

Page 5, line 4, strike "and (21)" and insert ", (21), and (22)".

Mr. DREIER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment makes two technical changes to the gift ban rule that was adopted by the House on November 16. These changes were inadvertently left out of the Gingrich-Solomon amendment to institute a tougher gift ban than the one contained in House Resolution 250. This amendment simply reinstates the exemptions for donations of home State products intended primarily for promotional purposes, and items of nominal value, such as greeting cards and baseball caps. The Gingrich-Solomon amendment was not intended to force Members to return Christmas cards to our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has been detained, but has no objections to the resolution or the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CHRISTMAS GIFT DRIVE FOR CHILDREN OF DISTRICT PRISONS AND LORTON REFORMATORY

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, a group of Members, Republicans and Democrats, have gotten together to try to urge congressional offices and others to donate a Christmas present for the children of residents of D.C. Lorton Reformatory or District jail. This is a program under the auspices of Prison Fellowship and Chuck Colson and a number of offices and congressional wives are doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge any Member or staff that is watching to call the office of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] or the office of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], or my office, or call the Prison Fellowship office at 265-4544 to donate a gift for children of parents who are serving either in D.C. Lorton Reformatory or District jail at this time of the year.

If these children do not receive a gift this way, many will not receive anything.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, 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 Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### DO NOT SEND TROOPS TO BOSNIA

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today American troops are in Bosnia. There are approximately 10 troops in Bosnia already, Mr. Speaker. By the end of the week, it will be 700. By the end of the year, probably 35,000 directly involved and 140,000 indirectly involved.

Today, Secretary Christopher, Secretary Perry, and General Shalikashvili came to the Committee on National Security to try to convince Congress to support the commitment to place ground troops in Bosnia. Soon, we here in Congress will be asked to support an agreement that we not only had no input in drafting, but also repeatedly have expressed our opposition to.

Mr. Speaker, the American public and Congress is opposed to placing troops in Bosnia. To those that are in support of placing troops in Bosnia, I think that they will be subject to change when we see the first widow handed a flag at a grave side next to their children whose eyes will be filled with tears.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious issue. There may be an agreement between those involved in the crisis over in Bosnia, and I have a copy of that agreement that was signed in Dayton, OH, on November 21. It was signed for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In this agreement, Mr. Speaker, there is no requirement for U.S. troops. Nowhere does it call out that United States troops must be on the ground in Bosnia.

If there is no written requirement for troops being on the ground in Bosnia, why are we there? Today Secretary Christopher said, "We are going to place troops on the ground in Bosnia because of our commitment to NATO." That is why we are placing troops there. Further, he said if we do not lead in this matter by placing troops on the ground in Bosnia, no one in the international community will ever follow the lead of America again.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully disagree with Secretary Christopher, because there is no written requirement in this agreement to place troops. I do submit that there are ways that we can lead in the effort to stop the atrocities that are occurring in Bosnia by other means. We can lead within this agreement. We can lead without placing ground troops in Bosnia. We can lead through air support, as we have done in the past. We can lead through logistical support and we can lead through intelligence gatherings and through provisions of hardware, through strategy.

In closing in the presentation that is going to be made by General Shalikashvili, he said that this operation is going to be tough and we must be prepared for casualties. We must be prepared for casualties. What is the acceptable level of casualties, general? Mr. President? The American public? Congress? What is the acceptable level of casualties? Is it 1,000 a week of young men and women, of Americans dying? Is it 250 per week?

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what that answer is, but I do know what the answer is in Kansas; what the people of Kansas are telling me. They are telling me that the acceptable level of casualties in Bosnia of United States men and women is zero. No casualties. That is what is acceptable, yet we are sending in troops now and they are going to be in harm's way.

Recently, I heard General Schwarzkopf talk about his lessons learned in Vietnam. No. 1, there is no such thing as a limited war. What we are entering into is allegedly peacekeeping. It is more like peacemaking. It may become an occupation. It will probably be termed as a limited war when the fighting starts.

Mr. Speaker, there are 45,000 to 60,000 Serbs who are opposed to this agreement. Our troops will be landing at Tuzla, within 1 mile of Serb positions, within mortar range. When those aircraft come on final approach, they will be in harm's way. There are Azerbaijan troops, which are Moslems, 4,000, who also do not agree with this peace agreement.

The second thing that General Schwarzkopf said is there must be a clear mission. I do not think that has been established.

The third is never, never put troops in a conflict without the support of the American public. Mr. President and Mr. Secretary, we do not have the support of the American public and we do

not have the support of the Congress. Let us not send troops to Bosnia.

#### REMOVE THE ETHICAL CLOUD FROM THE HOUSE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the question this afternoon is how long our Republican colleagues will be able to hold the lid down on the pressure cooker, the pressure cooker of the desires of the people of this country to see justice, to see the ethical cloud removed from the operations of this Congress.

Today, we have seen that it will take a little bit longer, for, for the second time, this Congress has refused to even discuss in the light of day whether a committee of this Congress should come forward and tell us what it has been doing for the last 14 months with regard to charges concerning the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Republican colleagues can hold that pressure cooker lid down. They can stand on it. They can sit on it. They can jump up and down on it. But sooner or later, enough people in this country are going to care about the operations of this House and the ethics of this House that they are going to demand a report and demand action.

We see the same concern with reference to the broader issue of the way all Members, the Speaker, myself, every Member of this institution, gets to this body with reference to the cost of campaigns.

All over this country, people are expressing their concern about the operation of the campaign finance system. I think they are pleased that despite the Speaker, we moved forward and banned gifts from lobbyists to Members of this Congress. They are pleased that despite the Speaker holding at his desk for month, after month, after month, a lobby reform bill, there was finally enough pressure built up that the lid came off that pressure cooker and we passed a lobby reform bill this week, despite his effort.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the big issue is campaign finance reform and whether there will be enough public interest to do something about that. The Speaker shook hands with President Clinton back in June in New Hampshire. They smiled at each other, it was a nice moment, and agreed that they would do something about campaign finance reform and what did they do? Well, the Speaker waited from June until November and then he came along and said, "You know what we need is a commission to study this." A stall commission to delay it past the next election. Then the Speaker went on to elaborate in testimony in front of a committee of this House that what we need is not less money in the political process; we need more money. The Speaker said there is less money going

into all these campaigns than the equivalent of two antiacid campaigns.

□ 1530

I think that is enough to give Americans heartburn, as they think about the future of our political system and the ethics of our system. If they had reason for concern, they certainly have reason for concern today when they look at papers across this country and reports about the improper activities of GOPAC, a committee that—essentially the "go" in GOPAC meant it was OK to go beyond the law.

In fact, after reading these stories, I now understand why it is that the Speaker thinks we need more money in the political process, that we are not spending enough on campaigns. That is because he has had a little more all along. He has had a little more through an organization called GOPAC that did not bother to comply with the Federal election laws, that according to the documents filed by the Federal Election Commission in Federal court here in Washington, apparently spent a quarter of a million dollars to benefit him in his reelection campaign a few years ago, an election campaign that he just barely made it back to this Congress, a pretty nice sum of additional money, maybe enough to promote anticid in Georgia, but certainly enough to get a person reelected outside and improperly, under our laws.

Let me just speak a little bit about those court documents and quote from some of them. The Federal Election Commission told the Federal judge here in Washington:

Hiding the identity of large contributors to organizations associated with elected officials and Federal candidates creates the appearance of corruption and makes enforcement of the act's other provisions unnecessarily difficult.

This is exactly what GOPAC did. I am quoting the FEC on this.

It did it for the avowed purpose of electing a majority of Republicans to the U.S. House of Representatives.

GOPAC's failure to register and file disclosure reports creates the appearance of corruption, and it is that appearance of corruption that the American people are learning about and eventually, no matter how many people you put on top of that pressure cooker, that lid is going to explode, and the demands of the American people for justice on this matter are going to be realized.

I refer again to the documents filed in Federal court here by the Federal Election Commission. It said that, unlike the Republican National Committee and the other two Republican Party committees, where Gingrich's idea might be too controversial, GOPAC could be as bold as it wanted to be, and its only restriction was whether or not its donors wanted to keep donating.

The only restriction on this issue is whether the American people will speak up firmly enough to demand we

have justice both on the ethics charges against the Speaker and on the need to see that this kind of GOPAC big spending is ended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### D.C. FISCAL PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is day 16 of my countdown to December 15. I will be here every day we are in regular session.

Next Wednesday, there is a hearing on the D.C. Fiscal Protection Act. I am here to protect the District of Columbia from another shutdown on December 15. I am here to protect 600,000 residents who are not parts of a Federal agency but tax-paying citizens of the Capital City of the United States, who got shut down in the last shutdown, even though they had no part in the struggle between the Congress and the Executive.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], who is a cosponsor of the D.C. Fiscal Protection Act which will get its hearing next Wednesday. The act has been well named; fiscal protection because the District of Columbia needs to be protected from any further blows to its fiscal health. Surely I do not need to tell my colleagues that the District is in delicate condition. There is a control board which is seeking to help the District return to financial solvency.

A shutdown of the District for the second time simply puts the city in the hospital. The Congress wants the opposite. If it indeed expects the opposite to occur, it must take action to make sure there is no shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Government shut down, for most Americans there was no direct hit, even though there was very direct inconvenience; and where there might have been something approaching a direct hit, the Congress took action to protect Americans and, I might add, to protect Members from the wrath of Americans, such as the exceptions that were passed to allow workers on Social Security to come to work.

The District of Columbia, on the other hand, was hit in three direct ways, three direct hits. First, the District Government was shut down. Second, District residents had their vital services wiped out and could not receive them. Finally, Federal employees who work in the District had to remain home.