really see Medicare as sort of a piggy bank, that you have this big pot of money, a slush fund or piggy bank, whatever term you want to use.

□ 1645

Medicare is a big program. A lot of money goes through Medicare every year in taking care of tens of millions of seniors' health care. What has happened is they first want to raid this piggybank or slush fund to the tune of $270 billion in tax breaks, mostly for the rich. Now that Mr. Dole has proposed a bigger tax break, they want to cut it even more.

Mr. Speaker, they also want to raid it in another way, and that is some of the programs they have, so that Medicare does in fact wither on the vine. Mr. GINGRICH has proposed something called medical savings accounts, which allows insurance companies to raid this piggybank or raid this slush fund.

It is no secret or it is no coincidence, I should say, that, when Mr. GINGRICH made his little speech about Medicare withering on the vine when he said we did not get rid of Medicare in round one because we did not think it was politically smart to do that, and we do not think it is the right way to go through a transition, but we believe it is going to wither on the vine. When Mr. GINGRICH said that back in October of 1995, he was speaking to a group of insurance company executives, all of whom will benefit from his Medicare plan.

So, first of all, he takes money out of Medicare to go to a tax break for the richest Americans. Then the money that is left in Medicare will not be spent on senior citizen health care to the same degree that it is now. The money that is left, much of it will go to those insurance companies for bigger profits and more money for them.

So we see already a declining amount of money in Medicare as a result of the Gingrich tax breaks for the rich. We see a further diminishing of this Medicare pot that should go to people like Margie in Macomb County, or people like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] was talking about. Instead of going to them, it is going to insurance executives. It is going to the people at Golden Rule, in Indiana, to the Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Those are the people that Mr. GINGRICH was speaking to that day. It is one thing after another that way.

Mr. Speaker, the reason Medicare will wither on the vine under the Gingrich plan is he will cut the amount of money in it with the tax breaks. We will see more of the health care dollars going to insurance companies so that senior citizens will have even less, and then the system literally does wither on the vine.

He was speaking correctly when he said it would wither on the vine under his proposal. He was not lying to the American people if he gets his way. But he is not going to get his way because the four of us and dozens of others in this body will continue to fight that. The President will continue to fight that. Clearly, the American people have been on our side because the Republicans shut the Government down in order to give this big tax break and make Medicare cuts.

So it is clear that the more people know about the Gingrich-Dole plan on Medicare, that they want to double premiums and increase copays and increase deductibles, the more the people will be unhappy about it.

I yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. I also wanted to say, I know the gentleman mentioned Medicaid as well, and we talked about that a little, and the same phenomena, particularly by reference to what it means for people other than seniors, their children and grandchildren. A part of the Republican leadership strategy from the beginning has been to also cut back on Medicaid, and the majority of the money in Medicaid right now pays for nursing home care. So, again, it primarily deals with taking care of the health care needs of the senior citizens.

We fought a very hard battle, you and each of the four people and the others that spoke here this afternoon, in trying to make sure that Medicaid was not cut back and also that it was not block granted. If it was block granted and it was cut significantly, I think what you would have seen essentially is that the States, in taking on more responsibility and relaxation of Federal standards and Federal requirements, basically would have shifted more and more of the Medicaid burden, the nursing home burden, if you will, to children, to spouses, to grandchildren.

Right now, as we all know and we have talked about this before, a State cannot go after a spouse for certain purposes. They cannot take their home. They cannot take their car. They have to leave them a certain

amount of living expenses if one's spouse is in a nursing home. They cannot go after children or grandchildren to pay for Medicaid nursing home expenses. But the Republican legislation that was before the House last year and again this year basically would have eliminated those requirements and allowed the States to go after those people in order to recover costs.

So what we would have seen is the cuts in Medicaid to finance these tax breaks primarily for wealthy individuals. More of the costs would have been shifted to the spouse, who is still living at home, to the children, to the grandchildren. Again, there is no free lunch. The end result of that would have been hardship for those people, hardship for children who instead of paying college costs, which are a big burden for them, for their children, would end up having to pay for nursing home care for their parents.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of shifting of costs that really bothers me. The other side of the aisle, GINGRICH and the Republican leadership, they want to give the impression that we can make these cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and it is not going to matter. It is not a big deal.

They keep saying we are really only cutting the growth, we are not doing anything that will harm anybody. But it has a direct impact in the shifting of costs not only to the senior citizens but also to their families. That is what I think we fought very hard against and we have to keep fighting for.

Mr. BONIOR. Would the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman makes a very good point. We are not talking here about something that will affect just seniors in this country, as he has so eloquently just stated. We are talking about the family who has kids coming up and maybe want to go to college, and they have aging parents who may need nursing home care or who may be on Medicare. When these things occur at that level of reduction, for our parents and our grandparents who are 65 and older, and who may need nursing home care and need that Medicaid payment, then those responsibilities and those pressures and those demands fall on people that are basically our age here who have kids and then who have parents who are getting up there in age.

That financial pressure is just quite incredible not only financially but mentally as well, the stress of having to make that decision whether you are going to send your son or daughter to college or you are going to take care of your parent.

Mr. Speaker, this was something that occurred on a very regular basis prior to 1965, before we had Medicare, before we had a Medicaid program in this country. What was occurring is when elderly people got ill, either their kids basically took care of them or they had to live in poverty. So what we are trying to do here is keep all the units of the family solvent. We are talking about kids who want to go to school. We want to support the student loan program. They wanted to cut it back.

We are talking about elderly parents who may need nursing home care. We want to make sure that it is there for them in terms of Medicaid. They wanted to repeal the whole program, not only repeal the program but do away with the regulations that allowed our parents and grandparents who may have to have nursing home care to live with some sense of dignity, where they are not tied up, where they are not gagged or fed improperly or abused, as they were prior to the government making regulations to stop this sort of abuse of our parents and grandparents.

So the gentleman from new Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is right on in terms of dealing with this question of the burden of leadership shift, and it will shift dramatically, as it has in instances already, to those folks at home who have children and who have aging parents as well.

Ms. DELAURO. If the gentleman would yield just on that point.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is so clear. Nursing home care and what the proposal was with regard to Medicaid really gets into the heart and soul of what families are struggling with today.

It is a very difficult decision to send a loved one to a nursing home. You make it with a sense of, am I doing the right thing for my elderly grandparents or parents; am I making the right decision for them, for me; what happens with my children?

And this whole Medicaid proposal that says the money goes to the State, States will make a determination and make a choice between whether or not they spend their Medicaid dollars on children or on seniors in nursing homes. They were going to remove the national standards on nursing home care, as has been pointed out, put the burdens on spouses and adult children.

Once again it was turned around. Suppose we find ourselves in a situation where our parent, if this went through, if we were not able to hold it back this time around, that the family would then, having made the decision of putting someone in a nursing home, have to take the person back into their home. What kind of cost is that? What kind of help do I provide——

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentlewoman would yield. The cost is about $39,000 a year for nursing home care. It is a phenomenal cost.

Ms. DELAURO. It really is. I went to speak to the Milford Senior Center yesterday. They have their club today. There were about 200 people. And we were talking about this, and we were talking about the nursing home care. After it, a woman came up to me. She says, you know, she says, I rely on the nursing home. My husband is there.

It was a very tough decision for her to put her husband in the nursing home. She said: He is getting wonderful care and they are taking good care of him. And she says: I would not be able to do that, I cannot do that if something should jeopardize all of that.

That is what we were looking at. And, quite frankly, my concern is that we beat that battle back one time. It was the American public, the outrage of the American public on what was going to happen. Now we listen to people over and over again coming back and talking about the same things again; that they are not——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The same thing, only worse, I would add, because now the tax break mostly for the wealthy is twice the size Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. DOLE originally planned, which means, I guess, they will not tell us, but we have to figure it will mean twice as large a cut in student loans, twice as large a cut in the environment and twice as large a cut in Medicare or Medicaid or twice as large an increase in premiums, deductibles and co-pays. They simply will not tell us.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. This goal of the Gingrich-Dole-Kemp plan here is indeed a bridge to the past, to pick up on a metaphor that has been thrown around the last few weeks. They are reaching deep into the past to a day where we did not have Medicare for our grandparents, where we did not have Medicaid that would take care of nursing homes, or we do not have help for our students.

It is quite bizarre, especially given the fact that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle consider themselves the epitome of futurism, the futurist ideas that they were espousing at the beginning of the Congress. And yet where do they want to take us? They want to take us way back when the security for the family was nonexistent basically in this country, in many ways.

So it is very, very perplexing. What we need to do is build on the programs that we have, streamling them, making them more efficient but making sure that they are there so that people will have the opportunity to lead productive and good lives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Think about the programs, and there are certainly Government programs that have wasted dollars and Government programs that have not worked, but think of the two programs we are talking about most today, a couple or three programs, Medicare and student loans.

Medicare has lifted millions of the elderly out of poverty in the last decade or two or three of their lives. Student loans have provided opportunities for millions of middle class families to send their children to college.

Both programs obviously can use some adjustment, but it is clear from what Mr. Dole's campaign manager said, Senator D'AMATO said, what Mr. Kemp, what Mr. Dole, Mr. GINGRICH

said, that they really want to eliminate these programs in the next decade. They are two programs that work so very well for middle class America, for poor America, for everybody.

Mr. BONIOR. On top of that, let me tell my colleagues what is especially disturbing to me. I remember picking up maybe 18 months ago the first volume of the Progress in Freedom Foundation's newsletter, that is the foundation founded by the Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH. And in their newsletter, actually it was more of a newspaper as opposed to a newsletter, I remember vividly reading the headlines. And it was, for heaven's sake eliminate Social Security.

That is where they are going next. That is where they are headed next. And they have already got their think tanks working, they are already talking about it. And we told, folks, that they were coming after Medicare. And the proof is in their own words as we have mentioned here on several occasions this evening in this 1 hour special order: wither on the vine, proud to have voted against it, no place in the free world. And now they got folks working on getting rid of the Social Security System.

□ 1700

It has been a lifesaver for people in this country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There are the intellectuals, quote unquote, in the Gingrich revolution that sit over at the Heritage Foundation or sit over in their ivory towers and somewhere around the Capitol in one of these really fancy buildings and think up all these great ideas and are totally out of touch with Margie in Macomb County and totally out of touch with the woman that Ms. DELAURO talked about, that have real problems, living on $8,000 a year, that struggle, that were able to send their kids to college on student loans, that need their Social Security, that use Medicare in the last couple of decades of their lives. They are coming up with these ideas and then these are the ideas they are trying to foist on the American people out of some think tank. The Social Security, Medicare, student loans, we are going to keep fighting for it because those are important and those have made millions of Americans who have brought them into the middle class and kept them in the middle class. That is what all of us should be here for.

Mr. PALLONE. I just wanted to follow up. It is funny you are talking about these Washington think tanks. I was just harking back to during the August district work period when we were not in Washington, I had a lot of senior forums. Over and over again, I just got these commonsense approaches from the seniors in my district about what to do to improve Medicare. And they all talked about long-term care, preventative measures.

In New Jersey, we have with the casino revenue fund. We refinance a program where if you are below a certain income, I think it may be probably close to $20,000 now for a two-family household, where if you are below that income, the casino revenue money pays for your prescription drugs. You have to pay like $5, but then you get the rest of the prescription drug for free, paid for with the casino money.

Also the State has experimented, I know other States have as well, with home health care. In other words, where over and above Medicare right now, they will pay for a certain type of home health care cost on an experimental basis. All the seniors kept telling me the whole time is, why are you guys talking about these negative changes, if you will, that the Republicans are proposing on Medicare. Why not think of some positive ways to save money through prevention or through dealing with long-term care problems. And it is true. There is no question that in New Jersey, once that prescription drug benefit came into play with the casino revenue money, which we were fortunate to have, that it saved a lot of money for people that did not have to be hospitalized or did not have to be placed in nursing homes or boarding homes. And the same with the home health care.

They have personal care, attendant service for certain people that come in so that they can stay in their apartment or stay in their house. Over and over again, studies have been done for the House of Representatives, for various committees, that show if you move in that direction, that ultimately you will save money because you prevent institutionalized care, which is so much more expensive. We do not hear about that from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They just want to talk about scrapping Medicare, having it wither on the vine.

Ms. DELAURO. That is such a relevant point, because what all of the data indicates is that the point was, in terms of health insurance, that you spread the risk so that the more people who are insured and who are covered, that is the way that you bring costs down. When you are operating in 2 systems, if you will, with people who have it and people who do not have it, people who do not have it get their health care from somewhere and that cost does not go into a vapor. Everybody else who does have it picks up that cost.

So the whole point has been, how do we get more people insured to lower the cost of health care. What we ought to be doing is thinking about that future, of insuring more people. We have only one system today where 99 percent of the population are covered, and that is Medicare for seniors.

And one of the items on the agenda, the Families First agenda that the Democrats have proposed for implementing after January 1 is to see if we can try to insure children from zero to 13 so that we have got another pool of people covered for insurance, again, to give parents the peace of mind that they have the opportunity to get insurance for their kids and make that more affordable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And to ultimately save money so the 12-year-old child with the cold will go to the family doctor rather than waiting until she is sicker and going to an emergency room.

Ms. DELAURO. So the point is, where do we need to go, as my colleague from New Jersey said, with regard to improving Medicare. We need to look at home health care, which can save us money. We need to look at the cost of prescription drugs to bring that cost down. What is it, what is it in the mindset that says, let us unravel the one system that we have that is approaching coverage of most of the population, thereby holding the cost down and not build on it but rather unravel it and go back to where it is helter-skelter, when we ought to be moving in the direction of trying to cover more and more people today who are without insurance and to look at preventative measures. It is, as our colleague from Michigan said, it is a bridge to the past and not the bridge to the future that we need to be making in order to assure affordable good quality health care for everyone in this country.

Mr. BONIOR. I will try to answer your question in terms of the mindset. It is the same mindset that denies proper labor guarantees in this country so people can bargain and organize in this country. It is the same mindset that, because of that, allows the society to become one that hires people who are temporary employees. The largest employer in the country is temporary manpower services now.

It is the same mindset that has these folks working in our society without health insurance, without any pensions, certainly without any pension portability, and without many of the other benefits that were fought for, gained, and took us successfully, at the conclusion of the Second World War, into a very productive, most productive period in our history during the 1950's and 1960's.

There is a huge retrenchment, there is a huge bridge to the past, pre-World War II, pre-1930's, and it is very, very scary. It is very, very scary. Where the protections of working men and women in this country are gone and the educational opportunities for our young people are becoming harder and harder to realize. And of course this assault on our seniors, their attacks on Medicare and Medicaid, and eventually, I predict, Social Security, if they are continued in power. So it is something that is worth fighting for, that we have fought for and will continue to do so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think, in summary, we have a couple more minutes, thinking about the bridge to the future and making the student loan program, particularly the direct loan program, work, make it available to people, make Medicare continue to improve

Medicare and Medicaid so that we can deal with the increasing costs but continue to cover people and continue to give people, lift people out of poverty, as we have done, contrasted with this bridge to the past that we have talked about where we do not want to go back to the days when, before the GI bill, when there were not opportunities for middle-class families to send their children or themselves to college.

We do not want to go back prior to the 1930's, when there was not a Social Security Program. We do not want to go back to the period before 1965, when there was not Medicare or Medicaid, when 50 percent, 54 percent, I guess, of senior citizens in this country had no health insurance prior to the mid-1960's, and now only 1 percent has no health insurance. There is no reason to go back. That is why we need to look forward.

I think the commitment, certainly from all four of us and many others here, is to continue to improve Medicare, continue to improve Medicaid, continue to improve the direct loan program, student loans overall, student grants, to take care of the elderly and to protect our natural resources by good environmental protection measures and to continue to give students opportunities, middle-class families, poor kids, give them opportunities that they can produce and they can give back to society.

I think that is what we are asking, and it is a rejection of these tax breaks for the rich to make all of these cuts in programs that matter, Medicare, student loans, environment, but instead to make these programs more efficient, make them work, bridge to the future so that students will have that opportunity so all of us can grow together.

I thank my friends from New Jersey, Michigan, and Connecticut.

WHITE HOUSE TASK LIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to talk about a document that was recently provided, very belatedly, by the White House to the Congress, a document now referred to as the task list. It is dated December 13, 1994, but it was just provided to the Congress in recent days. The task list shows 39 scandals that the White House staff in the West Wing, taxpayer supported staff, decided that they needed to work on because there was now going to be a Republican Congress. This memo was prepared just after the November 1994 elections.

I would like to read just briefly the scandals that the White House decided that it needed to task its own staff to work on. Some of these scandals are, of course, well known to the American people, but other scandals have only recently become known, even though this memo was written on December 13, 1994.

No. 1, Foster document handling. We will return shortly to the specifics contained in this memo on each of these. There are several admissions of illegality in this very memo.

Travel Office. We know all about Travelgate, of course. That has become a major scandal just as they predicted in here.

White House-Treasury contacts. Of course, we know about the illegal contacts between senior political appointees at the Department of the Treasury and the White House, tipping off the President, giving a heads up to the President and Mrs. Clinton about the criminal referral of the Whitewater matter.

Obstruction of justice, I am reading this from the White House internal memo, obstruction of justice re DOJ handling of criminal referrals. Use of White House resources for response efforts. Of course, that is what this memo is all about, but that is one of the scandals that is listed here. This entire memo is devoted to how to spin the press about the various scandals.

Foster suicide. Espy. Of course we know that Mr. Smaltz was assigned as an independent counsel to investigate the Mike Espy ethics question. We know about the criminal problems with Tysons there. Henry Cisneros, Ron Brown, Hubbell. Of course, we all know about the next top ranking man at the White House right underneath the Attorney General, Webster Hubbell, who is now in jail.

Ickes, union representation. And of course with Coia and all that ABC News has done on this scandal just in recent days, we now know why in 1994 they were worried about that.

Stephanopoulos, Nation's Bank. Again, this is a White House memo that they prepared secretly inside the White House using taxpayer resources and in the White House counsel's office, which they should not have been doing. That is not appropriate use of taxpayer funds. They have listed all of these scandals that they wanted to innoculate against and spin the press about.

The Stephanopoulos-Nation's Bank story was of course what the press widely described as a sweetheart, below market mortgage for George Stephanopoulos, the kind of deal that ordinary Americans could not get.

□ 1715

State Department passport files; another Clinton administration scandal that we are so familiar with.

Archives abuse of personal system. This is one scandal that they have not fully disclosed to us and that we will find out more about.

The Legal Defense Fund, and of course we know all about the ethical problems that the President encountered there, soliciting funds for the Legal Defense Fund when such solicitation is, in fact, in violation of the law.

The Health Care Task Force, and of course we know that that resulted in litigation against Hillary Rodham Clinton's task force. We know that a Federal judge ruled against the task force, and found that it was put together in violation of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and that documents were withheld from the public and from Congress when they should not have been.

Now there are 39 of these scandals that White House staff—there is a name of a White House staffer right after each one of these, after each one of these scandals, and they were all assigned and presumably are all still working at taxpayer expense on preventing the Congress from getting to know all of the facts in these things.

White House operations, drugs, passes, helicopters, and does that not ring a bell for so many of us? Each of those scandals, drugs in the White House, the passes being given to people without personnel clearances, the misuse of helicopters which resulted in the termination of White House staff; this is next on the White House, the Clinton, list of scandals that they were working on secretly in the White House.

Residence renovations. This is one that they believed was a potential scandal, but the American people do not yet know about it. We have just received this document.

Presidential immunity. Well, of course, we know that that is all having to do with the Paula Jones litigation, Paula Jones having sued the Governor of Arkansas for acts in his capacity, not as Governor but as a private individual apparently abusing the office, at least according to the allegations in the complaint, and the President has used not outside lawyers but taxpayer supported lawyers to make sure that his private civil litigation could be put off until afterward. This is, by the way, something that the courts have now reversed on and they have decided that President Clinton cannot put this off, but he has successfully put it off beyond the election.

White House Arkansans, Thomasson, Nash, Rasco; need we say more?

PIC surplus.

Improper electioneering at the SBA.

Now these are all admissions by the Clinton White House to themselves within the White House internally of what they were doing wrong.

GSA.

Value Partners. Now Value Partners was, of course, the partnership that Hillary Rodham Clinton invested in. Rather than putting their funds in a blind trust, they did not do so like President Bush did, like President Reagan did, like President Carter did; rather, ran their own investments, and Hillary Rodham Clinton was a partner in Value Partners, a hedge fund which sold short pharmaceutical stocks at a time that the pharmaceutical stock market was falling through the floor because of the Hillary Rodham Clinton