

your office into kind of a family living quarters where they can all stay?

All of these things, I think come from this new pronouncement, and I hope that we get a clarification later in the day from the Speaker, because I find this a very, very interesting new proposal that will probably make wonderful material for new sitcoms. If I were a sitcom writer and I read this, I would think, "Wow. We've been waiting for 200 years for the Congress to do this." Can you imagine? "They eat together, they sleep together, they legislate together." But I do not think that is what I want as the image of this House, and I hope we get some more information on this very soon.

GIVE CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, last year the Vice President of the United States, on a national news program, discussed health care reform and why the Democrats were not bothering to speak to the Republicans, and made the statement that "the Republicans didn't vote for Social Security, they didn't vote for Medicare, they're not going to vote for health care, so why should we bother talking to them?"

That refrain was picked up by the then-majority-party of the House, the Democrats, and we heard it on the floor time after time. The gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] dug up the actual facts, and he and I gave several speeches on that last year clarifying the situation, that in fact 83 percent of the House Republicans in 1935 voted for the Social Security Act, contrary to the statement made by the Vice President that none of them had.

Furthermore, 47 percent of Republicans voted for Medicare in 1965. And shame of all shames, more Republicans than Democrats voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In fact, 81 percent of the Republicans in the House at that time voted for it, whereas only 62 percent of the Democrats did.

Mr. Speaker, why do I bring this issue up again? We disposed of it last year immediately after Congressman HORN and I made our comments. The refrain from the other side of the aisle disappeared. But last week once again it emerged as we were discussing Social Security mandates as they relate to the balanced budget amendment and the fear of some people that if we balance the budget, we will cut Social Security.

Once again the Republicans were cast in the role of having opposed Social Security when it originally passed. Comments made by the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary indicate that.

I would like to read just a few statements that were made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week in which the

gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, stated, "May I remind the gentleman," and he is referring to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], "that Social Security was a Democratic Social Security insurance policy." Furthermore, he goes on to say that it was opposed by the Republicans.

Once again, we have the same strawperson being resurrected to say that the Republicans opposed Social Security, when in fact the record clearly shows that 83 percent of the Republicans in 1935 voted for the Social Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we do not have the old false information of last year resurrected again this year. Let us be sure that we deal with the facts. Let us give credit where credit is due.

I have a chart here which I would be happy to give to any Member of the other party who wants to review the facts, pointing out that in fact on such things as the Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, 93 percent of the Republicans voted for it. On the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, 99 percent of the Republicans voted for it. I have already given some of the other figures, particularly the Civil Rights Act, where more Republicans than Democrats voted for it.

I think it is clear that the Republicans are not Neanderthals as they are often characterized by Members of the other party. Let us give credit where credit is due. Let us stick with the facts. Let us stick with the actual record and recognize that we must work together to accomplish what is right and what is good for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the chart referred to in my remarks as follows:

VOTES CAST BY DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS ON MAJOR PIECES OF LEGISLATION THIS CENTURY

| | House Democrats supporting | House Republicans supporting | House vote |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Social Security Act (1935) | 196 | 183 | 372-33 |
| Federal Highway Act (1956) | 93 | 97 | 388-19 |
| Civil Rights Act (1964) | 62 | 81 | 290-130 |
| Medicare (1965) | 86 | 47 | 313-115 |
| Clean Air Act Amendments (1970) | 100 | 99 | 375-1 |
| Water Pollution Control Act (1972) | 99 | 93 | 380-14 |

¹ In percent.

² Source: Congressional Research Service.

RENEWED CALL FOR INDEPENDENT COUNSEL IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my comments, I just want to respond to my good friend, and he is my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS], to say on the Social Security issue, we would not be raising it, except that the Speaker, who raised the issue, said he wants to do away

with the CPI index as presently stated. If he does that and they refigure the CPI based upon what Mr. Greenspan and others have suggested, we are talking about a \$2,000 hit for Social Security recipients. There is no way around it.

I want the folks to be clear on that. If the Speaker and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the Republicans want to fool around with Social Security and the CPI index, it is going to cost seniors dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we saw one more example of why we need an outside counsel to look into the Speaker's ethics problems. The Los Angeles Times ran a story this morning that raises disturbing new questions about GOPAC. GOPAC, of course, is a multi-million-dollar political action committee run by Mr. GRINGRICH which at its very heart is part of the ethics complaint that is being filed against him.

Over the past 9 years, GOPAC has raised between \$10 million and \$20 million. Its contributors include people who have a direct interest in Federal legislation. Yet we do not know who contributed this money and we do not know how much was spent. We do not know this because GOPAC still refuses to disclose the names of its past contributors and its past expenses.

Let me just read a headline that was in the L.A. Times this morning. "Funding of Gingrich PAC Raises Questions. Key Corporate Donors Have Interests in Pending Federal Action. FEC Alleges Campaign Violations."

The L.A. Times story points out: "GOPAC" has collected contributions from wealthy individuals that far exceed annual Federal election limits."

It points out: "One Wisconsin couple gave over \$700,000 to GINGRICH's organization between 1985 and 1993, nearly twice what they could have donated directly to all Federal candidates."

Remember, Mr. Speaker, it was just last month that a top Gingrich ally when asked about GOPAC said that GOPAC was founded "as a way of getting around campaign finance disclosure laws."

We are not just talking about one or two campaigns here.

According to this morning's story in the L.A. Times, "GOPAC boasts that half of the 136 Republican lawmakers elected since 1990 actively used the group's training materials and followed its advice on how to attack Democratic opponents and use powerful issues."

It is not just who they gave to that is the problem, but why.

As the story points out, "The size of the contributions solely to GOPAC from corporate donors with important interests before the Federal Government raises questions about the prospects of preferential treatment."

When asked about GOPAC, the non-partisan director of the government watch dog group, Ellen Miller says, "GOPAC has clearly violated the spirit

of laws which govern how much people can give to support politicians. The biggest concern is the fact that is all hidden."

Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to know who is giving money to GOPAC and how it is being spent.

Clearly any person who has had dealings with GOPAC has a serious conflict of interest in this case. Yet last week we learned that 2 of the 5 members of the Committee on Ethics appointed by Mr. GINGRICH have had past dealings with GOPAC.

Mr. Speaker, this will not do. The only way that we are going to get to the bottom of this case is to have a professional, independent, nonpartisan, outside appointed counsel to come in here and investigate.

That is what this House had done in every high visible ethics case since 1979. It did it in the ABSCAM case, it did it in the Diggs case, it did it in the Hansen case, it did it in the St. Germain case, it did it in the case of the former Speaker and several others. In each case we have appointed a nonpartisan outside counsel to investigate.

As Mr. GINGRICH said himself in 1988, "The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House. Clearly, this investigation has to meet higher standards of public accountability and integrity."

In fact, the new chair of the Committee on Ethics, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], joined Mr. GINGRICH in his campaign for an outside counsel in 1988. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] was one of 71 Republican Members who joined Mr. GINGRICH in sending a letter to the Ethics Committee asking for an investigation of the former Speaker.

She is reported to have supported a call for a special counsel to carry out that investigation in 1988. Now she is backing away from it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, if past Ethics Committees were not fair or tough enough, why would this one be any different? The standard has been set, the precedent is there. It is time for an independent, nonpartisan outside counsel to come in and look at this issue.

GATT PROVISION REDUCES YEARS OF PATENT PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the subject I had in mind this morning, I would like to just suggest that there has been a great double standard in this Congress for many, many years. Whenever conservative Republicans do anything, it is worthy of attack and all sorts of suspicion is being cast on whatever Repub-

licans would do. Especially now that we are in control, we sense this double standard.

For example, NEWT GINGRICH's book deal comes under tremendous attack while the Vice President's book deal, which is not substantially different, ends up, "Well, that's just another book deal." Now we hear attacks on GOPAC, and the fact is that there are organizations around this city, environmental organizations, lawyer organizations, public employee union organizations which have the same sort of activities. But the focus has to be on GOPAC.

I would have to say there is a double standard being applied. I would just ask that when the public hears charges made by political figures, that it be taken into consideration that this is a political city and often charges are made for political reasons.

But what I have to discuss today is concerning a specific piece of legislation. Last year I vigorously opposed the GATT implementation legislation because in it was a provision that I and almost every inventor's organization in this country felt would drastically reduce the number of years of patent protection enjoyed by Americans.

This provision was not required by the GATT but was placed in the implementing legislation by powerful interests who would profit by ripping off American inventors and investors. Read that Japanese and other multinational corporations as well as megadomestic corporations that use technology rather than create it.

Covering this legal larceny, the United States Patent Office and the administration aggressively argued that the changes proposed would not—repeat that—would not decrease patent protection. In fact, they brushed off criticism, claiming terms for most patents would be increased by this change in the law. They used the prestige of their office to lie to us and to dismiss the opposition as not worthy of serious consideration.

Well, now that GATT has been passed, a different tune is being heard. On January 16, the New York Times reported an enlightening statement made by Mike Kirk, Deputy Commissioner of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Once the GATT implementation legislation goes into effect on June 8, Kirk now says that filing a patent after that day "could substantially shorten the term of patent." What? "Shorten the term of patent." This is the opposite of what Congress and the American people were being told before the GATT vote.

□ 1250

Somebody has been lying, which is known to happen when tens of billions of dollars are at stake.

These patent changes, unless corrected will mean billions of dollars in royalties that would be paid to American inventors and investors, will now stay in the bank accounts of foreign corporations. It means technology paid

for and invented in the United States will in a few short years be available to our world competitors to use against us for free.

This crime against the American people can be prevented. I have introduced legislation that will restore American patent rights to the guaranteed 17-year term that was in place before passage of the GATT implementation legislation. This bill, H.R. 359 has over 108 cosponsors. These people are protectionist, free traders, pro-GATT, anti-GATT, liberals, conservatives, Democrats, and Republicans. But what ties us all together is our commitment to do what is right by the American people. H.R. 359 is on the side of the little guy versus the big guy.

We are protecting America's rights. When Americans invest something or they invest in new technology, foreign corporations should not be able to use it without paying royalties to use it to out-compete Americans.

This is the travesty that passed through GATT. It was hidden in GATT. Now we are trying to correct that with H.R. 359.

I ask my colleague in both parties to join me as cosponsors for H.R. 359 and set the law right to prevent another crime against the American people, against American inventors and investors.

On the Senate side I am proud to announce that the majority leader, BOB DOLE, has cosponsored similar legislation which will now be known as the Dole-Rohrabacher bill.

APPOINTMENT OF OUTSIDE COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE SPEAKER GINGRICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the need for an outside counsel to investigate Speaker GINGRICH's financial empire grows stronger with each passing day.

Today there is an article in the Los Angeles Times which raises new questions about the Speaker's political fund raising organization, an organization known as GOPAC.

Earlier this month there were details of a secret meeting between the Speaker and Rupert Murdoch and that was leaked to the press. The meeting raised some questions because Mr. Murdoch has billions of dollars of business before the Congress, and at that same time there was a \$4.5 million book deal that was on the table.

The Speaker dismissed this meeting and its content or its import by saying that, "I never get involved in cases like this," but history in fact tells us otherwise. The Speaker has interceded on behalf of companies in the past, including writing a letter to Chief of Staff Leon Panetta asking the FDA to speed