

GOPAC have just been brought to light in documents filed in Federal court here in Washington. While now-Speaker GINGRICH chaired GOPAC, apparently the go in GOPAC meant go beyond the law. GOPAC was little more than a slush fund to subvert the Federal election law.

Quoting from those documents:

GOPAC routinely and continuously provided what was described as Newt support, expenditures for projects especially for Newt. GOPAC paid political consultants to help Newt think. Helping Newt was described as probably the single highest priority we've got in dollars. The expenditures total for Newt's support a quarter of a million dollars, not one dime of which was reported in accordance with Federal law.

Is it any wonder that Speaker GINGRICH refuses to act promptly on meaningful reform of our campaign finance laws when he would not even comply with the laws that we have on the books today? The GOPAC scandal is not going to go away. It is a serious violation of our laws. The Ethics Committee cannot duck it and this House cannot dodge it.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT A BALANCED BUDGET NOW

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, 1995 President Clinton signed the following statement in a continuing resolution: "The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002." Yet, just a couple of days ago when asked whether the White House would prefer to put off the larger budget debate until next year's elections, the White House press secretary, Mike McCurry, responded in saying, "Debate next year during the national election, campaign when we should, as Americans have that kind of debate."

They are trying to avoid balancing the budget this year, but we know what the American public want. They proved it in 1992 when Mr. Clinton told them that he could balance the budget in 35 years. They proved it in 1994 when they elected a Republican Congress. They proved it in 1995 when the people and the Congress wanted a balanced budget again. Now, against the will of the American public and against the will of the American people, the President is trying to avoid balancing the budget.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we know what the American people want. It is a balanced budget. Let us give it to them now.

WE MUST REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF TAX BREAKS TO THE WEALTHY IF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID ARE TO SURVIVE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is crucial in the budget negotiations that are now taking place that the amount of the tax breaks for wealthy Americans be reduced in order to provide sufficient funds for Medicare and Medicaid. Otherwise, seniors and low-income Americans will not have quality health care, or in many cases will not have any health care at all.

As we see from this scale that we have shown before, the amount of tax breaks almost equals the amount of Medicare cuts for seniors. If we do not reduce this, there is no way we are going to have sufficient funding for both Medicare and Medicaid.

The Treasury Department recently came out with some statistics that showed conclusively that the Republican tax cut is heavily weighted toward the rich. They estimated that the richest 1 percent would rake in almost twice as much, or 17 percent of the tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, the message has to go to these budget negotiators that they have to reduce these tax breaks for wealthy Americans if Medicare is going to survive, if Medicaid is going to survive, and if we are going to continue to provide quality health care under those two Federal programs.

DEMOCRATS AND FEARMONGERING

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, since the gentleman who just spoke is concerned about the cuts that the Republican plan is going to make in Medicare, if he would prefer then that we have a freeze. Would that satisfy the gentleman since, if he is concerned that we are cutting all of these programs, perhaps he would feel better about having a freeze in the programs? Would that work?

Of course it would not work, and the reason it would not work is that we are not cutting anything. In fact, if you see these numbers, you can see that the budget for 1995, the Federal budget, is \$1.5 trillion. It goes up to \$1.85 trillion in 2002.

What is unfortunate is that the minority wants to obscure the truth and obscure the facts and confuse the public about what is really happening, because by resorting to demagoguery and fearmongering and scare tactics, they believe that they can maintain a kind of tenuous political edge in the most disingenuous and exploitive way.

CONGRESS MUST VOTE ON SENDING TROOPS TO BOSNIA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, when our Founders drafted the Constitution,

the hottest debate centered around the power to declare war. Legislative history, legislative debate, legislative intent is absolutely clear. The Founders painstakingly articulated what they felt ensured, that in America no one person, no one person could place America at war or place Americans in harm's way.

Now after all of the political rhetoric, after all of the opinions by the military experts, after all of the analysis, after all of the newspaper writings and all the speeches, the fact remains that one person, one man, has decided to place troops in harm's way.

I believe that the Congress of the United States, who has abdicated the power in America where the people govern and turned it over to the White House, must vote on this issue. In America, no one man is deigned by the Constitution to have that power to place troops in harm's way. I think it is time to literally take our Government back.

NO MORE EXCUSES

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, for years politicians in Washington have paid lip service to the idea of balancing the budget. But when it came time to get the job done, special interests and weak backbones have always carried the day.

The new Republican majority made a commitment to end business as usual in Washington. We promised the American people that we would balance the budget so they could have more jobs, lower interest rates, and more take-home pay.

We have kept our word. After months of hard work and several tough votes, we put America's families and America's children above the politics of the past and passed the first balanced budget in 26 years.

Mr. Speaker, we have provided President Clinton with the opportunity to do the right thing. I sincerely hope that he seizes the day. The American people cannot afford to have the same old excuses and Washington gimmicks kill the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

ELISA IZQUIERDO

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week, when we were all giving thanks, 6-year-old Elisa Izquierdo was beaten to death. Her death has been added to the brutal slaying of Debra Evans as the latest ploy for attacking assistance to the needy. This type of outrageous opportunism that takes tragedies and twists them for political gain is shameful and immoral.

Many have claimed that the welfare system is to blame for these deaths. Instead of getting to the heart of the

problem we have engaged in mindless fingerpointing that blames adversity on the system.

This rhetoric of blaming the victim and the poor must stop. Death's like these have occurred because of the systematic destruction of America's social safety net.

We must invest in our fellow human beings instead of turning our backs on them. If we fail to do this, there will be thousands more like Elisa and Debra.

It should not take these heinous crimes to serve as a wakeup call that we must change our course. Stop making excuses and start funding change.

SHOW US WHERE CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE IN THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET PLAN, AND BE SPECIFIC

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Bill Clinton took over as President, he presented his 1993 budget plan. He was, of course, criticized by Members of Congress on his spending and taxing priorities. He responded to his critics by demanding specifics on how they would do things differently.

In fact, here is a quote from February 18, 1993. In St. Louis, MO, the President said, "My answer is: Show me where, but be specific. No hot air. Show me where, and be specific."

Well, today Bill Clinton criticizes Congress' balanced budget proposal. In fact, he was willing to shut down the Government to prove his point.

He criticizes, but he provides no specifics. He trashes our budget, but he does not say how he would do things differently.

Mr. Speaker, the President should end the hot air campaign and show us exactly where he would do things differently. Show us where, and be specific.

DEMANDING AN ETHICS COMMITTEE REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF SPEAKER GINGRICH

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clearer and clearer now why Speaker GINGRICH is pressuring Members of the Republican majority not to support the privileged resolution for the Ethics Committee to give the Members of this House and the American public a progress report on their 14-month-old investigation into the speaker's activities.

Today on the front page of nearly every major newspaper in America we are treated to the fact that the Speaker mixed campaign fundraising and his activities as a legislator. We see now tens of thousands of dollars contrib-

uted to the Speaker by those individuals that sought his legislative favors before the Congress of the United States, people who sought his favors dealing with asbestos regulation, with cement trade problems with Mexico, where the Speaker, in exchange for those \$10,000 contributions, wrote back to those individuals telling them he was terribly interested in their problems, he will look into it, or that he thanks them for their counsel on capital gains.

Mr. Speaker, the House rules are clear on the ethics. You cannot engage in that kind of activity when you are raising money from individuals, and then engage in favors for those individuals later on. The Ethics Committee ought to report to this House and to the American people.

□ 1015

AMERICAN PEOPLE DO NOT WANT TROOPS IN BOSNIA

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, we have no business sending troops to Bosnia—plain and simple. That is the message I am hearing from the people I represent, Mr. Speaker, and one the President would do well to heed. I pray he's listening.

The President proposes to send troops trained for combat to somehow enforce an uneasy peace among antagonists who have been at each other's throats for five centuries. He's sending heavy armor in an area totally unsuited for modern armored warfare. He is placing Americans in contact with radical factions that have no love for the United States. Remember, not all of the combatants on the ground have embraced the peace agreement, adding further to a long list of factors which add up to a potential disaster.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, we should never deploy combat troops abroad unless a national security interest is at stake. This deployment does not meet that simple test. Congress has spoken on this matter. The American people are speaking loud and clear. Listen to them, Mr. President. Stay out of Bosnia.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA SCHROEDER

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this morning to offer words of tribute to the gentlewoman from Colorado, PATRICIA SCHROEDER, my colleague. The gentlewoman took us all by surprise yesterday with her announcement. She deserves the thanks not only of thousands of grateful Coloradans but from an entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, whether on issues of military reform or women's rights or

the interests of the kids of America, she has been known to rock the boat when that was needed and to set a courageous course for America so many, many times. Her intelligence, her irreverence, her integrity has set the standard, but in no area more than in her wit and turn of phrase has she been an inspiration to so many of us over so many years.

The House of Representatives and the United States have been the richer for PAT SCHROEDER's selfless service.

ROOT OUT MEDIA BIAS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in order to form opinions and reach conclusions, the American people trust the media to present the facts objectively. Unfortunately, all too often this is not done.

Editorials, in the guise of news stories, regularly appear on the front pages of newspapers. Some reporters don't wait beyond the first paragraph to reveal their bias.

In the age of 15-second sound bites, positions on complex issues are reduced to "for" or "against," with no explanations.

The lack of the public's trust in the media is glaringly revealed by two 1995 public opinion surveys.

A CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll found that 60 percent of those surveyed think the media is out of touch with average Americans. In a Wall Street Journal/NBC News Poll, only 21 percent said the media are very or mostly honest.

Publishers, editors, producers, and reporters can better protect our democracy if they will initiate efforts to root out bias and present the facts objectively to a public yearning for the truth.

ALLOWING DEBATE ON PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in my new quasi-emeritus status, let me talk to the Members of the other side of the aisle. We are going to have a very important privileged resolution come in front of this House today, and that resolution we should be allowed to debate. If they vote to table it, we cannot even debate it. That resolution is about what is the status of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct's report on all the many, many charges against the Speaker.

Please, I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, get your voting cards back, get your spines out of the Cloakroom. We ought to have that kind of a report, especially on a day when the newspapers in America are filled with articles talking about how the Federal Election Commission has