

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

[Mrs. SCHROEDER 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 California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS 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 Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois 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 California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN 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 West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WISE 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 California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KIM 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 Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

INNOCENT MISTAKE TRANSFORMED INTO AN ETHICS COMPLAINT

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. EHRLICH, I wanted to conclude my remarks from earlier and just to say that, regardless of these types of attacks on our subcommittee and the process there, we do not feel that that should be the type of

debate we have in this Congress. What we are going to do is continue on the merits of our bill that will protect the taxpayer and end the taxpayer subsidy for lobbyists here in Washington, and I look forward to working with my colleague from Maryland in doing that.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will stay right there, I hope the American people are watching this tonight, Mr. Speaker, and I would like the gentleman in very concise terms to go before me in 2 minutes the facts of what was set out earlier.

From my understanding, you have a hearing, you were the subcommittee chair, a mistake was made, a prop was made, a mistake was made by a staffer; correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. We should have used the prop first and then distributed the smaller version.

Mr. EHRLICH. It was distributed prior to the time it should have been distributed; is that correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct.

Mr. EHRLICH. When you found out about this mistake performed by the staffer, what did you do?

Mr. MCINTOSH. At the hearing I told people this is our document. We intended to make the point this way, and that evening I sent a letter of apology to Miss Erin saying, if there was any umbrage taken, it certainly was not our intent.

Mr. EHRLICH. And to my colleague how long was the offending piece of paper on the desk for public consumption? Do you know?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I am not sure exactly how long it was there. It did not take long before we were asked about it, and the staff withdrew the document and have since then reissued it with a disclaimer that this information about the grants comes from the subcommittee.

Mr. EHRLICH. The irrefutable facts, however, are once I found out the staffer had made a mistake, you ordered it off the table, you offered an immediate apology, at least you recognized a mistake had been made publicly; correct? And that evening you wrote a formal letter of apology; is that correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct.

Mr. EHRLICH. Now, Mr. Speaker, a political culture that encourages this scenario to be transformed into an ethics complaint against my colleague from Indiana is not what the American people have a right to expect. A political culture that seeks to personalize innocent, innocuous mistakes and attacks a Member of this body personally not on the issues, not on political philosophy, not on political orientation, that is all fair, I would submit, to the general public and the Members of this body, but a political culture that requires even a personal attack against my colleague from Indiana on these facts is broken, and I thank my colleague from Indiana for his indulgence.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line to this entire situation, as the chairman of the full committee stated, as the chairman of the subcommittee stated tonight, we

were sent to Washington to change this culture, and if there is one thing I hope we can claim success on come November 1996, and I will direct this comment to my colleague from Indiana, it is that we change the culture that seeks to personalize innocent mistakes. Where I came from, in a State legislature, this is a nonevent.

□ 1930

Here, it is an ethics complaint. I submit to the people of this country, this is not what they voted for November 8, 1994. I am making it my business, and I want the Members to know, and I want every Member of this body to know that this has to stop. I thank my colleague for his indulgence.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me say that I wholeheartedly agree, that we need to get to debating the facts. In this particular case, I think what is feared more than anything by these groups is that we will succeed in telling the American people about how their tax dollars are being used. In this case it was \$7 million that indirectly went to benefit this lobbying group through a laundering scheme. Interestingly enough, when I asked Ms. Aron at the committee hearing to help us bring out those facts and to tell us if she did not agree with these dollar amounts, how much Federal subsidy there was, this was her response.

Mr. EHRLICH. Let me understand this now. This quote that you have produced was her response, and that is the reason the entire document was generated in the first place?

Mr. MCINTOSH. She said, "We are not going to tell you, Members of Congress, how much taxpayer dollars go to our membership, how and whether that taxpayer dollar is being used to subsidize our lobbying effort." In a typical kind of arrogance that has grown up in this city of people who have gotten used to living off of the taxpayer dollars, she said, "I will not. I will not go into the amounts of Federal monies that my members receive." To me, we owe it to the taxpayer to tell them that information.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, if only our opponents would debate the issue on the merits.

THE VA-HUD-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES CONFERENCE REPORT

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

REGARDING ATTACKS ON MEMBERS AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVE DUTIES

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that I just went up and checked our own

House manual book, our rules manual. It is in every office. On page 360, you will read that an attack upon a Member about his representative duties is a bona fide point of personal privilege. I would recommend that you do what I said I would not do myself to correct some attacks on my honor. I will not waste the committee's time, because they were more personal. But that is an attack on the whole freshman class, on me, on all of us, on what we are trying to do. I would recommend you do it in the middle of the day tomorrow, or as soon as you can next week, check it with the Speaker, but not—

Mr. GEKAS. And not tonight.

Mr. DORNAN. And not tonight.

Mr. GEKAS. Thank you for yielding back my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am engaged in a small war of "Dear Colleagues." My office sent out a "Dear Colleague" letter on the impending conference report and the vote we are going to take on the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations. That "Dear Colleague" was answered by another one, and now we have submitted a surrebuttal "Dear Colleague."

I would like to explain this to the House, because this information flowing back and forth is going to be very important in the decision that each Member of the House has to make on the appropriations for EPA under the Independent Agencies portion of the VA-HUD conference report that we are going to be debating.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let us start from the beginning. This is important. When we passed the Clean Air Act, and all of us want clean air, for gosh sakes. Who can accuse anybody in the Congress or outside the Congress of not wanting to have clean air? Well, anyway, because of the language in the Clean Air Act and the authorization granted in there, the EPA had certain powers. One of them was to set auto emission standards for the 50 States.

What has happened is that the mandates issued out of the EPA for centralized emissions mechanisms in the various States were so draconian and so devoid of proper standards for clean air, and really devoid of the necessary information upon which proper testing could be accomplished, that 16 States had to throw up their hands and determine that it was impossible for them to comply with that kind of centralized emission mechanism called for by the EPA.

So what has happened is that, with a lot of intermediate history which I will not reiterate here, we came to the point where a rider, one of the 16 or 17 riders, is being inserted into these Independent Agency appropriations for the EPA which would say, very innocuously and reasonably, that we would like to see the EPA conduct a 2-year study of air sampling, shall we say, to determine what is an alternative to the centralized mechanism that they are mandating, because we do not think that 16 States, and perhaps others, will be able to safely and cost-effectively

comply. That is all we wanted to do with this rider that is 1 of the 16 or 17 riders.

Now, when I sent out my letter, my "Dear Colleague" letter, I alerted everyone that we ought to vote no on the Stokes-Boehlert motion to instruct conferees, because we could be cutting out highway funds unless we supported this rider. If we supported Stokes-Boehlert, we could be cutting out highway funds for the 16 States. That is the essence of my "Dear Colleague."

What that was followed by was a "Dear Colleague" by the gentleman from New York, SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, and I guess the former chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STOKES, that that was not true, that no State would be facing losing highway funds if they got rid of this rider and let the EPA do what it wanted to do.

So what did I do? I researched as fast as I could, and my staff did an excellent job to try to bring this into focus. We have learned that indeed the EPA sends out letter after letter to California, to Pennsylvania, to Virginia, threatening the loss of highway project funds and highway funds unless those States and others comply with this centralized version.

Then they say, "We do not mandate centralized monitoring of auto emissions," but then if you do not, then if you implement something else, you could lose 50 percent of the credits that in themselves wind up costing highway funds to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to straighten this out. Let me repeat, the rider which is in the bill now, which I want to protect, is one that would put the EPA on hold on these mandates for this centralized system, put them on hold until we can test the air, get some samples, determine the best way to determine this auto emissions program, not to force this down our throats in an ineffective, cost-ineffective manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN 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 Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

DEMANDING INFORMATION ON THE WELFARE, WELL-BEING, AND WHEREABOUTS OF JOURNALIST DAVID ROHDE

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

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to express my serious concern over the welfare of an American journalist who has just been reported missing in Bosnia. I received a phone call from the father of David Rohde this morning indicating that—he was aged 28 and currently serving in the Balkans as a reporter, Eastern European correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor—I am advised that he has been reported missing as of last Saturday.

American embassies in Belgrade, Zagreb, and Sarajevo are all assisting in attempts to locate Mr. Rohde, along with the United Nations. It is believed that David is being held at Pale, and the Christian Science Monitor quoted a U.S. State Department spokesman as saying that "All indications are that Mr. Rhode was traveling in an area under the control of the Bosnian Serbs, and we hold them responsible for his safety."

I have to confess, Mr. Speaker, that I have a personal interest in this. Not only is Mr. Rohde's father a constituent, but barely 4 years ago I served in uniform as a member of the U.S. Marine Corps. My responsibility in the early days of the American incursion into northern Iraq was to work with the international press corps who are in that part of the world, in that god-forsaken part of the world, attempting to cover the story.

I have nothing but profound admiration and respect for the courage and the integrity of the international press corps, particularly many of the brave American journalists who risk their lives on a daily basis to bring back to the American public information on critical crises around the world. Mr. Rohde is no exception to my observations.

I might also note for the record that on the issues of Bosnia and the difficult conflict in the Balkans, I have tried to be scrupulously neutral. At no time have I favored any one side over the other. I feel, and have felt for a long time, that our interest in the Balkans is to ensure that all three warring countries resolve their differences and they they live together in peace. But there is a certain irony that on the very day that the peace process is beginning, in Dayton, OH, and that the Presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia have arrived in our country, it is ironic that Mr. Rohde has been reported missing in one of those areas, possibly in the Bosnian-Serb area.

I would say to the Presidents of those three countries and to the people of those three countries that your credibility is on the line. Whoever took David captive owes it to report immediately on his welfare and his well-being. We want an accounting of Mr. Rohde. We want his whereabouts disclosed, and we will hold you, whoever took this individual captive or is holding him against his will, we will hold you responsible for his safety.