

Let me read to you an editorial from the Port Saint Lucie News, published by Scripps Howard, a prominent news gathering source around our Nation. The editorial says, "Slowing down not stopping." If a car was going down the highway at 70 miles per hour, and the driver let up enough on the accelerator for the speed to be reduced to 65 miles per hour, would you then say the car had stopped? Well, if you are a Democrat Member of Congress, you probably would.

Of course, if the Democrats conceded that this was just an instance of going slower, they may also have to concede that the Republicans are not planning to deprive the elderly whose savings have run out, and other poor people, of health care. The Democrats are making that case all over the land. It is preposterous and shameful.

The real issue is that the budget cannot be balanced without reducing the growth rate of entitlement programs or increasing taxes astronomically. If the budget is not balanced, interest payments on the debt will eventually consume all of the Federal budget and leave no room for anything else. What do the Democrats plan to do then?

I have received commentary from my districts through a newsletter we submitted to our constituents. Do you support the Medicare Preservation Act? They had four choices: strongly support, to strongly oppose. A gentleman, Oto Fredro, from West Palm Beach, FL, somewhat support. Would like to stay with the current Medicare plan. Oto, you can do that under the Republican's plan.

Doug Weaver, strongly support, would consider a new plan like an HMO. Also urges us to decrease funding for the B-2 bomber. Decrease money for food stamps. Increase money for Medicare. Decrease money for foreign aid. Decrease money for welfare.

Glenn Shaffer, Lake Placid, FL, strongly supports Medicare Preservation Act. But wants to stay in the current Medicare plan. Glenn, you get to stay in the current Medicare plan as you choose.

Leonard Keal from Palm City, FL, strongly support. Again, wants to stay in the Medicare plan.

Miriam Dunst, somewhat opposed, very skeptical about the plan, wants to stay with Medicare. She wants to have that choice. You can stay there and we appreciate your response.

Joseph Cezosie from West Palm Beach, FL, strongly opposes our plan, but would like to consider an HMO. Under the current plan, he cannot select an HMO. Under our plan, you can.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about tax cuts. There has been a lot of talk about balancing Medicare in order to provide for the tax cuts. They are not related. The Post Times the other day did take on the President of the United States because, they said, he spent too much on the explanation of taxes, too little on principle. In one typically self-pitying moment, Bill

Clinton demonstrated again last week why he is a President with many enemies and also few friends. He spent Tuesday night explaining that he had raised taxes too much.

Folks in this Congress, the 104th Congress, the freshmen have come here to make a difference. We have problems in our system. Do I think the Republicans have solved all the problems in Medicare? Absolutely not. Do I think we have a silver bullet to erase years of wasteful spending in our system? Absolutely not.

I want to target fraud, waste, and abuse in our bill. I want to strengthen the provisions that we brought to this floor, strengthen the provisions for fraud and abuse. Anyone who rips off our taxpayers should do jail time. Anyone who rips off our taxpayers in Medicare should have their licenses removed, be it a hospital, be it an insurance company, be it a provider.

But, ladies and gentlemen, make no bones about it; when I come from the sixth oldest district in America and I had over 700 people attend my town hall meetings saying to me, help save Medicare, nobody is screaming at me. Nobody yelling at me. One of two people threatened to throw me out of office, which is the risk of this business. Nobody is saying that this was the horrible plan. They want explanations.

One person got up in one meeting and said I had done a terrible thing and I was voting against him. The New York Times was with us, following that meeting. One person gets up to speak negatively about our plan, their headlines, tough Medicaid meeting. It was not a tough meeting. The public supports us, and I am proud to represent the 16th District of Florida.

GINGRICH BOOK DEAL

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, once again we are confronted in the press with reports of violations of House rules with respect to our Speaker of the House, Speaker GINGRICH. That is the bulk sale of his books to organizations that have connections to the Speaker and have been supportive of the Speaker or in fact have contributed to the Speaker in the past.

We saw, unfortunately, in the past when the Speaker engaged in this same activity, he later had to resign from office for this transgression of House rules. The suggestion here is because the commission is somewhat smaller, therefore it is right. No, it is not. The house rules prevent that.

This is the second time in a matter of a week and a half where revelations have again appeared in the press suggesting that the Speaker's political action committee, GOPAC, was more deeply involved and involved earlier in Federal campaigns and campaigns for

Members of Congress and trying to change the majority in Congress before it was authorized to do so.

The New York article that was published a couple of weeks ago outlines exactly what took place in communications between GOPAC and members of the Republican Party. So where are we?

We are a year later. What is an ethics committee and a chairman of that ethics committee doing that continues to try to manage the investigation and to manage the spin and to manage the flow of information to Members of Congress, to the press, and to the public rather than engaging in an investigation. A year later, when witnesses still have not been called, when documents have still not been subpoenaed, and information has not been gone through that is relevant to this information, according to the popular press.

What we need, what this House needs and what this House deserves and what the American people deserve is a full-blown independent investigation, not an investigation managed by Members of the Speaker's party who are indebted to the Speaker politically in this House or for their daily activities in the House or to their districts. What we need is an investigation, as the Speaker called for for the previous Speaker, and that is an independent counsel. As the Speaker said of the previous Speaker, if you have done nothing wrong, you have nothing to fear.

What this House cannot tolerate and what Members of this House cannot tolerate and what the public should not tolerate is the continued efforts to try to manage this investigation, to get past the Contract With America. Then they wanted to manage it to get past the Medicare fight. Then they wanted to manage it to get past reconciliation. Then there is a question of whether the Speaker is going to run for President. Will the revolution continue?

Those are all interesting. Those all may be consequences of the Speaker's activities and the consequences of this investigation, but they are not reasons of which an independent investigation should be forgone.

We are talking about the most powerful Member of this House, obviously one of the most powerful politicians in the country, one of most powerful people in line of succession to the President of the United States. The suggestion is somehow that we are going to manage and we are going to change the nature of the investigations that this Congress is engaged in in the past when it has to unfortunately investigate one of its own. That is that you have to eventually get to an individual, an independent counsel.

Apparently the ethics committee has arrived at this conclusion after a year of seeing that they could not properly handle this investigation. So now what they are trying to do is to manage the charter of the independent counsel, to suggest that he can only go down road A, but he cannot go down road B, he

can only go down so far on this path of evidence, but he cannot go down too far. He cannot stumble across things that may come up in the nature of that investigation.

If they had done that to the independent counsel in the Espy case, they would have never discovered Jim Lake and his scheme to provide illegal contributions to a Federal candidate.

That is the nature of an independent counsel, to be independent and as free to go as far as the facts and the truth take that individual; not as far as the facts and the political realities of the political debts and the political obligations take that investigation, but as far as the facts and the truth take that investigation.

□ 1245

The time has come for the chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to admit they cannot do a job that will satisfy the needs of the Members of this House of Representatives in terms of telling their constituents that we have a different way of doing business, that we have a different way of handling congressional ethics, that we have a different way of handling the transgressions of those ethics because it is now Speaker GINGRICH, as opposed to Speaker Wright, or it is not Speaker GINGRICH, as opposed to 9 or 10 other Members of Congress, that had independent counsels. Let us meet the standard that Speaker GINGRICH has set our for the House, and that is an independent counsel.

TOURISM: THE WORLD'S LARGEST INDUSTRY AND GREATEST JOB CREATOR

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I have an important statement here which might take me longer than 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, thank God for the tourists. Here in Washington, in the small towns and big cities across America, the sight of a camper or a tour bus packed with people eager to spend money in local motels, restaurants, and gift shops is an answer to many a prayer. Each one of these vacationers is an economic miracle funding and fueling a massive industry, travel and tourism. That is America's second-largest employer and provides billions of dollars in revenue for every State, city, and town across America.

In today's changing world of high technology and increasing mobility, tourism is an economic sleeping giant. Futurist John Naisbitt has written that tourism in the next century will be the largest industry not only in America, but worldwide, and I agree. I believe that Naisbitt is right. Travel and tourism is also awakening politically from its slumber.

Mr. Speaker, we now have 302 members of our Travel and Tourist Caucus, an indication of how important this industry is to Congress. In 1995 travelers in the United States will spend an estimated \$535 billion. This is real economic muscle. Today we support 14 million jobs and provide \$493 billion in wages and salaries. That comes out of travel and tourism. The revenue generated by travel and tourism will total \$127 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes. That is what travel and tourism contributes to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you exactly what it means for each and every household in America. It means that you are paying \$652 less in taxes. Let me repeat that, \$652 less in taxes for each household, every year because of travel and tourism. This decrease in taxes comes to the American taxpayer from the travel and tourist industry and from the tourists.

Given these statistics, Mr. Speaker, convincing government to actively support travel and tourism should be easy. But, as my colleagues know, in spite of the growing support for the travel and tourism industry, the United States is losing ground. We must seriously focus on travel and tourism so that we can add jobs and income here in America.

In the recent hearing I held right here on Capitol Hill in our Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee, Greg Farmer, Under Secretary of Commerce for Travel and Tourism, delivered some startling news.

He pointed out that the United States ranks 33d in the world among nations spending funds to promote tourism. That is even behind Malaysia and Tunisia. For the past 3 years, the U.S. market share in tourism has declined from 18 percent down to 15 percent. This means a lot of jobs and a lot of revenue right here in America, and the message is clear. The United States has invested less money in tourism, and now we are paying the price for that neglect. We are losing our share of the international tourist market.

We cannot allow that to continue to happen, and, Mr. Speaker, this means one thing for the working people in America: lost jobs. In the past 3 years the United States has lost 177,000 tourist jobs to other countries. Why? Because travelers are choosing destinations other than the United States, and we must reverse that trend, and that is what we are attempting to do in the Travel and Tourism Caucus. We want to bring travel and tourism, which has a great story to tell, here to the Congress, America, and around the world because travel and tourism is the incoming tide of a strong economy.

The need for action in this area is clear, and that is why we have, in my opinion, 302 members of the Travel and Tourist Caucus. Caucus members know that travel and tourism is America's economic prosperity, and it must be considered as two sides of the same coin.

Next week, as my colleagues know, on Monday and Tuesday a week from today and tomorrow, we are having our first ever White House Conference on Travel and Tourism. We are having some 1,700 people from every congressional district in America here on Capitol Hill, and from that conference we are going to take the recommendations and implement them into legislation. We can get in step with travel and tourism, the greatest economic engine that is propelling America into a stronger economy. By the year 2000, more than 661 million people will be traveling throughout the world, and, Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that travel and tourism will have more impact on our country and in our world economically than any other industry.

ACTIONS, NOT WORDS, ARE IMPORTANT

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have come to talk a bit about words, words, words, words and how we often think we know what they mean, but they are not meaning what we think they mean so often as they are used by the Republicans in this time.

First of all, the words "family friendly." This was going to be a big "family friendly" Congress. Well, guess what they are selling first? They are selling the day care center for staff, and the day care center has been gagged. When you call and say, "What's going to happen to you, are you going to move somewhere?" they say, "We have been ordered not to talk to anybody about it." That does not sound very family friendly to me, and so, when you hear family-friendly, just think of the child care center for the staff being put on the auction block by these guys and see if you think that is family friendly.

Now the other thing that we hear about is independent counsel. We now hear that we are moving toward an independent counsel. Well, when you think of independent, independent means independent. But we hear the big hangup as to why we cannot have an independent counsel is because they want to find a way to leash the independent counsel, put blinders on the independent counsel, and keep the independent counsel in a cage. That is not an independent counsel. That is a lap dog, and no one wants a lap dog from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as we look into these issues dealing with the Speaker's ethics charges.

We also hear the big fight about, that was in the paper today, about the Speaker and his bulk sales in the newest, newest charge that has been piled up in front of the door of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and what does the word "bulk" mean? The newspapers today are filled with