



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1997

No. 135

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, October 3, 1997, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1997

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PEASE].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 2, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, director, Lutheran Social Services of Virginia, Fairfax, VA, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, You have placed us in a world of space and time, and through the events of our lives You bless us with Your love.

Make us all mindful of the swift and certain passage of time, not only the ticks of the clock, but the sweep of the years.

We acknowledge that time is Your gift to each of us. We pray, let us all accept Your gift of time, the hours of this day, the days of this month, the months of this year, and the years of our lives with gratitude, using the gift wisely in the cause of peace and goodwill to all.

O God, let us use our time for blessing rather than cursing, for thanks-

giving rather than complaining, for caring rather than gaining, and for giving rather than conserving.

May we know Your presence in our lives. May we see Your love in our surroundings, and may we live with joy in this moment. Amen.

THE JOURNAL OF TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the unfinished business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Tuesday, September 30, 1997.

The question is on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

THE JOURNAL OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of Wednesday, October 1, 1997, and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BALLENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2267. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2267) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GREGG, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Ms. MIKULSKI, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1179. An act to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H8301

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE, PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND
REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRA-
NEOUS MATERIAL IN THE CON-
GRESSIONAL RECORD TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 30, 1997, THROUGH
TODAY

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for Tuesday, September 30, 1997, Wednesday, October 1, 1997, and for today, all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks."

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
OCTOBER 6, 1997

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS
BOARD

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the testimony presented last week in the Committee on Education and the Workforce and in other recent hearings makes it apparent that the National Labor Relations Board is an out-of-control Government bureaucracy.

Under the direction of the current Chairman and general counsel, the Board appears to be liberally interpreting the law and appears in many cases to be getting involved in labor disputes in order to promote the agenda of organized labor.

In our committee last week, hard-working business people spoke about the questionable NLRB actions in labor disputes and testified that the Board ignores illegal union tactics which result in substantial cost to the employers and disruptions and uncertainty in the workplace. The Board's conduct also allows unions to harass companies until they give in and agree to rep-

resentation, despite the wishes of the employees.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should rightfully be concerned that the National Labor Relations Board is not acting as a neutral referee in labor disputes as required by law. This behavior should be unacceptable to anyone who values the traditional concepts of fairness and balance in the labor-management relations in the United States.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

[Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FRUSTRATIONS OF DOING THE
PEOPLE'S BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today, I have to say, a bit saddened by some of the events that have occurred this past week. I came to Congress in 1994, and like many of us who came here, we had never been in government before, certainly had not been in Federal Government service before, and I have to say over the past 3 years I have had a wonderful opportunity to see the way that Government works, to see the way that Congress works, to see the way Washington, DC, works, and there have been a lot of highlights.

I have seen a lot of good, decent people on both sides of the aisle who care about this country, who care about their children's future, and who believe that America can do better, and I have been very proud to serve here. I think most Americans who, like me, had really just gotten their news from sitting on the couch watching TV their whole lives would be pleased if they came up here and saw a lot of things that happened. But regrettably, as is in

any profession, there are some who do not really carry themselves with as much dignity as others.

I have to say, this past week I was deeply saddened by some of the events that occurred on this floor during debates regarding a seat in California, and it was Ms. SANCHEZ'S seat, and it had to deal with the challenge that Bob Dornan was placing on Ms. SANCHEZ.

Just putting aside the facts of this case, what bothered me the most was that there were several Members on the Democratic side that came up and chose to use race as an issue, and they have been using race as an issue over and over again. In fact, I think it would be safe to say, and I saw some journalists report that their activities could be described as race-baiting, basically calling anybody who followed the Los Angeles Times observations and who followed the observations by the House panel on this election, suggesting that anybody that raised tough questions about this election somehow was racist against Hispanics. I have to say, all we have to do is wave the race flag and one does cause a lot of people to retreat.

The reason I come to the floor today not retreating is because, regrettably, I think this is just another tactic by a very scared minority, the Democrats, political minority, who are trying to do their best to change the subject instead of changing America for the better or instead of changing the law for the better.

The Los Angeles Times reported early on about this election that the corruption and the vote-buying and the number of illegal aliens voting was so widespread that one of Mr. Dornan's opponents, not Ms. SANCHEZ, but one of Mr. Dornan's opponents, actually held a raffle for a car for illegal immigrants and told illegal immigrants that if they signed up for this raffle, all they had to do was vote, and the winner of this raffle would win a new car. And so the gentleman, the illegal immigrant that joined this, actually entered a raffle, voted illegally in the election, and then won a car because of it, according to Los Angeles Times reports.

There have also been documented up to 350 to 400 illegal immigrants voting in this election, with the possibility of many more voting, but regrettably, because the Justice Department has not moved swiftly enough, this matter continues to drag out.

But I guess what it highlighted to me was a continuing trend, and it was a trend to obstruct justice, politically obstruct justice, instead of seeing to it that the American people found out what was going on, and of course this is happening in campaign finance debates across Washington and across America. Every time somebody is charged with a new crime or a possible crime, or every time the news media comes out and attacks somebody for questionable behavior, they immediately turn around and try to change the subject.

This morning's New York Times writes, on the front page, top headline:

"Democrats Used State Parties To Bypass Limits." Over \$32 million was sent to local and State officials for the Democratic party to illegally, possibly, counteract FEC laws. This is a violation. So what happens? What do they do? They immediately change the subject and say, let us talk about campaign finance reform. This has been happening for some time.

On September 10 of this year, the headline for The New York Times said, "Democrats Give \$2 Million to Candidates, Records Show." Down below, a Democratic party contributor said, whoever did this should go to jail. This is illegal, and they knew it.

Yet, all we have heard are member after member of this party come to the microphone and do procedural motions to adjourn and all of these other things that are supposed to delay us from doing the business of the people's House, which is costing American taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars, if not more, and none of them will step up to the microphone and say, I am very concerned about the abuses and the laws broken that have been reported in The New York Times or The Washington Post; I am very concerned that American democracy may have been influenced by illegal foreign money; I am very concerned that the Chinese Communists have their top leaders sketch out a plan on how to influence elections in America. We do not hear that. Instead, we just hear people changing the subject.

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee last year, it was reported a week ago, admitted arranging access for donors, and what he did in one case, one particularly offensive case, is he used his power as chairman of the Democratic National Committee to get an international fugitive an audience with the White House because this international fugitive said that he was going to give the White House \$300,000.

Now, how did he do it? The first thing he did was, he called the international fugitive and they set up a dinner. Then the international fugitive said, I am having trouble getting into the White House because the National Security Council will not let me in the White House because I am an international fugitive. That seems to make sense to me.

Well, the Democratic National Committee chairman then, according to his own notes and records, then called the CIA, this is unbelievable, using our Central Intelligence Agency for political purposes to get an international fugitive into the White House to meet the President of the United States. They called the Central Intelligence Agency, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and told the CIA to call the Committee on National Security to get them into the White House.

Now, of course what happened? The international fugitive did get to the White House. His name is Mr. Tamraz.

He gave the White House \$300,000, because he wanted to get a pipeline overseas.

□ 1015

Now when the DNC chairman was asked by the Senate panel on whether he did try to get an international fugitive into the White House by using the CIA, by calling "CIA Bob," as he called him, he said, and this is no surprise, he said, "I have no memory of any conversations with the CIA."

It seems this amnesia trend is sweeping Washington, and I think if we mix a subpoena with Washington tap water and media requests for interviews, all of the sudden people's memory starts to go. I could sort of refresh his recollection by simply using his own words. When he was meeting with an international fugitive, in the notes of the meeting with the international fugitive he wrote, "Go to CIA." And that is the Democratic National Committee chairman Donald Fowler's handwritten note reminding himself to go to CIA to intervene on behalf of an international fugitive for Democratic National Committee fundraising. "Go to CIA."

And, Mr. Speaker, this guy says "I don't remember." Now, I believe, and call me crazy, but I believe if I am chairman of the Democratic National Committee and an international fugitive comes to me and says, "I want to go to the White House and give the President \$300,000," and then I picked up the phone and probably called the Central Intelligence Agency and spoke to Bob. He is on a first-name basis with CIA Bob. And then said, "Bob can you help the National Security Council understand the need to give this international fugitive an audience with the President of the United States?" And I broke arms at the National Security Council and it eventually happened, I think I would remember.

I do not know how many laws were broken here, I think probably an awful lot, but I would remember. And yet we hear time and time again, "I have no recollection." "I have no memory." And I think I really do need to introduce a bill called the National Amnesia Relief Act that would somehow study the effect of water and subpoenas on Washington, DC, officials, because I have got to tell my colleagues, amnesia is sweeping the Capital this year like never before.

Mr. SALMON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. One gentleman who never has a problem remembering is the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], a good friend of mine, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more worthy project to pursue than a national study on the effects of the Potomac water on the brain, because apparently amnesia is running rampantly through this place.

Let me just make a couple of comments. First of all, the gentleman talked about this last week and the

idea that there was a lot of race-baiting going on; that whenever the other side, the Democrats, seem to be losing an argument, they always throw out this trump card that purportedly gives them the upper hand, and that is to call us racist when they are losing on the merits of the argument.

I found that same thing to happen just the other night when we were about to adjourn and we were trying to get through the work, and that we had scheduled to do yesterday, and they got up and raised the issue several times that we were not concerned about the Jewish Members of this body. It was a very, very special Jewish holiday and it was fast approaching, and they wanted to know why we terrible racists over on the other side, or anti-Semites, would not be more sensitive to the needs of these Members of Congress, when they themselves were moving every time they got a chance to adjourn, knowing full well that it would take up extra time, knowing full well that it would cause those Jewish members of this body to miss or to be late for this holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is despicable. We were doing everything that we could to try to get through, and they were pursuing these dilatory tactics time and time and time again, and yet the American public lets them get away with this.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time just for one moment, I thought what was so telling about yesterday's episode, and I didn't bring that up. I thought the race-baiting a few nights ago was bad, but yesterday they raised the ugly specter of anti-Semitism and that somehow we were unfeeling toward the Jews to observe this very, very holy holiday, which of course we were not, and they knew it. But it was, again, win at all costs, which concerns me.

I thought it was very telling at the end of that debate that we had a very honorable Jewish gentleman from New York, a Democrat, stand up and plead. He pleaded.

Mr. SALMON. With his own people.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. He pleaded with his own Members of his own party, "Please, let us enter into an agreement with the majority leader." It was a good agreement. He said it was a fair agreement and it was the best way for us to move forward to do the people's business, but at the same time respect one of the holiest of all holidays for the Jewish people.

Unfortunately, the goodness and decency of the Jewish Member from New York was ignored by other Democrats who, I guess, regretfully saw this as an opportunity to gain political advantage.

Again, it was a very sad moment. But I thought the gentleman showed a lot of courage, and I must say that an overwhelming majority of the Democrats agreed with him and agreed with us, agreed with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] and agreed with us that this was a good idea.

Regretfully, we had Democrats, and I have not seen it in 3 years since I have been here, we had Democrats screaming at each other, yelling and fighting. Obviously, we had Jewish Members who were concerned that other Members may not have been as sensitive as they should have been. I saw it going on and I was saddened by it.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I think it was interesting to note that yesterday, and one does not have to be a math teacher to figure this out. I think my son who is in remedial math in the third grade could figure this one out. If we would have not had all of the dilatory tactics pursued by the Democrats yesterday, the motions to adjourn every time they got a chance to stand up, we would have been done by 12 o'clock. As it stood, because of all of the dilatory tactics that they employed yesterday, we did not finish until, what was it, 3:00 or 3:30?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time again, we actually finished at about 3 o'clock. We started to calculate the dilatory tactics that they have taken over the past month and how much it would cost the American taxpayers, and it is a remarkable number.

Now, they have that right. And let me just say right here, right now, the rules of this House allow Members to do that. And if they do that, that is their business. That is fine. If they want to delay for their own political agenda, that is their constitutional right and it is their right under the rules of this House.

But do not tell me when delaying from allowing Members to get home, delaying us to do the people's business, do not tell me that I am being insensitive in keeping people here when it is their dilatory tactics that are more responsible.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, it reminded me painfully of a time in my young life when I had a very, very traumatic experience. I remember when I was a little boy and my brother and his friends were playing in the living room and they broke a very, very special vase that was very, very important to my mother. And, frankly, they framed me for it.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. That has happened.

Mr. SALMON. I was the one who got blamed for breaking this vase, and my father came home, and I said, "Daddy, I didn't do it. I didn't do it." Well, he did not believe me because all the evidence seemed to suggest that I was the one that did it, and so I got a spanking. Finally my brother came clean on it.

Mr. Speaker, I am just hoping that they come clean some day. Frankly, for them to be doing all of these dilatory tactics and being the reason that all of these Jewish Members were threatened at not being able to participate in their very, very special holiday, which all of us wanted them to do it,

and then trying to blame us for it when they are the ones extending the time and playing gamesmanship on the floor, it brought back those painful memories all over again.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it would be very interesting to see what would happen if some of these people broke their parents' vase at home. They probably would have changed the subject and said, "Yes, what this tells me is that we need to sue the vase makers to make sure they make the vases stronger." We have seen the changing of the subject.

Let me go back to what we were talking about. We were talking about how amnesia is sweeping Washington, DC, on not trivial matters, but very important matters of substance.

This is a headline, again talking about the international fugitive, that the chairman of the Democratic National Committee used his power to influence the CIA to influence the National Security Council to allow this international fugitive to get into the White House and give the President \$300,000. The New York Times wrote a story on September 18, and it says, "Ex-White House Aide Tells of Pressure Over Donor," and her name is Sheila Heslin, testified under oath before the Senate investigating committee that the Energy Department officials and the CIA, as well as the Democratic National Committee, pressured her as a National Security Council member to let an international fugitive into the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that is so shocking, not just to me but to most reasonable people, that the American people have set up a National Security Council to protect the White House from international fugitives like this gentleman, and then the chairman of the largest party of the United States of America, and the Department of Energy that was formed to help Americans with energy crises, and then we have the Central Intelligence Agency which is supposed to protect our national security, being used to actually break down this wall of security that the American people placed between the White House and international fugitives.

This is what Sheila Heslin, who was a National Security Council aide who gave a very valiant effort to keep these people from the White House, said under oath. "I was shocked. I said what the hell is going on? Why are you guys working with Fowler?"

And that was National Security Council aide Sheila Heslin in testimony before the Senate on her reaction to the CIA's intervention on behalf of an international fugitive. This is what the New York Times says.

I will yield to the gentleman in one moment, but I wanted to tell what they said the next day in their editorial about this shameful episode in American history. The New York Times wrote of the international fugitive's testimony before the Senate

committee, and he by the way was very proud that he was able to buy influence.

Mr. SALMON. Buy influence.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Buy influence and muscle his way into the White House. The New York Times wrote, "He," the international fugitive "was affirming that in the shadowy reaches of the international business world it was believed accurately that during the 1996 election, dubious entrepreneurs could buy White House audiences, particularly if they did not quibble about the cost of the ticket."

Again, the New York Times is saying that in the shadowy reaches of the international business world, the White House was for sale. The Times editorial concluded, "That so many high level people even took the party's role into consideration is one of the most shocking lapses of judgment."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of people on the other side, and even some who have written letters to the editor, say we are wasting time and we should get on with the business of the people, we should stop this investigation of the White House.

My response to them is, do those same people believe that all of the investigation of Watergate was not time well spent? In fact, as despicable and as sad of a time as Watergate was in the history of America, and I believe justice was served there, I do, there were never any allegations at that time of espionage, of treason, of bringing people in and possibly selling secrets to the enemy.

If Watergate was bad, then what potentially could these investigations yield? We are talking about very, very important matters and the White House has established a very, very disturbing pattern. Here is how it goes: It is a three-part, three-step pattern. No. 1: "I unequivocally was not there, did not do it. I did not do it."

□ 1030

I did not do it. That is in regard to raising money from Buddhist temples or making fundraising phone calls from the White House, which is in strict violation of U.S. law. OK. Then when the facts come out and the Washington Post and other media outlets find out through their investigative techniques that that is not accurate, that you in fact were there, that you in fact did do what you said you did not do, then the next response is, well, I cannot recall. I cannot recall whether I did that or whether I did not do that.

Then when the proof is in the pudding and you know exactly that they did what they said they did not do or they cannot recall whether they were there or not, the third response is, well, if I did it, it must have been legal. And there might even have been a fourth response now that Janet Reno is helping them. Well, the law is really kind of a stupid law in the first place.

It really should not be on the books. Is that really the kind of people that we want leading our country? People that go through that kind of self-denial?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. That is what the Washington Post has editorialized about time and time again. What they call it is telling the truth in dribs and drabs. They said, you paraphrased what they said, how the White House starts with a denial, then they say they cannot recall. Then they deny it. Then a little bit of information comes and they limit it to that, and then more information comes out later on and then they say, big deal. It happened time and again. It happened with Web Hubbell. It happened in a lot of the China investigation. Craig Livingstone. You were talking about how there is possible espionage. Newsweek reported that John Huang, when working at the Commerce Department and at the DNC, he would regularly get briefings from the CIA and then talked about times that he would get in a taxicab and go immediately over to the Chinese Embassy and talked.

It is, again, very, very disturbing. You brought up the name of Janet Reno. The New York Times has been very critical of Ms. Reno. I have been very critical. I know a lot of others have. I think in a way she has acted as shamefully as John Mitchell has in not moving forward as quickly as she should have when every reasonable person across the country knows of the abuses. Like you said, there are denials from the President that he raised money from the White House and then he says, if I did raise money, I did not break the law, when records show that he did, through the Post report, raise at least half a million from the White House.

You have a Vice President, AL GORE, who said that he had never done it before. Then we find out later that he placed at least 47 calls. Now we are over 100 calls. We were told that the coffees were not fundraisers. They were admitted to be fundraisers. Democratic Senator LIEBERMAN, in the hearings, stated as much, said we have to say that at least conclusively 103 of these coffees were fundraisers. So they have retreated.

Now the position they retreat to, and I have to tell you, the position that Janet Reno is supposedly debating this week is, it is insulting to the intelligence of me, you, the American people, that is, that, OK, there was a law that said do not raise money on Federal property, but it was an old law. And it was even before telephones were invented, and it had nothing to do with phone calls or anything like that. I wish I had the exact quote from the L.A. Times, but I can tell you what it said. It talked about how Judge Abner Mikva, who was the President's attorney, White House counsel in 1993, wrote a memo and said specifically, it is against the law to raise money in the White House. It is against the law to use White House phones to raise

money. Avoid raising money at the White House at all costs. It is illegal. That is what he wrote in 1993.

Why have we not heard that from the Attorney General? Why have we not heard that from news reports? I have to tell you, the news media, not print media, but the media, ABC, CBS, NBC, the evening news have been circling their wagons, as Brent Bozell has reported very well in his daily updates, and been avoiding the story. They talk about it is an old law, they talk about how it may not apply. They never talk about how the President's own attorney in 1993 told the White House, do not raise money at the White House. It is illegal. You never hear that, do you?

Mr. SALMON. No, you do not hear that. In fact, we all have copies of the memo that he sent to the President wherein he told the President that fundraising from Federal property, it was illegal. It is the same for you and I. As freshman Congressmen when we came in 3 years ago, one of the very first things that we were told was do not make fundraising phone calls from your office. It is illegal. How long did the Vice President serve in the Senate before he went into the White House?

It gets down to this. I believe that pretty much what I am about to say has been editorialized over and over again, and I will paraphrase, you are down to either one, if indeed as all the evidence shows there were fundraising phone calls from the White House, and that is illegal, you are left with two very painful answers or a choice between two very painful answers. No. 1, there is some crooked behavior going on; No. 2, they are not very intelligent. And it might be a combination of both. I am not sure. But either one is very disturbing.

Let me comment, or ask you a question. As to saying I cannot recall, I cannot recall. I cannot recall, have you ever had a speeding ticket or a parking ticket?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Since I do not have a subpoena and have not been drinking Washington, DC, tap water, I can remember. Yes, I will admit here that I have had a speeding ticket.

Mr. SALMON. I remember I had a speeding ticket. I was going about 10 miles over the speed limit. I remember this was over 12 years ago. It was the last speeding ticket that I got. I remember exactly what day it was. I remember, I am not saying I remember exactly the date but I remember the time of year. I remember my nephews were in the car with me. And I remember being very chagrined because I was trying to set a better example for my nephews and being pulled over. It was a very embarrassing thing. This was 12 years ago that I got this speeding ticket, yet I remember all of the circumstances surrounding that speeding ticket. We are talking about a violation of Federal law, far more important than a speeding ticket or a parking ticket. I think most Americans out there can remember if they have gotten a speeding ticket or parking ticket.

They can remember the circumstances, the emotions that they felt. They can remember what they were doing at the time that they received that speeding ticket.

Do you think that we should really believe that with the commission of this serious a violation of Federal law that these people cannot recall?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Again, it goes back to what the gentleman who chaired the Democratic National Committee said when he said he could not recall whether he helped get an international fugitive into the White House by using influence over the CIA, the Energy Department, the National Security Council, the White House itself. It absolutely strains credibility. I have to say that I am personally offended that the Justice Department has taken as long as it has in making its decision. I have to also say that I am offended that they continue to walk this fine legal line saying, we need to check and make sure that this one law about fundraising applies. This scandal is so huge, this is the largest fundraising scandal in American history, even if the media, even if TV media does not want to report it. It is the largest fundraising scandal in American history. If the media decides to pursue it aggressively and if the American people tune into it, I think they will see that it is every bit as damaging to the structure of American democracy and the structure of this constitutional Republic as what happened during Watergate, which was, I have to tell you, Watergate was an absolutely shameful period in this Nation's history and one of the heroes out of Watergate was a Senator from Tennessee named Howard Baker, who during the hearing had the guts to put aside partisanship in a way that JOE LIEBERMAN has done for the Democrats and asked the question, what did the President know and when did the President know it. I wish there were more Howard Bakers. I wish there were more JOE LIEBERMANS on both sides of the party, both sides of the aisle, who would ask tough questions and put the interests of America over the interests of the party.

I have to tell you, I did not come to Washington, DC, as a Republican. I think I prove that every day. I came to Washington, DC, as an American to be part of, be a positive part of a process to get money, power, and influence back to the States, back to the local governments, to balance the budget, to cut taxes, to do the type of education reforms we need to do to empower parents, teachers, students, local school boards, and take the power and authority and money out of the bureaucracies in Washington, DC.

I did not come here as a Republican, as a partisan Republican. JOE LIEBERMAN from Connecticut did not come to Washington, DC, solely as a cheerleader for the Democratic Party. Howard Baker did not come to Washington, DC, as a cheerleader for the Republican Party back in the 1970's. I

have yet to hear one Democrat in this Chamber go before that microphone and say, yes, I am concerned that we were allowing international fugitives to abuse power, that the Democratic Party skimmed \$2 million, as reported by the New York Times, that China may have bought influence in the White House and that there may have been espionage going on, that so many people that were contributors to the White House and now have fled this country and will not be recalled. It is a frightening spectacle.

Mr. SALMON. I think you make a really good point. I have been really proud that at least there is one Senator over on the other side, on the Democrat side that seems to be interested. I have been very impressed with Senator BOB KERREY and his willingness to try to pursue at least truth and justice. I do not believe anybody could accuse us of being partisan hacks or flunkies for the Republican leadership. There probably has not been two more vocal people on the floor in challenging our own leadership and in bucking the tide with our own leadership when we feel that they have gone astray.

I think we have earned the right to question whether or not this administration is engaged in an illegal activity. I think you make a really good point. Not one Democrat has stood up and asked for justice to be sought or found in relationship to the alleged illegal fundraising and selling of secrets and possible espionage going on in this White House, not one Democrat has stood up. I challenge them. I will buy whichever one does a steak dinner if they will have the moral courage to stand up and ask that we at least get to the bottom of the truth.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I think the gentleman is now starting to strike a nerve because maybe if you go to cash instead of money and maybe if you can get cash from a foreign friend and offer them some foreign cash, maybe that would be the type of thing they understand because they certainly understood it during the 1996 election. Tamraz understood that they understood that because this international fugitive, when questioned what mistakes were made and what laws were broken, his only response was, I think next time I will give \$600. That is international fugitive Roger Tamraz commenting on his ability to buy White House access.

You are exactly right. We have not been partisan Republicans. We have questioned our leadership, I would say tougher this year than we certainly have questioned the Democrats. We have held them to a higher standard. We have the gentleman on the floor with us today that questioned them on the pay raise. We had some tough questions on how we thought they were trying to slip the pay raise through with the help of the Democratic leadership. We have questioned them on a lot of other things. I am very concerned about the \$600 million that the IRS was

given this week. I do not think they should be given anything. But these concerns continue to grow.

We asked tough questions of both sides. Again, it seems to me we have the right to ask the President and the Attorney General what they are doing. I have got to say, the Attorney General is going to be making a decision this week. She will be making the decision on whether to appoint a special, an independent counsel to look into it, and the New York Times editorialized a week or two ago that they did not believe that the President nor the Attorney General could be trusted to look fairly into this matter. The New York Times, who usually sides with more liberal Members of Congress, they did not this time. They said we cannot trust Janet Reno and we cannot trust the President to look into this, an independent third party needs to be sought.

□ 1045

Mr. SALMON. If the gentleman will continue to yield just a few seconds, this situation with Janet Reno is so disturbing: That she cannot get by the fact that she feels she has to protect her boss more than she has to represent Justice or the needs of the American people to get to the truth and to find justice in this matter. I think we should pass a bill on the floor, if she does not appoint a special counsel, to call her the Enabler General instead of the Attorney General.

And frankly, just finally, the phrase, "A day late and a dollar short," we are talking about several million dollars here, and, frankly, she has a responsibility, a constitutional responsibility, to get to the bottom of this and to find truth and to find justice.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman.

She does have that responsibility, and she needs, again, to review the situation.

As the New York Times wrote in an editorial on September 10, 1997, yesterday's testimony yet again punctures the fiction that the abuses that occurred were solely the responsibility of the Democrat Party and not the White House. That is very important for Janet Reno's decision, how much the White House was influenced.

And, again, the front page of the New York Times today talks about how the White House and, I think, Dick Morris had a scheme to funnel money to State parties to do it. And the New York Times editorialized about Janet Reno's faulty fix and stated, the Attorney General mistakes efficiency for integrity. And we hope, like the New York Times and others hope, that she will find the integrity that she needs to make the decision.

I would like to yield now to a gentleman that has been very helpful in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in investigating these things, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his leadership in

pointing out the problems with this administration.

We have seen them from the days we started, first with the Travel Office and as we moved through the FBI files and as we moved through Whitewater and Craig Livingstone, and we have watched this in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight relatively stunned.

And as we start to get the depositions, as we prepare for the larger investigation of campaign finance scams, I was so outraged about a week and a half ago to see that the President of the United States was proposing to call Congress into a special session on campaign finance reform. Talk about gall.

Rule No. 1 for campaign finance reform should be, follow the current law. What good does it do for us to pass a bunch of laws if they do not follow the current law? Today I wanted to share a couple of stories to illustrate this point.

Story No. 2: Last month, the Democratic National Committee returned \$85,000 in funny money, this time to help repay victims of the \$38 million fraud using President Clinton's photo. The pyramid scheme, set up by Unique Gems International Corp, has been called one of the costliest credit card rip-offs in U.S. history. Here is how it happened.

In October 1996, at a Florida fundraiser, President Clinton took a photo with executives of the Miami-based jewelry-making company who coughed up \$85,000 to the DNC. So the price tag for this picture was \$85,000.

When you start going after money everywhere as fast as you can get it, you forget to do some background checks. The pictures were featured in company newsletters to gain credibility with investors. The caption read, "The company has been honored by President Clinton for its role in helping many people with real opportunities to earn a well above average income."

Potential marks were told by one company boss, "We met with the President. If it were not a good company, the President would not have invited us to dinner."

Soon, investors were lining up to buy worthless beads to assemble into necklaces, which the company promised to market to retailers. At one point, when Unique Gems was using the President's picture most extensively, it was raking in \$1 million a day.

By the time the operation was shut down, 15,000 people had been bilked, most of whom were new immigrants hoping to turn their \$3,000 investment into a small fortune. The Democratic National Committee bilked new immigrants indirectly through this type of scheme.

Unique Gems apparently used third parties to donate \$85,000 to the DNC, despite Federal law prohibiting such donations. Four of Unique Gems principals, who have, surprise, surprise, left the country, are foreign nationals prohibited by law from donating to U.S. campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, this is yet another example of campaign finance reform. Rule No. 1, follow the current law.

Former leader of Common Cause Fred Wertheimer put it best: "This is one example, and it is a classic example, of an attitude that led to the Clinton campaign saying, 'if you give us money, that is all we care about.'"

Just so everyone gets this story straight: DNC got the cash, swindlers got a photo with the President, and 15,000 people got stuck with \$38 million of worthless beads.

The second case is Jorge Cabrera. As we know, the Vice President has been a good student of President Clinton's in more ways than one. In December 1995, Vice President GORE attended a fundraiser in Florida for 60 wealthy contributors. Among them were several guests more fitted to Shawshank than southern Florida. Consider the following attendees:

Jorge Cabrera, a drug trafficker with links to a Colombian cartel.

Dr. Joseph Douze, a fugitive who once blew up a bridge.

Great background checks on these people.

And the host for the evening, Jerome "Jerry" Berlin, was indicted in 1990, and later acquitted, on Federal conspiracy charges of bribing Federal officials. One of the politicians allegedly targeted was then Senator AL GORE, who prosecutors said did not know of the alleged plot.

One guest, who paid the minimum \$10,000 cover charge, said, "Maybe the reason I got to sit with the Vice President is that I was the only honest person in the room."

To be fair, the Vice President was disappointed to learn that his picture had been taken with a long-time drug dealer. "He never wants to be associated with people who break the law."

That makes for interesting Cabinet meetings. In fact, sometimes you wonder how he looks in the mirror, since he violated the laws in campaign fundraising from the White House.

Some of the same donors at the Florida fundraiser later received personal greetings from the President and the First Lady. Only days later, the Cali-connected Cabrera was sipping eggnog at the White House Christmas party.

Cabrera, who gave \$20,000 to the DNC, was later sentenced to 19 years in prison for helping import 6,000 pounds of Colombian cocaine that was killing kids in the streets of Fort Wayne, IN, and western Florida, and in Kansas, and he did not get a background check. This man was a drug cartel dealer, for crying out loud.

At the time of the Gore fundraiser and the White House visit, he had already been arrested twice on drug charges and pleaded guilty to non-drug-related charges. Court papers said that by 1995 he was already deeply involved with the Cali Colombian drug cartel.

Ross Perot put it nicely: "I never thought I would live to see a major

drug dealer give 20,000 bucks in Florida and then be invited to a big Democratic reception by the Vice President of the United States, AL GORE, and then be invited to the White House for a Christmas party."

An invitation to the White House Christmas party was also sent to Dr. Douze, although the Government had confiscated his passport and restricted his travel after his arrest on 11 counts of Federal mail fraud and conspiracy.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for a second, I have to ask a question. Did the gentleman just say that a man who had his passport seized because he was a felon was invited to the White House even after we seized his passport?

What I am saying is, is the gentleman saying that basically the standard of getting in the White House is below the standard of actually being able to stay in the United States of America?

Mr. SOUDER. I think that is what I am saying. And, furthermore, a convicted drug dealer was let in. So it was not as though they did not have a record, it was not as though they did not have background checks on these people, it was the classic cannot see, cannot hear, and, therefore, there is no evil.

A Federal judge also denied his request to leave the area, Douze' request to leave the area, to visit the White House. But Douze, who was arrested in 1988 for blowing up a bridge in Haiti, received the judge's permission to visit his dying mother in Haiti a few weeks after the Gore fundraiser. Surprise, surprise, he has not come back.

How does it happen? They let it. They do not follow rule No. 1, which is to follow the current law.

I would like to, if I can, take a few more minutes here to go to the third case, Johnny Chung. This is his quote: "I see the White House like a subway; you have to put in coins to open the gates." That is how Johnny Chung explained his \$50,000 contribution which was delivered to the First Lady's office in 1995 to buy access to the President.

Chung said he was seeking VIP treatment for a delegation of visiting Chinese businessmen when he was asked to help defray the First Lady's White House Christmas receptions that had been billed to the DNC. Chung's visit to Washington in March 1995 raised concerns in the Clinton administration's National Security Council.

So in answer to the gentleman from Florida's question, here the National Security Council at least warned them. The Passport Office did not. The other, presumably State Department, did not, on the case from Haiti. They did not warn the White House on the drug dealer's connections, but here the National Security Council did warn them.

One aide described Chung in the memo as "a hustler" trying to exploit his contacts at the White House. And we already saw in the first case what the contacts in the White House can do for bilking poor immigrants.

Chung essentially paid \$7,000 a head to have six businessmen and himself watch Bill Clinton deliver an 8-minute radio address followed by photos with the President.

Chung knows his way around the White House. In December 1994, he escorted a Chinese beer executive through the West Wing, carrying two six-packs and taking pictures as they went. A photo with the First Lady with the beer executive is on display on one of Beijing's busiest street.

"He became an irritant," says one White House official. He took unfair advantage of the First Lady's office." At least he never came away empty handed.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman could stay to answer a few questions, first of all, the first question I have is, how did the White House respond to the National Security Council's warning about Mr. Chung?

And I ask that because I had been speaking previously about how actually the National Security Council had said, do not let Mr. Tamraz in; he is an international fugitive. Then, of course, we saw the Democratic National Committee chairman improperly use his power to influence the Energy Department and influence the CIA to put pressure on the National Security Council.

And of course Ms. Heslin was tough and told them that he was an international fugitive, he could not get in, so they went around her.

How did the White House respond when the NSC also said this international business gangster was dangerous?

Mr. SOUDER. With benign neglect, would be kind. With overt refutation and opposite action, would be the correct way, because not only did they allow him in, they allowed him in repeatedly, and at a radio address, and into the White House with the Chinese businessmen. So they did not heed their National Security Council's warning.

And so at some point we have to say, how are we going to pass additional laws to regulate people who will not follow the laws, who allow drug dealers in, who allow people in who blow up bridges, who have their passports revoked, who have been warned by the National Security Council that the guy is a risk?

What they are doing is, they are going ka'chung, ka'chung, so to speak, because they want the money, they want the cash register to ring with the dollars, because that was the primary goal, not the integrity of the political process of the United States.

They abused people like Johnny Chung. His statement when he says he thought that was what you have to do, this is not a statement on Johnny Chung as much as it is a statement on the White House: "I see the White House as like a subway. You have to put in coins to open the gates."

So people who did not understand our system were led by this administration

to think that the way it works in America is, they have to put the coins in, or you do not get any action. And that is a disappointing demonstration to people from all these different countries about how this works.

I am so disappointed in this administration, that they would let the world think that the way we do business with the President of the United States is giving him illegal campaign contributions.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And, regretfully, that is something that has been echoed, again in the New York Times: "Oil man says he got access by giving the Democrats money." And in this story he testifies, "I think next time I will give \$600,000," and stated, really, that the way to get into the White House was money and said that was the only reason he was there, was money.

I want to yield in a second to the gentleman from Kansas, who is certainly a good friend and a great Congressman, but my office has called me back up, and I have to offer an apology, because I had said no Democrat had stood up and questioned the fundraising. And my office notified me that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has; and, of course, he is a trailblazer.

I have to remind the gentleman from Arizona, he owes the gentleman from Ohio a steak dinner, because he said he would give a steak dinner to the first Democrat that actually stood up and questioned it. The gentleman from Ohio, of course, the trailblazer, did that.

Something that the gentleman from Indiana and I have not touched on yet, something that we are going to be working on in the coming months, has been the abuse by the Democratic National Committee and the AFL-CIO to launder money.

According to press reports and according to three Teamsters officials who have been indicted now and who are talking to the U.S. Justice Department, the AFL-CIO and the DNC have been acting improperly.

There is another part of this scandal that, of course, the Attorney General would like to ignore but simply cannot. The Washington Post, on Friday, September 19, 1997, wrote, "U.S. says Carey aides used DNC and AFL-CIO. Consultants plead guilty to funneling money to 10 Teamsters presidents' reelection campaign." And in the heart of the article it says, "Both the DNC and the Clinton-Gore Reelection Committee agreed to seek contributions to the Carey campaign in exchange for Teamsters' donations to the Democratic National Committee." And, of course, according to the Washington Post, that is what happened. That is what the United States is telling us now.

□ 1100

And, of course, it is blatantly illegal to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], who has had some experience dealing with some of the parties involved.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] for yielding.

I want to remind the Speaker that this Congress, through the Department of Labor, actually spent \$20 million to oversee this election, and we were spending our taxpayers' dollars to try to ensure that there was a fair election in the Teamsters Union. And what happened is that we had an unfair election and that the president of the Teamsters Union had to step down, now is in very serious trouble.

Many people wonder, where do the unions get all this money that is available? It comes to them through compulsory union dues, it comes from all types of dues from working men and women that are struggling to make ends meet. And up to 80 percent of the money in their union dues does go for contract negotiations, it does not go for grievance procedures. Eighty percent of the money, or approximately in some cases 89 percent of the money, goes to the international headquarters here in Washington, DC, where they push their own political agenda, where they push their own political candidates, where they attempt to launder money, in this case, in order to get their agenda forward, with no regard to what the workers have in mind as far as what they think is best for America.

Well, this is a typical laundering campaign, where the AFL-CIO was funneling money into the Teamsters, the DNC was funneling money into the Teamsters, with hopes of later on getting it reimbursed from the Teamsters back to the Democratic National Committee.

But it is not just at the Federal level. It is not just at the White House. We have had experience of it happening right in Kansas, in the heart of America in the Bible Belt.

The Wichita Eagle reported about how the Kansas State Democrat Party, which is limited by law to receive only \$25,000 in Federal funds coming from the Federal party to the State party, managed to get \$315,000 by funneling it through or laundering it through local Democratic candidates and county State parties.

A candidate would get a check for \$500; and a phone call would say, "We would appreciate if you would send \$400 right back to the State party." A county, the Democrat party, would get a check for \$5,000, limited by statute again, and it will come back to the party. And they used that money to run ads against Senators and against Members of Congress who were running for election.

I think it is really interesting that the defense is kind of the same in each instance, whether it is the White House or whether it is the Vice President or whether it is the State party. First of all they say, "Well, I did not do it." Then later on, as more of the details come out, they say, "I didn't not do it. But, well, maybe I did do it, but it wasn't wrong."

Then the third line of defense was, "Well, yes, maybe it was wrong. But I will never do it again." And then the fourth line of defense is, "Well, it is not my fault. We had to win, you see. We had to do anything, at any cost, regardless of the law."

Well, we must, No. 1, uphold the law here in America. Because if there is no justice in Washington, DC, there is no justice in Wichita, KS, or in Florida, or Indiana, or anywhere in the United States. We must uphold the law of the United States of America in the States.

The campaign financing must start with the individuals. Rule No. 1, as was stated earlier by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER]: Follow the law. If we are ever going to find where we are going, we have got to find a place to start from. And that is the current law today, we must follow the law.

I guess the Democrat Party in the State of Kansas, the Teamsters, and the national party in the White House are tired of breaking old laws, so they want campaign reform so they get a brandnew set of laws to break.

I want to say in closing, we cannot write enough laws. We have proved that. We have laws upon laws, statute books upon statute books. People have to do the right thing. It is up to the American people to ferret out those who will misalign what they say and what they do and mistreat the taxpayers and the people of America by not doing the right thing. So voters need to find candidates that will do the right thing and support them so we can change America.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] for his insights. And he is right, we have got to abide by the laws that we have already passed.

I have said for some time that for the Democrats and the President to talk about how they want new laws to be passed on campaign finance reform would be a lot like the driver of Princess Diana coming back from the dead and holding a press conference and demanding that the speed limit be lowered in the tunnels of Paris or that the alcohol level be lowered in Paris for DUI.

Abide by the laws that are on the books and nobody is going to get hurt. Regretfully, though, this is just another way that they can change the subject. And my colleague is right, it is shameful, a lot of the bobbing and weaving. I know the White House, the Vice President particularly said, "I did not break the law. I did not do anything wrong. And I promise I will never do it again."

It just does not make sense. The American people are being underestimated. They are smarter. When we see the scandals that are occurring, when we see the National Security Council, when we see money laundering with the AFL-CIO and the Teamsters, when we see the Energy Department being improperly used, the CIA, the NSC, the

White House, the Vice President's office, it is time for us to do something.

I agree with the New York Times and I agree with editorial writers across the country, Janet Reno has no choice but to step up to the plate and hire an independent counsel, not a partisan Democrat, not a partisan Republican, but somebody that is independent that can look into this and look into the type of abuses, again, that the New York Times even wrote about this morning that the Democrats use State parties to bypass limits; that \$32 million were sent to the local level, paid for by ads aiding Bill Clinton, possibly very, very illegal.

Somebody must look into this. We cannot allow the integrity of the American system to continue to be questioned like this. Let us get somebody independent in that can look at the law and apply the law equally to both sides. If that happens, America is the winner, not just Republicans or Democrats.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PEASE]. The Chair will remind all Members that they are to refrain from references to individual Members of the other body.

ELIMINATE MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to my colleagues today about a project that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] and I have started in the last few weeks. I want to thank each of my colleagues who have joined us in cosponsoring our legislation to eliminate the marriage penalty tax in our Tax Code.

I first started focusing on this when I received a letter from a constituent of mine, Sharon Mallory, who lives in Straughn, IN. Sharon wrote to me about how she and her boyfriend wanted to get married, went to the accountant, and found out that she would have to give up her \$900 tax refund and start paying \$2,800 if they got married. Sharon closed her letter of last February saying, "We hope some day the government will allow us to get married by not penalizing us. It broke our hearts when we found out we can't afford it."

And it broke my heart to think that Sharon and those like her that want to get married and start families in this country are not able to because our Tax Code penalizes them simply because they are married.

I have started a project on my website, and I wanted to share the results of this with my colleagues. People, when they want to communicate with me about the marriage penalty, have started leaving me e-mails at my

site, www.House.gov/McIntosh, where we have got a special page on the marriage penalty and what it means to people. So, if I may, let me show my colleagues the map of the United States and some of the dozens of responses that we have gotten.

My colleagues, these are just a few of the communities around the United States where people have written me these e-mails explaining to me what the marriage penalty has meant to them. Let me share with my colleagues a few of them.

Wayne Shelly, who lives in Dayton, OH, wrote this:

Penalizing for marriage flies in the face of common sense. This is a classic example of Government policy not supporting that which it wishes to promote. In our particular situation, my girlfriend and I would incur an annual net penalty of \$2,000 or approximately \$167 a month. Though not huge, this was enough to pay our monthly phone, cable, water, and home insurance bills. Therefore, the net effect to us is that, if we remain unmarried, the United States Government will pay these four bills for us.

He might have gone on to say, conversely, if we do get married, instead of paying those bills, we are going to have to dig into our pockets and pay the Government that money.

A second message was from William Dixon of Osgood, IN.

I was a single parent paying child support. I remarried in 1990. Because of my change of status, I owed a tax bill that I could not pay. I am still trying to pay these taxes and penalties.

Terri Wyncoop of Springfield, VA, wrote to me:

I knew it was more than enough because I had never owed before I was married. However, when I married I owed every year. We could owe anything from \$500 to \$1,000. We both claimed zero, and took out an additional \$25 weekly out of both of our checks and still owed. Unfortunately, our marriage failed because of financial reasons.

Does it not just break the hearts of my colleagues to know that there are American citizens like Terri Wyncoop of Springfield, VA, who attribute the breakdown of their family to the fact that this government penalized them for when they were married?

I can just picture the desperate straits of those two young people who want their marriage to succeed deciding, "Well, let us take more out of our paychecks in order not to pay taxes at the end of the year," and to find themselves still penalized and hit with that terrible burden.

Now, those financial crises often-times come in at a time when young people are trying to make a new life together. And people say to me, how can that make a difference? Well, I want to share with my colleagues a few statistics of what has happened in this country since 1969 when we started penalizing marriages in our Tax Code.

The National Fatherhood Initiative reports that since the marriage penalty was created for the average American, the probability that a marriage taking place today will end in divorce or permanent separation is calculated to be

60 percent of those married. The percent of married couples households has plummeted from 71 percent to merely 55 percent of our households in America today.

In America, 1 out of every 11 adults is divorced, 3 times the proportion the year the marriage penalty first came into effect. So this penalty, as we can see from across the country, is having a devastating effect on American families. We must eliminate it from our Tax Code.

I am proud to say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] and I have introduced a bill, along with now close to 200 cosponsors, that will do just that. We will not stop until we have succeeded in passing this legislation. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join us in that effort.

SPIRIT WHICH REFLECTS AMERICA OF TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we have had a bit of a reign of pettiness over the past few weeks in the House of Representatives. Certainly it would appear to the general public that pettiness was in command, and much of the previous presentation that we have had was in that same spirit of pettiness.

I would like to talk about a different kind of American spirit, American approach, and commend to my colleagues in the Congress a different approach for the rest of what remains in this session, this first year of the 105th Congress, and to go forward into the next year of the 105th Congress in January with a different mind-set. Instead of the pettiness and the small-mindedness, we should look to inspiration from our past American heroes who have done things in a much bigger way.

I intend to talk about some very practical problems under this big theme of going forward in a spirit which reflects the America of today that should be. I think we ought to heed the call of President Clinton when he called for us to behave like an indispensable Nation, that we are the indispensable Nation, and we ought to behave that way as we go into the 21st century.

The previous discussion was an appropriate one in that it focused, to some degree, on the subject of campaign finance reform, but it was on petty terms. This is one example of how we fall off into pettiness. Pettiness prevailed yesterday as we were about to adjourn for the religious holidays, shouting back and forth on the floor about certain kinds of procedural items. It was generated by a bigger kind of pettiness that prevails as a re-

sult of the majority's insistence that an election was won in California by my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], that that election has to be investigated and re-investigated despite the fact that she had a marginal 1,000 votes in that victory. Never before in the history of the House have we allowed this kind of petty investigation, subpoenaing of records and all kinds of harassment tactics to take place in connection with a disputed election.

□ 1115

So that pettiness generated pettiness from the other side in terms of motions to adjourn and motions to rise, out of frustration on the minority's side to vent its anger through these methods. So we reduced to that, one sort of pettiness forces another.

When it comes to campaign finance reform that my colleagues were discussing before, we must realize that the campaign finance reform issue is an appropriate issue and ought to be discussed in a profound way. We ought to look at the reform of campaign financing in the most profound way. Do not call for a special prosecutor for one individual or one candidate or for the Vice President or for the President. Let us call for a thorough investigation of the whole campaign financing, the raising of money, the spending of money, by both parties, because I think the American people, in their wisdom and their common sense, understand that both parties have gone too far in raising funds for elections and that the real problem at the bottom of all of this is whether our democracy will be able to survive.

Can a democracy survive as a compatible partner with capitalism? Will capitalism inevitably overwhelm the capitalist economic system and inevitably overwhelm the Democratic governmental system?

In other words, if we have capitalism and we have freedom in the marketplace and we allow unbridled profits, and people become powerful in proportion to the kind of profits they make and the kind of money that they accumulate, if they are going to restrain themselves and not use that power to take over the governmental apparatus, can we have capitalism in a Democratic society and capitalism not move to take over? Can we have the rich not using their wealth to distort the democracy?

That is a profound question underneath all of this. Let us deal with it. Republicans and Democrats are guilty. Yes, the Democrats at this point are being exposed, there is more in the paper about them, because the focus is on the White House, a highly visible President and Vice President, but the pettiness of the arguments is being dismissed by the common sense of the American people. They are not impressed. They are not impressed with discussions with telephone calls and who made what telephone calls from where.

They are right not to be impressed, because in the final analysis it is a little absurd. Every Member of Congress knows that they have gotten telephone calls in their offices about fundraising. If they did not make them, somebody else made it to them. You cannot cut somebody else who calls you to talk about fund-raising. Every Member of Congress knows that they go home and they make a lot of telephone calls from home. That is perfectly legal.

Now, why do we not advise the President and the Vice President to go home to make their calls? If they do that, are they not still on Federal property? Does that not make the President and Vice President different and special? They are always on Federal property. They are home. They cannot make calls at home without being on Federal property.

It is a little ridiculous to insist that the President and Vice President have to be subjected to some kind of standard which is as stupid as that in terms of where you make a phone call from and insist that we should appoint a special prosecutor to focus on that.

We need an investigation. We have commissioned an impartial commission to look at campaign financing, the raising of the money and the spending of the money across the board. We might want to even consider privatizing that and giving a contract to Common Cause to take a thorough look at the whole thing, to pinpoint where some people have broken the law, the present laws, and to make sweeping recommendations for reform that the Congress might want to bind themselves to and on a fast-track basis.

We do trade treaties on a fast-track basis. We say we are going to accept the recommendations on an up-and-down basis, we are not going to amend it. Let us have a commission, either a private commission or an appointed commission, to look at the whole of campaign fund-raising and expenditure of funds.

Let us look at the relationship between Archer Daniels Midland and one of the candidates, the fact that a candidate's wife earned \$1 million in speaking fees the year before. There are all kinds of things to be examined that a commission could look at fully.

If we focus on Republicans, we are going to find the same kind of problems that have been already exposed among Democrats. The process is tainted by the need to raise millions and millions of dollars, and we need to get away from that.

Underneath that, we need to find a way to deal with the problem of how we keep the capitalistic system which we all know is the system of the present and the system of the future. Capitalism is the only economic system that seems to work in the world, so how do we live with it, adjust it so that it does not take over?

We have laissez-faire, laissez-faire rules; a government will not interfere

with the economy, a government will not interfere with the marketplace. We do not have reverse rules, which says that the marketplace and the rich, the corporations, will not interfere with the government. That is the problem. We need some kind of way to guarantee that money will not be used to run our democracy, money will not be used to distort the democratic process. That is the profound question underneath of all of this.

Let us think big. In thinking big, I am drawn to the very stunning announcement that was made a couple of weeks ago by Ted Turner. I think it is a positive note to begin on. Ted Turner announced that he was going to give \$1 billion over the next 10 years to the United Nations, \$1 billion. That is a capitalist who has succeeded, and there is a capitalist who thinks in terms of the American approach to problems, and certainly the America of the 21st century. He opens the door to a new way of having people and corporations with big money behave. He has thrown down a challenge.

I think it is a great thing that Ted Turner has done. A lot of cynics will say, well, he is not really giving cash, it is stock and the earnings on the stock, it is spread over a 10-year period. Cynics can always find a way to tear down an idealistic gesture. Some people say, well, he is just looking for headlines. Well, OK, maybe he is, but that is a great way to get headlines.

If the United Nations gets the money or the profits from the stock and kids in Bangladesh get vaccinations, and Rwanda, they get a decent meal, if things happen all over the world as a result of him getting publicity, then that is great.

If he was unconcerned about publicity, of course, we know he could have taken the Dick Morris approach. Dick Morris says, when you do big things, do them in small pieces at a time, teaspoonfuls. Ted Turner could have announced a \$100,000 grant every week for the rest of his life and gotten plenty of headlines, it seems to me, if that was all he wanted.

He did things in a big American way. He did things in a way which is an example of the best spirit of the American approach to problems. It was the kind of spirit that an LBJ and an FDR and General Marshall of the Marshall plan were capable of, in their own sphere, not in the sphere of giving away money, philanthropy, but in their own spheres. We have had Americans do things in a big way, a profound way, that no other Nation or no other group of people have really been able to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Morrill Act that most people do not even know about or appreciate. The Morrill Act was the act by a Congressman named Morrill, M-O-R-R-I-L-L, because most people do not know about it, that created a land grant college in every State of the Union.

The land grant colleges were created with a specific mission, to provide

practical education to the citizens, and it set in motion the whole set of agricultural experiment stations, local county agents to carry out the results of the experiments. It set in motion all of the activities which generated an American agriculture industry which has still not been surpassed by anybody in the world. We feed cheaper, we feed more people cheaper, than any other nation in the world as a result of that base that was laid by the Morrill Act.

But, of course, it did far more than establish agriculture as an enterprise worthy of study, worthy of scientific nations. Those land grant colleges have become major centers of intellectual activity in all of the States.

So the Morrill Act was one of those big acts. Ted Turner acted in the spirit of Morrill when he did that.

I do not know which Congressman was responsible for the Transcontinental Railroad Act. A lot of people do not know that the transcontinental railroad, linking up the railroads from the East to the railroads from the West and establishing that line right across the whole country, that was not done by private enterprise, it was done with the money of the taxpayers. The taxpayers paid private contractors to build that transcontinental railroad. It was a monumental activity, a monumental kind of action taken on by the Government, that resulted in linking the east coast with the west coast and establishing this Nation as one whole Nation in a way that could not have been done without that transcontinental railroad linkage.

Then we had, of course, the New Deal by Franklin Roosevelt, which was a sweeping plan which looked at the problems that we were experiencing economically and said, we have to approach these problems in a way to try to get at solutions, and we have a New Deal which transformed the role of the Federal Government totally, and later on the Great Society of LBJ which established Medicaid and Medicare.

We are debating about the cost of Medicaid and the cost of Medicare, aid to elementary and secondary education. All of that came under LBJ, who thought in the vein of an FDR and a Morrill and moved in a way which came to grips with big problems, enormous problems, and had ideas and concepts and legislation which were big enough to take care of those problems.

Then we had the Marshall plan, George Marshall. His conception of how we get Europe out of economic chaos and save it from communism was an unparalleled plan, unparalleled generosity on the part of the American people in terms of giving of their tax dollars to help to rehabilitate the economies of Europe, big, sweeping activities that were conceived by Americans who thought big.

So when President Clinton calls for us to behave as we are citizens in an indispensable Nation, he is in harmony with a tradition that has already been established.

I was very impressed with the President's State of the Union address, and I entered a piece in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 4 which I am going to read at this point before I talk more about the spirit of Ted Turner and how that spirit needs to be applied, the spirit of the big American approach, the willingness to seize the issue and to move with an overwhelming game plan to deal with it. One billion dollars to the United Nations by Ted Turner is a big act dealing with a big problem that has repercussions and will generate positive by-products throughout the whole world.

□ 1130

First positive by-product of Ted Turner's gesture is, of course, it shows up the American Congress as a very petty body. We owe the United Nations \$1.2 billion. One or two people in the Congress have held up the payment of our dues to the United Nations. We are blackmailing the United Nations into doing what we want to do by holding up our dues, and here is a man in one fell swoop is willing to give a billion dollars. Why can the Nation not pay past dues of more than a billion dollars? Why do we have to insist that they reform first, when we know that any organization that has more than 100 people is going to have inevitable administrative problems?

We have an IRS that has problems. We have a CIA with big administrative problems. They lost \$4 billion dollars in a petty cash fund. We know that mankind is not an automatically administratively efficient animal. We have trouble administrating things. Administration is always a problem. Every agency and bureaucracy, every large construct will inevitably face problems.

So we should not put the United Nations in a category by itself and say we want them to reform all of their structural problems, we want them to solve all of their structural problems, we want maximum reform and then we will pay our dues. The world would not be able to run at all and would come to a standstill if we said that everybody had to be administratively efficient, every agency and department of the government must be efficient and effective before we allow the taxpayers' money to keep it running. It is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, Ted Turner's action to give \$1 billion to the United Nations, the first by-product is to show how petty our behavior is with respect to the United Nations.

When I was a kid, we collected nickels for the UNESCO and the United Nations was a great hope for the future, and now we have Members on the floor of Congress maligning the United Nations, which still is the hope of the future in terms of spreading the benefits of peace and prosperity throughout the world.

So in harmony with the President and in appreciation of the President's

State of the Union Address on February 4, I read the following into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I made a statement and then I entered one of my rap poems to go with it:

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's inaugural address was not a State of the Union speech obligated to provide substance for general proposals. Appropriately, the President used his second inaugural statement to set a tone for the next four years, the prelude to the 21st century.

America is a great country blessed by God with wealth far surpassing any Nation on the face of the earth now, or in the past. The Roman Empire was a beggar entity compared to the rich and powerful Americans.

God has granted us an opportunity unparalleled in history. President Clinton called upon both leaders and ordinary citizens to measure up to this splendid moment. The President called upon all of us to abandon ancient hatreds and obsessions with trivial issues. For a brief moment in history we are the indispensable people.

Other nations have occupied this position before and failed the world. The American colossus should break the historic pattern of empires devouring themselves. As we move into the 21st Century we need indispensable leaders with global visions. We need profound decisions.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I ended with the following rap poem:

Under God, the indivisible, indispensable Nation. Guardian of the pivotal generation. Most fortunate of all the lands. For a brief moment, the hold world we hold in our hands. Internet sorcery, computer magic, tiny spirits make opportunity tragic.

We are the indispensable Nation. Guardian of the pivotal generation. Millionaires must rise to see the need, or smother beneath their splendid greed. Capitalism is King, with potential to be Pope. Banks hoard gold that could fertilize universal hope. Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, King, make your star-spangled legacy sing. Dispatch your ghosts to bring us global visions. Indispensable leaders need profound decisions. Internet sorcery, computer magic, tiny spirits make opportunity tragic. We are the indispensable Nation. Guardian of the pivotal generation. With liberty and justice for the world, under God.

We are the indispensable Nation, and we ought to behave as leaders in the Congress like we are leaders of an indispensable Nation. Pettiness should be pushed to the background. We have problems before us which demand the best minds operating in a manner which seizes the moment and implies broad overall approaches and plans which get real solutions.

The President proposed a board on race relations. He tackled a huge problem which needs a lot of profound light, less heat and more light thrown upon it: The problem of race relations in America. It is a huge problem.

The board that the President has appointed has an opportunity to deal with the problem like they are profound leaders of an indispensable Nation, or they can allow it to crumble away into pettiness and small talk. They can get caught up in running away from controversy to the point where they run away from relevance. That race board is a good idea that needs to think in more profound terms about what it wants to do.

We have a problem with our Internal Revenue Service which has been highlighted in the past 2 weeks. The Internal Revenue Service is a necessity to have someone collect the taxes, and it is most unfortunate that Congress has over the years not applied and used its powers of oversight on a more regular basis. The oversight powers of Congress have really not been used in monitoring the executive branch of Government in general. It has always been a political thing, where one party in charge will zero in on just those items and those agencies which give them some political advantage from year to year. They neglect an ongoing master plan to oversee and look at what the Government is doing everywhere. The IRS is long overdue for some critical examination.

The problem with the present examination is that it is moving toward triviality. It is not trivial to deal with the problems in individual taxpayers' experiences with the IRS. Everybody who has faced the tyranny of IRS and found themselves being victimized deserves to have some relief and deserves to have the attention of Congress.

But what we have to understand is that the systemic problem, the systemic problem generates the specific problems, and nobody wants to deal with the systemic problems of IRS; that the system itself is based upon the assumption that we can collect more taxes, gain more revenue, please bosses at the top, if we go after small people who do not have defenses, if we collect from people who cannot hire corporate tax lawyers and who cannot bring in reams and reams of files and books and overwhelm us. The IRS agents can quickly show that they are doing something. Each agent, each department can collect taxes faster from individuals and families than they can from people who have the real money, corporations and the very rich who have the networks of investments.

We have had in the past, at least on two occasions, I think, administrations which have sent memos and they have been allowed to leak or we found out what they were saying, which in essence said: Go after the middle class. Tell the Internal Revenue if the collections are down, it is because they keep wasting time with the corporations. Go after the middle class because we get a quick return. They have the money and they are not going to put up any defense, so collect most of the taxes from the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, the systemic problem is the problem we ought to be dealing with. What is the result of that kind of approach of collecting most of the taxes from the middle class? We have in America a clear pattern. I used to bring a chart here. I do not have it today, but the chart showed that in 1944, corporations were paying a far greater share of the taxes than individuals and families. Corporations were paying almost 40 percent of the taxes and individuals and families were down much lower, 27, 28 percent.

Over the years, that has reversed and corporations now pay, I think, 11 or 12 percent now of the overall income tax burden, while individuals and families are paying 44 percent. Now, that is the result of a systemic problem, the problem of the philosophy of the IRS to collect money where it is easy to collect money. It is easier to collect money from the middle class than it is from corporations.

Mr. Speaker, we need to go after the systemic problem. Let us approach the IRS and the revamping of the IRS a profound way. What we are doing now is having a process where we intimidate the IRS and we highlight their activities in a way that only forces them to do more of what they have always done, and that is they will continue to try to avoid controversy by going after those who are most vulnerable. They will only come up with some public relations schemes now to hide the fact that they are doing it.

Corporations at this point are paying a smaller share, not only because of the way the tax laws are written but because of the way the IRS collects taxes. We have highlighted on this floor a profound problem that nobody wants to deal with. I have written to Mrs. Richardson, the previous tax commissioner before she resigned. I have written to Secretary Rubin. We talked about section 531 and 537 of the Internal Revenue Code. That section, to summarize, says that if corporations buy back their own stock illegally, that is, the Code says they cannot buy back their own stock except for certain purposes, and if they buy back the stock for purposes other than that, they have to suffer a penalty, and the penalty is something like almost a 39 percent penalty. It is on the books.

Mr. Speaker, I am not on the Committee on Ways and Means. I did not help write it and I do not help to monitor it at this point. But I am fascinated by the fact that we have corporate welfare in this country in several forms. One form is that corporate welfare flows through the IRS. The IRS, in its attitude and its refusal to enforce the Internal Revenue Code with respect to corporations, provides a subsidy to corporations that individuals do not get. Individuals are put on the spot more because the IRS is not doing the job it should be doing with the corporations.

Mr. Speaker, that is not an idle charge. We can back that up with some statistics which I will not go into now. I have admitted it into the RECORD before. I have put a whole set of arguments into the RECORD. I have listed corporations that are buying back their own stock in ever greater amounts. And when a corporation buys back its own stock, it does two things. It is violating section 531 and 537 of the Internal Revenue Code, which nobody seems to care about because they are afraid of corporations, but it is also denying the shareholders the profits. By making the decision to buy back the

stock, the corporation hoards unto itself the wealth.

If it were to pay in dividends the money that it uses to buy the stock, then individual shareholders would benefit from that. I wonder what the mutual fund groups really think about this and why they are allowing it to happen year after year. What it does is keep the prices of stock up. If corporations buy back their own stock, that guarantees that there is a fund there ready to swoop in the minute the stock begins to go down and buy the stock so that the price goes up again.

Mr. Speaker, that, in my layman's mind, borders on manipulation, and that is part of the reason why the law was made the way it was made, to forestall excessive manipulation of the market. I wonder how much of the market's soaring prices is due to the fact that corporations have a fund ready always to buy stock as it goes down, and then it goes back up.

But in the meantime, what does that mean for the shareholders who are in it for the short-run, long-run, it does not matter. If shareholders do not get the dividends, they are deprived of the choice of spending their money and their profits some other way.

As we investigate the IRS, the IRS ought to be investigated with greater profundity than I hear now being exercised. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House is about to start its own investigation, its own hearings. Let us ask the question: Why have receipts from corporations over the years gone down drastically, while receipts from individuals and families have gone up? Explain that. Tell us how it is done.

We know the IRS cannot share with us the records of individual taxpayers or individual corporations, but they have statistics which show, and that is how we are able to say this, there are statistics that show that corporations paid a far smaller proportion of the overall income tax burden than they paid in 1944. We had a switch, so why did that take place?

Mr. Speaker, let us approach this like leaders, profound leaders in an indispensable nation, and deal with a systemic problem of a system so we correct the system and move it toward a more just method of tax collecting, instead of wild charges being made about abolishing the IRS, going to a flat tax system, doing all kinds of things which will make the rich even less vulnerable to taxes while poor people will be saddled with greater taxes. The flat tax, all the schemes that we have seen, they let the rich off but they do not do much to help middle-class taxpayers.

So in the area of tax reform, the IRS, let us move in the spirit of Ted Turner instead of the spirit of Mickey Mouse. The Mickey Mouse spirit is gnawing away at the agenda in this Capitol. Everybody wants to do things in a small way, and then blow them up with headlines and get a lot of credit for having done something. It is not important

that we highlight the fact that individuals are being abused unless we deal with the system and corrections of the system.

□ 1145

I have talked about campaign finance reform being dealt with in a most profound way so that we have an investigation that runs across the board and deals with the problem and comes back with real recommendations that Congress agrees to enact, recommendations which will protect the American democracy, the democratic form of government from our capitalistic economy. There is a simple problem. If there are rich people in a society, are they going to use their wealth or be allowed to use their wealth to distort the democratic process? That is the problem and that problem has to be dealt with.

I have also talked about the President's Race Relations Board. Is the Race Relations Board going to deal with petty problems of attitudes that people may have and names that people may call each other and a lot of things that are going on from now until the world comes to an end or are they going to take this initiative to really provide us with some background information on what it is all about?

What is race relations all about in America, the core of race relations, the race relations between African-Americans and mainstream Americans? That is the most sensitive problem. That problem has its roots in a thing called slavery. If the Race Relations Board is not going to deal with some factual analysis on the history of what slavery was all about, of what 232 years of economic denial, of not being able to own anything, for 232 years the ancestors of slaves were not able to own anything, they could not own property. They could not pass anything down from one generation to another. So we descendants of those slaves ended up without having the benefits.

We are unlike any people anywhere in the country because we did not have anything to bring over from the Old World with us. They did not allow us to do that. Then for 232 years they exacted labor from the slaves without paying them, without allowing them to own anything. If you do not establish what that means, if you do not really use your resources to delve into that and to make the American people understand the consequences of a people being deprived for 232 years of livelihood and being able to pass it down. The wealth of America and the rest of the world is primarily inherited, it is passed from one generation to another. If you interrupt the flow of wealth from one generation to another for 232 years, what does that mean? So much is attached to income and wealth. There is a correlation between income, wealth, and education. There is a correlation between income, wealth, and the ability to cope with the problems of our modern society. There are cor-

relations that cannot be ignored. If you do not have the wealth, you are not allowed to pass down even modest amounts of money from one generation to another. What is the consequence?

So the Race Relations Board appointed by the President needs to attack that in a big way. Then I said the IRS and the investigation of the IRS needs to be put in a new light and approached in a more profound way.

Now I would like to conclude by focusing on the most important subject of all, and that is approaching education in a way which is consistent with the spirit of Ted Turner's billion dollar gift to the United Nations, approaching the education problem in a way which is consistent with the New Deal, the Marshall plan, the Great Society, the Morrill Act, the transcontinental railroad. I forgot to mention the latest act which I consider on a plane worthy of being compared to the Morrell Act or the New Deal, and that is the Federal Communications Commission, Federal Communications Commission establishment of a universal fund for schools and libraries. The Federal Communications Commission established a fund for telecommunications at schools and libraries that will begin with \$2.2 billion per year to go to schools and libraries in the form of discounts for services. The discounts will range from 20 percent for the richest school districts and schools to 90 percent for the poorest school districts.

In other words, in my district many of the schools who have large numbers of poor students who receive school lunches, they qualify for a 90 percent discount. If the telephone bill is part of the plan, they would only pay 10 cents on every dollar, a dollar's worth of telephone service they use. If they are on the Internet, whatever the charge is on the Internet, they would only pay 10 cents on the dollar because of the fact that this fund, the universal fund established under the order of the FCC, will take up the balance.

The universal fund was mandated by Congress. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 mandated that the Federal Communications Commission must establish some way to help schools and libraries. That was a great act of Congress. It was one of the acts worthy of an indispensable Nation, worthy of the leaders of a Nation going toward the 21st century.

So finally, the universal fund for schools and libraries fits into the whole school reform effort that ought to be moved up to a higher level. We are talking about school reform now again in very trivial terms. The approach to school reform has lapsed into pettiness. Pettiness, headline grabbing is what generated the stampeded into testing. We stampeded a proposal for national testing, leaping over agreements that had been made by Congress that we should have three approaches, where the Federal Government was involved in education reform in three major ways. They were to deal with the national curriculum, deal with national

testing standards, voluntary standards. Not a national test, but national testing standards were to be developed with the leadership and input of the Federal Government, and we had opportunity to learn standards as a part of that. Of course, because it grabs headlines and it does not cost very much money, testing has gotten pushed out of proportion to everything else.

It is that kind of pettiness, refusal to look at the problem in terms of the 21st century approach and think big about education reform. Education reform is a great challenge that we face now, probably the greatest challenge the Nation faces. We know there are things that are radically wrong and they can be corrected, we have the resources to correct them. We must go forward to deal with those corrections. We should not hesitate to apply the great wealth and the great know-how of the American Nation to the problems of education.

I talked before about Ted Turner, but there are a couple other examples of acting on a big scale that I would like to mention also before I conclude with the discussion of education. There are some other people other than Ted Turner who understand what the 21st century, as we go to the 21st century, how we should behave. Ted Turner set a new standard for billionaires, but not by himself. There is a guy named George Soros who also is a billionaire. He is funding several projects that are very critical in terms of analyzing what can be done about certain kinds of problems and in terms of allowing certain approaches and solutions to go forward so that they can be studied, and many of them are controversial. George Soros moved from Eastern Europe, where certain governments have kicked him out completely, to controversy here in America with the drug problem and the problem of what to do with our cities, a problem of anti-immigration attitudes, lawmakers and a few others. So George Soros, even beyond Ted Turner, is using his billions to get involved in controversy, to take on what other foundations have always backed away from; that is, using their dollars in areas of great controversy.

There are areas of controversy which need the help of most. Solutions to the problems that are considered controversial are solutions that are needed most. But we have not had the benefit of corporate money and foundation philanthropy because of the fact that everybody was afraid. So George Soros, in that new area, moves in a new direction.

In the area of education, we recently had an announcement by the Democratic task force on education which I want to applaud. It is a step forward in terms of clearly outlining what they are recommending that the Democratic Caucus members do. As such, it is a recommendation for all people in America interested in education reform. My problem is that it does not go

far enough. It is not petty. It is profound, but it falls short of some problems that we are facing.

The Democratic Caucus plan includes the following set of principles. I applaud these principles. They call for first-class public schools that emphasize academic excellence in the basics. They call for well-trained, highly motivated teachers to help children achieve high standards. They call for the use of public dollars to improve public schools rather than private school vouchers and at public expense of a Federal role in education that supports local initiatives for strong neighborhood public schools. They call for the empowerment of parents to choose the best public schools for their children, and they say that every child should have access to a safe, well-equipped public school. They expand that, in the area of every child should have access to a safe, well-equipped public school, by focusing on the problem at the heart of all the problems of school reform; that is, they call for relief from crumbling and overcrowded schools. They call for a replacement of crumbling, overcrowded schools with schools with well-equipped classrooms and the kinds of resources that all children need. Five billion dollars to repair crumbling schools and provide new construction to relieve overcrowding and reduce class size, and they call for the assisting of schools to wire classrooms so that they are able to make use of the funds that I talked about before, the FCC universal service funds for schools and libraries.

I applaud the Democratic Caucus task force on education for what they have done. I think it is great that they have focused on one practical thing that is doable. The President proposed a \$5 billion construction package and then in the negotiation process it got lost. It is well-formulated. It is in a bill. I think more than 90 Members of Congress are on the bill. It is a practical piece of legislation. It is a practical proposal that could move in the 105th Congress. Maybe not this year, this year of the 105th Congress, but early in the next Congress it could move. I think it could move better if it is part of an omnibus education program.

We should not hesitate to come forward with an omnibus education package in the next year. We should spend the rest of this session at least in outlining some of the things that ought to be included in that package, but at the core of an omnibus education package there should be a construction initiative because construction is at the heart of school reform. In my district when I talk to teachers and principals about we want to wire the schools for the Internet, make use of the universal fund that has been established by the FCC, they look at me, it is funny, it is a joke because they have a problem of roofs leaking and walls crumbling on the top floors of the schools. They have a problem with enough chalk. They

have a problem with old blackboards. They have a problem with lack of repairs of the seats in the school. They have a problem with too many children.

The schools of New York are still overcrowded. We are in the midst of a mayoral election and you would not know it because everybody in the press and the media, working very hard to reelect the present mayor, so all of a sudden the problem we had in the fall of 1996 where 91,000 children did not have a place to sit—we have a school system of a million children and it boggles the mind when you start talking about the New York City school system, but there are a million children, more than a million children, 1,100 schools, 60,000 teachers, and it is overwhelming. But the system has failed to keep pace with the enrollment and you have last fall, in 1996, an admission of the fact that 91,000 children did not have a place to sit when school opened. This year it is an election year, and all of a sudden the problem seems to have gone away. The press and the media refuse to acknowledge we still have a massive overcrowding problem. There are schools which will tell you, we do not have an overcrowding problem, yet they have now 1,500. If you were built to hold 700 and you have 1,500, you have an overcrowding problem. They say they do not have an overcrowding problem. And you say, how many lunch periods do you have? They will tell you we have three. Some kids in some schools are forced to eat lunch at 10 in the morning because they have so many youngsters the cafeteria will not hold them all and they have to move in relays.

When you have to make a youngster eat lunch at 10 in the morning, you have a crisis. The last youngsters to eat lunch eat at 2. You have a crisis on both ends. It is child abuse, but those things are going on.

In the New York school system there are still almost 300 schools that have furnaces that burn coal. In the middle of a big city you have school furnaces burning coal. That is a crisis. We have the highest asthma rate in the country, one of the highest. The children are directly affected by the inability of the system to provide adequate facilities.

□ 1200

They not only have to live near those furnaces burning coal, they have to go and sit in classrooms in the schools where the coal is being burned.

We have a crisis. We have a crisis, and it is not just New York City's crisis, not New York State's crisis alone. The State, at least, has belled up to the problem to the tune of placing on the agenda for a referendum vote a bond issue which will raise \$2 billion to build schools, build, repair and renovate schools. That is a first step forward. I applaud my colleagues in the New York State legislature. They have taken the first step.

New York City, of course, the mayor, in this election year, has found funds to do repairs here and there. Everywhere we go we have some visible signs of the mayor's office, which cut the schools by \$1.5 billion in the past, now discovering that education is important and producing funds and results.

Over the summer we had junior high schools throughout the city each receiving computers. I am glad we are having an election year because education is getting the attention in New York City that it should get. But we need a more profound response.

The State of New York, with its bond issue, needs help. Even a well meaning administration who really wanted to do something about education in New York City needs help. Why not get the help from the Federal Government? That is where most of the money is. The Federal Government has a responsibility, which is a moral responsibility.

It is not in the Constitution that the Federal Government is responsible for education. Most States have that in their State constitution. But it does not matter, we have the money and the resources. The money does not come from Federal sources because there are no Federal citizens in America. Maybe the citizens of Washington, DC, who have now been taken over again by the Federal Government, are Federal citizens. But the rest of us are citizens of States and we are citizens of cities and towns. We pay income tax from those cities and towns and States into the Federal Government. So the money comes from the local level, all of it does, and there is nothing wrong with having the money go back to take care of crisis situations.

The crisis now in America is not just in New York City but, according to the General Accounting Office, we need \$120 billion for the infrastructure and repair programs of school systems throughout the whole Nation. It is not a local problem.

So at the heart of this education effort of the Democratic Caucus, I am glad to see they place school construction as the most specific area that they are approaching.

The caucus also has focused widely on well-trained teachers. I think there is agreement among Republicans and Democrats that we need well-trained teachers. I think there is agreement among Republicans and Democrats that we need to have more effort to wire the schools to make use of telecommunications and technology.

I think there is one other area of agreement, which I am afraid the Democratic task force did not mention, and that is charter schools. We have backed away from any mention of charter schools.

Now, why are charter schools important? Charter schools are important because of the fact that there is agreement on charter schools among Democrats and Republicans. There is agreement that both unions, both big na-

tional unions, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, both have agreed charter schools are a good idea.

We are going to be debating on this floor next week a bill concerning the D.C., District of Columbia, appropriations, and there is a very controversial item in that bill. That bill has an item which deals with the D.C. schools being forced to implement a voucher program. The D.C. schools in that bill are going to be forced by Congress to implement a voucher program.

Now, vouchers have not been implemented anywhere else in the country as a result of Federal funding or Federal intervention. This will be the first case. This would be Congress exercising its overwhelming powers over the District of Columbia to bully them into accepting vouchers.

It does not matter to the people who offer this amendment to do this that citizens of the District of Columbia had a referendum. They had a referendum, and they voted that they did not want vouchers. The citizens specifically voted not to accept vouchers. They do not want vouchers. It was put to the test in a democratic election. They voted that they do not want vouchers. They are embracing charter schools.

The District of Columbia has taken steps to embrace charter schools in a way no other locale has. The District of Columbia has established a board for charter schools. They have called for applications for 20 charter schools.

Now, here is a point of agreement where the Democrats agree and the Republicans agree, AFT, UFT, that charter schools are not a bad idea. I do not think charter schools will ever overwhelm the traditional public schools. I think the future of good schooling for most of America's children, the future is in the public schools.

The public schools, however, need to have a stimulant. Some people say they need competition. And the bureaucracies that I have encountered, certainly the bureaucracy of New York City, does need competition. We need ways in which we shake up the smugness among administrators and principals and superintendents by showing them that all the things they say cannot be done; there are some people who can do them using the same amount of money that they have.

Charter schools are public schools. Charter schools would take the same amount of money per child that the traditional public schools have, and the charter schools would use that amount of money per child to provide an education in accordance with the accountability standards established by the State. They would have to meet the same standards as the traditional public schools.

The difference between charter schools and the traditional public schools, however, would be the governance and the management. They would have more flexibility and more freedom because they would not be a part of a

hide-bound bureaucracy. They would do things that we cannot do in a bureaucratic system, which insists everyone has to do the same thing everywhere regardless. They would do things without having to run up a chain of command for approval. They could take some risks, and they would probably have some failures as a result, but they might have a lot of successes. At any rate, they could tackle the big problems.

They say in the public schools that they cannot have disruptive children, they cannot have children coming from certain kinds of backgrounds, with problems at home, et cetera. Let us throw that child into a charter school and tell the charter school board of directors, who should be a group of people who come together and are pledged over a long period of time to work with the problem of schooling, and not a fly-by-night operation where somebody wants to experiment for a little while, maybe while their child is in the school, and then they will drop it. We need a solid board of directors for these charter schools, and they ought to tackle some real education problems.

At any rate, the District of Columbia has made its decision. The District of Columbia has a charter school board. They are calling for the establishment of 20 more charter schools. Next week, as we debate the appropriations provision which will force them to install vouchers, we should look at charter schools as an alternative. We should tackle the whole problem of education, at least.

It requires a movement on a broad base. There are a lot of components of education reform, but there are several components of education reform which now we can move forward on them because it is possible to reach agreement.

There is agreement that we need more training for teachers and that the resources ought to be provided partially by the Federal Government. There is agreement on that. We ought to be able to move forward there.

There is agreement that technology and wiring for the Internet will greatly improve education in our schools. We have a universal fund established for that. We should move forward on that.

There is agreement on charter schools, that charter schools are a good idea. Right now, in America, we have less than 800 charter schools. We have 86,000 traditional public schools. So when we look at 86,000 versus 800, we know charter schools are not about to overrun traditional public schools. Even if we had 10 percent, it would not overrun traditional public schools. So traditional public schools are not threatened by charter schools.

Charter schools represent an experiment that we ought to try. Charter schools represent an experiment which is far superior to vouchers. Vouchers carry us into another realm of private education where people who accept public money can tell us that they are not going to do things except their

way. They have our money, our taxpayers' money, but they are going to do things their way.

They are honest enough to tell us that up front. They are not going to change their curriculum. They are not going to change their culture. They are not going to stop giving religious instruction, if they give religious instruction. That is what they are set up to do. They are honest enough to say that if we give them the money, they are not going to change or let us dilute their integrity.

So private schools or religious schools will operate as they have always operated. So let us not give them public money. Public money should go to public schools, and charter schools are public schools.

I want to conclude by saying that nowhere is the need greater than in the area of education, that we understand that we are leaders in an indispensable Nation. We are leaders in an indispensable Nation. We are the pivotal generation. If we are petty at this point, when our resources are greater than ever before; if we are petty at this point, when we do not have any global crisis, there is no world war, there is nothing attracting the attention of the American leaders and American resources as much as education should; if we at this point will not shift the tremendous amounts of dollars that we have spent on the cold war and on military defense, shift some of that money into education to meet the recognized crises in education, then we are petty leaders in an indispensable Nation, and the great indispensable Nation will lose its place in the world.

I have said before that compared to the United States of America, Rome was a little village. The Roman empire, with all its splendor, was nothing compared to the kind of colossus that America has at this point. But the minds of the American leaders are not measuring up to the size of the Nation and the mission of the Nation. We need a generation of profound leaders who act in a way that this indispensable Nation requires.

Ted Turner, in the area of billionaire philanthropy; George Soros, in the area of billionaire philanthropy; they have shown the way; Reed Hunt, at the Federal Communications Commission, has shown the way in the new guidelines for universal funds. There are many places where there are Americans who think like FDR and LBJ and they know we have to tackle big problems with big solutions. And in the area of education, we need to understand that we have a big problem that needs big solutions.

Part of that solution should be the training of teachers; part of that solution should be the upgrading of our schools with technology; part of that solution should be charter schools. And underneath that whole set of those subparts, there has to be a massive program to build schools. The construction, the bricks and mortar, comes first in this particular case, but in this indispensable Nation, we need an indis-

pensable school system with universal quality education for all.

DESIGNATION OF HON. EDWARD A. PEASE TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 1, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through Monday, October 6, 1997.

NEWT GRINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the designation is accepted.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MINGE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for September 30, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. ROTHMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for September 30, on account of attendance at funeral service for Florence Rothman.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for October 1 after 2:20 p.m., on account of personal business.

Mr. SAXTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for September 30 until 2:45 p.m., on account of attending a memorial service.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for September 30 after 3:30 p.m., on account of official business.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for October 1 after 1:45 p.m., on account of a death in the family.

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

Mr. MCKEON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PAXON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUTCHINSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

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. 394. An act to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain property located in the County of Iosco, Michigan.

H.R. 1948. An act to provide for the exchange of lands within Admiralty Island National Monument, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 996. An act to provide for the authorization of appropriations in each fiscal year for arbitration in United States district courts, and for other purposes.

S. 1198. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend the special immigrant religious worker program, to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to extend the deadline for designation of an effective date for paperwork changes in the employer sanctions program, and to require the Secretary of State to waive or reduce the fee for application and issuance of a non-immigrant visa for aliens coming to the United States for certain charitable purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 6, 1997, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debate.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
Office of Compliance,

Washington, DC, September 30, 1997.
Hon. NEWT GRINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 303 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. §1383, I am transmitting the enclosed notice of proposed rulemaking (proposing amendments to procedural rules previously adopted) for publication in the Congressional Record.

The Congressional Accountability Act specifies that the enclosed notice be published on the first day on which both Houses are in session following this transmittal.

Sincerely,

RICKY SILBERMAN,
Executive Director.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995: Amendments to Procedural Rules.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Summary: The Executive Director of the Office of Compliance is proposing to amend the Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance to cover the General Accounting Office ("GAO") and the Library of Congress ("Library") and their employees. The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA"), 2

U.S.C. §§ 1301-1438, applies the rights and protections of eleven labor and employment and public access laws to covered employees and employing offices within the Legislative Branch. Five sections of the CAA, which apply rights and protections of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 ("EPPA"), the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act ("WARN Act"), the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act of 1994 ("USERRA"), and the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 ("OSHA Act"), and which prohibit intimidation or reprisal for the exercise of rights under the CAA, become effective with respect to GAO and the Library on December 30, 1997. This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM") proposes to extend the coverage of the Procedural Rules to include GAO and the Library and their employees for purposes of proceedings relating to these five sections of the CAA and the general provisions of the rules relating to *ex parte* communications. These proposed amendments to the Procedural Rules have been approved by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance.

Dates: Comments are due within 30 days after the date of publication of this NPRM in the Congressional Record.

Addresses: Submit comments in writing (an original and 10 copies) to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, Room LA 200, John Adams Building, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Those wishing to receive notification of receipt of comments are requested to include a self-addressed, stamped post card. Comments may also be transmitted by facsimile ("FAX") machine to (202) 426-1913. This is not a toll-free call. Copies of comments submitted by the public will be available for review at the Law Library Reading Room, Room LM-201, Law Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, Washington, D.C., Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

For further information contact: Executive Director, Office of Compliance, at (202) 724-9250 (voice), (202) 426-1912 (TTY). This notice will also be made available in large print or braille or on computer disk, upon request to the Office of Compliance.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

1. Background and Purpose of this Rulemaking

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA" or the "Act"), Pub. L. 104-1, 109 Stat. 3, 2 U.S.C. §§ 1301-1438, applies the rights and protections of eleven labor and employment and public access laws to covered employees and employing offices within the Legislative Branch. With respect to GAO and the Library, five sections of the CAA will become effective as of December 30, 1997: (a) section 204, applying rights and protections of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 ("EPPA"), restricts the use of lie detector tests by employing offices; (b) section 205, applying rights and protections of the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act ("WARN Act"), assures covered employees of notice before office closings and mass layoffs; (c) section 206, applying rights and protections of the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act of 1994 ("USERRA"), protects job rights of covered employees who serve in the military and other uniformed services; (d) section 215, applying rights and protections of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 ("OSHA Act"), protects the safety and health of covered employees from hazards in their places of employment; and (e) section 207 forbids intimidation or reprisal against covered employees for exercising rights under other sections of the CAA.

The Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance establish procedures for considering

matters that involve employing offices and covered employees other than GAO and the Library and their employees. The purpose of this rulemaking is to extend the rules to cover GAO and the Library and their employees for purposes of any proceedings in which GAO or the Library or their employees may be involved as employing offices or covered employees.

The Board of Directors has also proposed to extend its substantive regulations implementing sections 204, 205, and 215 of the CAA to cover GAO and the Library and their employees. The NPRM was published in the September 9, 1997 issue of the Congressional Record, at 143 Cong. Rec. S9014.

2. Record of earlier rulemakings

To avoid duplication of effort, the Executive Director plans to rely generally on the record of earlier rulemakings. The current Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance were proposed, adopted, and amended in three phases during the past two years. See 141 Cong. Rec. S17012 (daily ed. Nov. 14, 1995) (NPRM); 141 Cong. Rec. S19239 (daily ed. Dec. 22, 1995) (final rules); 142 Cong. Rec. H7450 (daily ed. July 11, 1996) (NPRM); 142 Cong. Rec. S10980 (daily ed. Sept. 19, 1996) (final rules); 143 Cong. Rec. S25 (daily ed. Jan. 7, 1997) (NPRM); 143 Cong. Rec. H1879 (daily ed. Apr. 24, 1997) (final rules). A copy of the Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance is available for inspection at the Law Library Reading Room, at the address and times stated at the beginning of this Notice, and may also be viewed or downloaded from the Office of Compliance's internet Website at <http://www.compliance.gov/proful3.html>, or <http://www.access.gpo.gov/compliance/proful3.html>.

3. Proposed amendments

The Executive Director is presently aware of no reason why the procedural rules to cover GAO and the Library and their employees should be separate or substantively different from the rules already adopted for other employing offices and their employees. The Executive Director therefore proposes in this NPRM to extend the coverage of the rules already adopted to include GAO and the Library and their employees, and to make no other substantive change to the rules. Specifically, the NPRM proposes to amend the definitions established in section 1.02 of the Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance: (a) by including the employees of GAO and the Library in the definition of "covered employee," (b) by including GAO and the Library in the definition of "employing office," and (c) by adding a new paragraph (q) to section 1.02 specifying that GAO and the Library and their employees are included in these definitions only for the purposes of proceedings involving sections 204, 205, 206, 207, or 215 of the CAA or for purposes of the rules regarding *ex parte* communications. A technical correction is also necessary in the language being amended.¹

4. Request for comment

The Executive Director invites comment on these proposed amendments generally and invites comment specifically on whether there is any reason why the rules for GAO and the Library and their employees should be separate or different from the rules already adopted for other employing offices and their employees.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 30th day of September, 1997.

RICKY SILBERMAN
Executive Director,
Office of Compliance.

¹ In section 1.02(b) of the Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance, reference to the Office of Technology Assessment is being removed, as that Office no longer exists.

Accordingly, the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance hereby proposes the following amendments to the Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance:

It is proposed that section 1.02 of the Procedural Rules of the Office of Compliance be amended by revising paragraphs (b) and (h) and by adding at the end of the section a new paragraph (q) to read as follows:

"§1.02 Definitions.

"Except as otherwise specifically provided in these rules, for purposes of this Part:

- * * * * *
- "(b) *Covered employee.* The term "covered employee" means any employee of
- "(1) the House of Representatives;
 - "(2) the Senate;
 - "(3) the Capitol Guide Service;
 - "(4) the Capitol Police;
 - "(5) the Congressional Budget Office;
 - "(6) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol;
 - "(7) the Office of the Attending Physician;
 - "(8) the Office of Compliance; or
 - "(9) for the purposes stated in paragraph (q) of this section, the General Accounting Office or the Library of Congress.

* * * * *

"(h) *Employing Office.* The term "employing office" means:

- "(1) the personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or a Senator;
- "(2) a committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate or a joint committee;
- "(3) any other office headed by a person with the final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or privileges of the employment of an employee of the House of Representatives or the Senate;
- "(4) the Capitol Guide Board, the Capitol Police Board, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, and the Office of Compliance; or
- "(5) for the purposes stated in paragraph (q) of this section, the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress.

* * * * *

"(q) *Coverage of the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress and their Employees.* The term "employing office" shall include the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress, and the term "covered employee" shall include employees of the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress, for purposes of the proceedings and rulemakings described in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3):

"(1) The processing of any allegation that section 204, 205, or 206 of the Act has been violated, and any allegation of intimidation or reprisal prohibited under section 207 of the Act. Sections 204, 205, and 206 of the Act apply to covered employees and employing offices certain rights and protections of the following laws:

- "(i) the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988,
- "(ii) the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, and
- "(iii) the Chapter 43 (relating to veterans' employment and reemployment) of title 38, United States Code.

"(2) The enforcement of the inspection and citation provisions of section 215(c)(1), (2), (3) of the Act, and proceedings to grant variances under section 215(c)(4) of the Act. Section 215 of the Act applies to covered employees and employing offices certain rights and protections of the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

"(3) Any proceeding or rulemaking, for purposes of section 9.04 of these rules."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5304. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Carfentrazone-ethyl; Temporary Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300554; FRL-5744-8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5305. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Exception Decisions to Early Entry Prohibition, Worker Protection Standard; Technical Amendment [OPP-250122; FRL-5599-3] (RIN: 2070-AC95) received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5306. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glyphosate Oxidoreductase and the Genetic Material Necessary for Its Production in All Plants; Exemption From Tolerance Requirement on All Raw Agricultural Commodities [OPP-300552; FRL-5745-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5307. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting notification that it is estimated that the limitation on the Government National Mortgage Association's ("Ginnie Mae's") authority to make commitments for a fiscal year will be reached before the end of that fiscal year, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1721 nt.; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

5308. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the report on State member bank compliance with the national flood insurance program, pursuant to Public Law 103-325, section 529(a) (108 Stat. 2266); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

5309. A letter from the Assistant to the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Electronic Fund Transfers [Regulation E; Docket No. R-0959] received September 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

5310. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Acquisition Regulation; Revisions to Organizational Conflicts of Interest (RIN: 1991-AB26) received September 30, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5311. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Refrigerators, Refrigerator-freezers and Freezers [Docket No. EE-RM-93-801] received September 30, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5312. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Hydraulic Brake Systems; Passenger Car Brake Systems (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket 85-06; Notice 13] (RIN: 2127-

AG35) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5313. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 15% Rate of Progress Plan for the Baltimore Ozone Nonattainment Area [MD 053-3020; FRL-5905-8] received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5314. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revocation of Significant New Use Rules for Certain Acrylate Substances [OPPTS-50625B; FRL-5744-6] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5315. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Latex Condoms; User Labeling; Expiration Dating [Docket No. 95N-0374] (RIN: 0910-AA32) received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5316. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the report on shareholder proposals, pursuant to Public Law 104-290, section 510(b)(2) (110 Stat. 3450); to the Committee on Commerce.

5317. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to Public Law 102-1, section 3 (105 Stat. 4); (H. Doc. No. 105-138); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

5318. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting ILO Convention No. 177 and Recommendation No. 184 concerning Home Work; Convention No. 178 and Recommendation No. 185 concerning the Inspection of Seafarers' Working and Living Conditions; Convention No. 179 and Recommendation No. 186 concerning the Recruitment and Placement of Seafarers; Convention No. 180 concerning Seafarers' Hours of Work and the Manning of Ships; Recommendation No. 187 concerning Seafarers' Hours of Work and the Manning of Ships; and Protocol of 1996 to the Merchant Shipping Convention, 1976, pursuant to Art. 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on International Relations.

5319. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of justification for use of section 506(a)(2) authority to draw down articles, services, and military education and training from the Department of Defense, pursuant to Public Law 101-513, section 547(a) (104 Stat. 2019); to the Committee on International Relations.

5320. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Satellite fuel, Ground Support Equipment, Test Equipment, Payload Adapter/Interface Hardware, and Replacement Parts for the Preceding Items, When Included with a Specific Commercial Communications Satellite Launch [Docket No. 960918265-7203-04] (RIN: 0694-AB09) received September 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

5321. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the ATF's revised strategic plan, pursu-

ant to Public Law 103-62; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5322. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Acquisition Regulation: Elimination of Non-Statutory Certification Requirements (RIN: 1991-AB31) received September 30, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5323. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, Universities, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations [FRL-5881-5] received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5324. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled "Adherence to the Merit Principles in the Workplace: Federal Employees' Views," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5325. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the report to Congress under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3504(e)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5326. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report on the U.S. Antarctic Marine Living Resource Directed Research Program, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.; to the Committee on Resources.

5327. A letter from the Chair, Advisory Council on California Indian Policy, transmitting the ACCIP Historical Overview Report: The Special Circumstances of California Indians, pursuant to Public Law 102-416; Public Law 104-109; to the Committee on Resources.

5328. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gifts; Acquisition of Lands or Interest in Lands by Purchase or Condemnation [WO-130-1820-00-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AC98) received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5329. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Simultaneous De-designation and Termination of the Mud Dump Site and Designation of the Historic Area Remediation Site [FRL-5885-1] received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5330. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Coastal Service's Center Broad Area Announcement [Docket No. 9707-14173-7173-01] (RIN: 0648-ZA31) received September 23, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5331. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 092697A] received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5332. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries

Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Nontrawl Sablefish Mop-Up Fishery [Docket No. 961227373-6373-01; I.D. 092497C] received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5333. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended [Public Notice 2600] received September 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5334. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Adding Slovenia to the List of Countries Authorized to Participate in the Visa Waiver Pilot Program and Designating Ireland as a Permanent Participating Country (Formerly with Probationary Status) [INS No. 1786-96] (RIN: 1115-AB93) received October 1, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5335. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Interim Designation of Acceptable Documents for Employment Verification [INS No. 1818-96] (RIN: 1115-AE94) received October 1, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5336. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's 1996 Progress Report on the Transition to Quieter Airplanes, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 9308(g) (104 Stat. 1388-383); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5337. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-200 Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-ANE-35; Amendment 39-10134; AD 97-19-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5338. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-ANE-32; Amendment 39-10133; AD 97-19-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5339. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Enstrom Helicopter Corporation Model F-28A, F-28C, 280 and 280C Helicopters (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-SW-31-AD; Amendment 39-10142; AD 97-20-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5340. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; de Havilland Model DHC-7 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-NM-36-AD; Amendment 39-10141; AD 97-20-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5341. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model L-188A and L-188C Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-NM-07-AD;

Amendment 39-10140; AD 97-20-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5342. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-NM-237-AD; Amendment 39-10139; AD 97-20-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5343. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Inc. TSCP700-4B and -5 Auxillary Power Units (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-ANE-03; Amendment 39-10138; AD 97-19-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5344. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models 1900, 1900C, and 1900D Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-CE-60-AD; Amendment 39-10131; AD 97-15-13 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5345. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials in Intrastate Commerce; Delay of Compliance Date, Technical Amendments, Corrections and Response to Petitions for Reconsideration (Research and Special Programs Administration) [Docket HM-200; Amdt. Nos. 171-154 and 173-262] (RIN: 2137-AB37) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5346. A letter from the Chairman, Interagency Coordinating Committee on Oil Pollution Research, transmitting the Committee's biennial report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 101-380, section 7001(e) (104 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5347. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled "Implementation of the National Intelligent Transportation System Program," pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 6054(c); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5348. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—NOAA Pan-American Climate Studies (PACS), Program Announcement—September 30, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

5349. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Appeals Regulations: Remand for Further Development (RIN: 2900-A150) received October 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5350. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Regulations Governing the Offering of United States Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Company Tax and Loss BONDS [Department of the Treasury Circular, Public Debt Series No. 3-68] received September 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5351. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule—Import Restrictions Imposed on Archeological Artifacts from Guatemala [T.D. 97-81] (RIN: 1515-AC24) received October 1, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5352. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a report concerning Recommendations to Ensure Compliance by Federal Contractors and Subcontractors, pursuant to Public Law 104-208, section 8118 (110 Stat. 3009-114); jointly to the Committees on National Security and Veterans' Affairs.

5353. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled "Successful Telecommuting Programs in the Public and Private Sectors," pursuant to Public Law 104-50, section 345; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Appropriations.

5354. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report for the Demonstration and Commercial Application of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Technologies Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 12006; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Science.

5355. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Importing Noncomplying Motor Vehicles" for calendar year 1996, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30169(b); jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

5356. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting a notice of proposed rulemaking (proposing amendments to procedural rules previously adopted) for publication in the Congressional RECORD, pursuant to Public Law 104-1, section 303(b) (109 Stat. 28); jointly to the Committees on House Oversight and Education and the Workforce.

5357. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's certification to the Congress regarding the incidental capture of Sea Turtles in commercial shrimping operations, pursuant to Public Law 101-162, section 609(b)(2) (103 Stat. 1038); jointly to the Committees on Resources and Appropriations.

5358. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on Iran-Related Multilateral Sanction Regime Efforts, pursuant to Public Law 104-172, section 4(b) and 10(a); jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Banking and Financial Services, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2571. A bill to authorize major medical facility projects and major medical facility leases for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1703. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improved and expedited procedures for resolving complaints of unlawful employment discrimination arising within the Department of Veterans Affairs; with amendments (Rept. 105-292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2206. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1789. A bill to reauthorize the dairy indemnity program (Rept. 105-294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1779. A bill to make a minor adjustment in the exterior boundary of the Devils Backbone Wilderness in the Mark Twain National Forest, MO, to exclude a small parcel of land containing improvements (Rept. 105-295 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2366. A bill to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to conduct the census of agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-296 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1779 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1779. Referral to the Committee on Resources extended for a period ending not later than October 2, 1997.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 2603. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to arbitration in U.S. district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACKARD (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SHIMKUS,

Mr. WOLF, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. COX of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EWING, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CAPPAS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BRADY, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COOK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. HALL of Ohio):

H.R. 2604. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to protect certain charitable contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 2605. A bill to require the United States to oppose the making of concessional loans by international financial institutions to any entity in the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FROST, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 2606. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish certain requirements for managed care plans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that every effort should be made to assure the complete implementation of, and compliance with, the December 1996 Guatemalan peace accords; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

212. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to a resolution urging President William Jefferson Clinton and the Congress of the United States to support the methodology proposed by the United States Bureau of the Census to

conduct the Federal Census of the year 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4, of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 367: Mr. TALENT and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 373: Mr. STOKES and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 872: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WHITE.

H.R. 1126: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1151: Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 1165: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1232: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1371: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1500: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1526: Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 1534: Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1619: Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 1636: Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 1703: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. REYES, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 2195: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2206: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2221: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 2273: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2292: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 2331: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 2459: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FORD, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2497: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WHITE, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 2563: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2571: Mr. FILNER and Mr. MASCARA.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. WELLER.

H. Res. 224: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. TURNER.