

My Administration also supports changes to the Federal Advisory Committee Act to facilitate communications between Federal, State, local, and tribal governments. These changes are needed to support this Administration's efforts to expand the role of these stakeholders in governmental policy deliberations. We believe these actions will help promote better communications and consensus building in a less adversarial environment.

I am also directing the Administrator of General Services to undertake a review of possible actions to more thoroughly involve the Nation's citizens in the development of Federal decisions affecting their lives. This review should focus on the value of citizen involvement as an essential element of our efforts to reinvent Government, as a strategic resource that must be maximized, and as an integral part of our democratic heritage. This effort may result in a legislative proposal to promote citizen participation at all levels of government consistent with the great challenges confronting us.

We continue to stand ready to work with the Congress to assure the appropriate use of advisory committees and to achieve the purposes for which this law was enacted.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 6, 1995.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN UNITED NATIONS, 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United States Government in the United Nations and its affiliated agencies during the calendar year 1994. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 264, 79th Congress; 22 U.S.C. 278b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 6, 1995.

□ 1830

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). 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.

JUDGE HENRY WOODS AND THE WHITEWATER CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, about 4 or 5 weeks ago I took a special order talking about a judge in Arkansas, in Little Rock, a Federal judge who has close political ties to the current Governor, Jim Guy Tucker, and President Clinton, and particularly the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton. Judge Henry Woods has been a long-time political adviser to the President and to Mrs. Clinton. He has appointed her to a number of boards. He recently was given a case involving the current Governor, Jim Guy Tucker, which was brought to his attention and put before his court by Mr. Starr, who is investigating the Whitewater matter and other related matters.

At that time, when I had my special order. I suggested that in order to eliminate any appearance of impropriety, Judge Henry Woods should recuse himself and not be the judge to hear this case, because no matter what he did, if he rendered a decision in favor of Mr. Tucker, Governor Tucker, it would have the appearance of impropriety.

One of the other judges down there in a related case dealing with Webb Hubbell, who was indicated and convicted, you remember Webb Hubbell, he was the Assistant Attorney General appointed by President Clinton, did recuse himself. He did it because he felt like the appearance of impropriety was something that should not even be considered by a Federal judge.

I urged during my special order that Judge Henry Woods recuse himself, as the other Federal judge did in a related case, but Judge Henry Woods did not do that. This week it was announced that he dismissed one of the indictable offenses against Governor Jim Guy Tucker, and it certainly does give the appearance of impropriety because of this connection with Jim Guy Tucker and the people who are currently residing in the White House, as well as other Democrat leaders throughout Arkansas.

Tonight I would like to submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, all of the information I have regarding Judge Henry Woods, my previous special order, an article that was written by a person from Little Rock who served in the Arkansas State Senate with Judge Henry Woods when he was in the Senate, and I would like for all of these articles to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so at some future date, if Judge Henry Woods renders decisions that are of concern to Members of the House, there will be a record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say to all who are on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that we ought to have a complete and thorough hearing on the Whitewater case and all the related cases, including the one currently pending before the courts involving Jim Guy Tucker, the Governor of Arkansas, I think there is so much that appears to be col-

lusion down there that it boggles the mind. For Judge Henry Woods to participate and render the decision he did last week regarding Jim Guy Tucker is just beyond comprehension.

As a matter of fact, I would like to just read one thing that was said in the newspaper article which I think was put in the paper today. "It's typical hometown anger at the Feds coming in," says James Madison University political science professor Robert Roberts. "But if it hadn't been for Federal prosecutors, the level of scandal at the local and State level would be 10 times greater than it is today," Roberts predicted. This is the part I want to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In particular, "Roberts predicted Starr would win on appeal," that is the decision by Judge Henry Woods he is going to appeal, that "Roberts predicted Starr would win on appeal because of the long tradition of granting independent counsels widespread discretion. This is nothing for President Clinton to cheer about," says Roberts. "He is best served by letting the investigation run its course quickly, and this just delays things."

I submit to my colleagues here in the House that the reason for this delay is because of the close personal relationship Judge Henry Woods has with First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and other people in the Jim Guy Tucker administration. It is unfortunate this happened. It should not have happened. He should have recused himself.

The material referred to follows:

[From the USA TODAY]

INDEPENDENT COUNSEL CHALLENGED

(By Tony Mauro)

A Little Rock federal judge's decision Tuesday to dismiss fraud indictment against Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker marks the first time the broad powers of an independent counsel have been trimmed.

U.S. District Judge Henry Woods said Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth Starr overstepped his authority in June by indicting Tucker of fraud charges related to a federal loan to finance a cable TV venture.

Starr contends the judge has no authority to rule on the scope of the investigation, which was launched to look into irregularities relating to the Whitewater real estate venture in which President Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton were partners.

"I cannot accept the proposition that . . . no court has the power to determine where there is jurisdiction to proceed in the matter," wrote Woods, a 1979 Carter appointee.

Starr promptly announced he would seek an expedited review by a federal appeals court in St. Louis.

Tucker still faces an 11-count indictment stemming from dealings with Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan, which was owned by the Clintons' Whitewater partners, James and Susan McDougal. They also have been indicted.

The ruling comes amid debate over the power of independent counsels, a hybrid breed of prosecutors created by a post-Watergate federal law in 1978.

Independent counsels are appointed by a three-judge panel at the request of the attorney general when a high-level official is suspected of violating federal law.

Originally viewed as properly insulated from political influence, critics now say

independent counsels are too insulated—politically unaccountable and prone to lengthy fishing expeditions that go far beyond the original allegations.

"The logic of the law is to sweep in more and more potential cases, things the Justice Department would not have punished," says former Justice Department official Terry Eastland, who wrote a book on independent counsels. "It becomes a very messy business and it's bad for the system."

Starr, a former Republican administration official, came under attack in Arkansas and in the White House for straying beyond Whitewater and reviewing every political transaction in recent Arkansas political history.

"It's typical hometown anger at the feds coming in," says James Madison University political science professor Robert Roberts. "But if it hadn't been for federal prosecutors, the level of scandal at the local and state level would be 10 times greater than it is today."

Roberts predicted Starr would win on appeal because of the long tradition of granting independent counsels wide discretion.

"This is nothing for President Clinton to cheer about," says Roberts. "He is best-served by letting the investigation run its course quickly, and this just delays things."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 1995]
ONE WHITEWATER INDICTMENT OF TUCKER
DISMISSED

FEDERAL JUDGE RULES INDEPENDENT COUNSEL
STARR EXCEEDED HIS AUTHORITY IN TAX CASE
(By Susan Schmidt)

A federal judge yesterday dismissed one of two indictments against Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker on grounds that the prosecutor, Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr, exceeded his authority in bringing the case.

U.S. District Judge Henry Woods threw out a June tax fraud and conspiracy indictment of Tucker and two other men involved with him in a cable television venture, saying the case "bears no relation whatsoever" to the questions Starr was charged with investigating. A second bank fraud indictment of Tucker, handed up last month, still stands.

Tucker has not sought dismissal of that indictment, which relates more directly to the Whitewater investigation. That case is being handled by a different judge.

The 21-page ruling, issued after 1½ hours of oral arguments, touches on the controversial question of how broad a special prosecutor's authority should be in pursuing evidence not directly connected to the central theme of an investigation.

Objections to broad inquiries have been raised in other independent counsel investigations, including the probe of former agriculture secretary Mike Espy.

Woods agreed with Tucker's lawyers that the allegations had nothing to do with the independent counsel's mandate to investigate the interrelationships between two defunct Arkansas lending institutions and the two couples who owned the Whitewater Development Corp.—Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton and James B. and Susan McDougal.

It was not enough, the judge said, that Starr "fortuitously stumbled across the defendants' alleged violation of law." The authority to bring charges against Tucker rested with the Justice Department, he said.

The issues raised in the tax fraud indictment "were not related in any way to the investigation of Whitewater," said Tucker's lawyer, William H. Sutton. "We felt the independent counsel legislation was very special, applicable to a defined set of people, primarily high officials in the federal government."

Starr said his office will seek an expedited appeal of Woods's ruling before the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals and then the Supreme Court, if necessary.

Appearing before Woods in Little Rock yesterday morning, Starr argued that his evidence against Tucker was sufficiently related to the main areas of his investigation to justify his bringing an indictment.

Even if Woods did not agree, Starr said, the judge did not have the authority to limit the powers of an independent counsel's activity.

The scope of such a probe has never been successfully challenged "since Watergate, since the scandals that gave rise to the Ethics in Government Act" under which he was appointed, he said. Attorney General Janet Reno filed a court brief in support of Starr's position.

But Woods disagreed. "I cannot accept the proposition that a citizen can be put on trial in my court for a loss of his liberty, and that no court has the power to determine whether there is jurisdiction to proceed in the matter," he wrote. "Surely the independent counsel and attorney general do not suggest that there can be no judicial review of prosecutorial jurisdiction of an independent counsel. . . . Such a precedent would be both novel and dangerous."

Starr had argued that one of the elements of the June indictment stemmed from a business deal between Tucker and David Hale, owner of Capital Management Services, which Starr is investigating along with McDougal's savings and loan association, Madison Guaranty.

Starr said the second Tucker indictment shows that the crimes alleged in the June indictment were directly tied to Capital Management and to Madison.

Tucker was accused in the dismissed indictment of falsifying a loan application to Capital Management, a company funded by the federal Small Business Administration to make loans to disadvantaged businesses.

He allegedly used the money he borrowed from Capital Management to help purchase a cable television company, then sold the company and allegedly conspired to avoid paying several million dollars in federal taxes.

Tucker has not sought a dismissal of the second 21-count indictment, in which James and Susan McDougal are also named as defendants. The three are accused of engineering financing for millions of dollars in allegedly phony real estate transactions through Madison and Capital Management.

Tucker, a Democrat, has complained that he is being made a scapegoat in a politically motivated investigation, and he has made much of Starr's Republican background.

Even if Woods's ruling is overturned, it will delay by many months Tucker's trial on the first set of charges, pushing it well into next year. If Tucker prevails on appeal, Starr would turn the case over to the attorney general for prosecution.

Woods, appointed to the federal bench by President Jimmy Carter, has had a longstanding professional relationship with Hillary Clinton who practiced law in Arkansas until her husband was elected president.

Woods wrote to late deputy White House counsel Vincent W. Foster Jr. in June 1993 to ask whether he should grant an interview to a reporter from Mother Jones magazine who was preparing an article on Hillary Clinton.

In a written inquiry to Woods, the reporter said she wanted to interview him because he had appointed Hillary Clinton to a trial advocacy panel early in her career and later to the committee on the Little Rock school desegregation case.

"Would you take this up with Hillary or her press secretary and give me instructions as to whether this interview should be granted?" Woods asked Foster.

Woods's letter to Foster was turned over to congressional investigators by the White House.

WHO IS HENRY WOODS?

Last year, the President was reminiscing with Connie Bruck of *The New Yorker* about his 1990 gubernatorial race. At one point, he said, he was undecided about running and an influential Arkansan came up with a substitute: Hillary Clinton. The powerful member of the Arkansas political family "desperately wanted her to run for governor," the President told Ms. Bruck, "and it got out and around the state."

That gentleman was Judge Henry Woods of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas. "Henry," a friend of the judge told Ms. Bruck, "just hangs the moon on Hillary." Judge Woods has contributed 15 years of distinguished service to the judiciary, particularly in the long-running Little Rock school desegregation cases. At a critical point in 1987, Judge Woods named Mrs. Clinton counsel to a citizens' committee working for racial balance in the schools. "I called on Hillary a lot," he told Ms. Bruck. "She was not just functioning as advisor to the committee."

Gov. Tucker has angrily declared his innocence and says he may challenge Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's jurisdiction. "None of the allegations," Gov. Tucker said, "involve President Clinton, Mrs. Clinton or any other person in the executive branch that the regular U.S. Attorneys would have had a conflict in prosecuting." As we have noted in regard to the Clintons, this is correct in a narrow sense; but it is also true that the indictments and guilty pleas so far obtained by Mr. Starr paint a disturbing picture of the political and business landscape from which the President and First Lady emerged.

Understandably, for example, Gov. Tucker would have preferred that "the regular U.S. Attorney" handle his case. That would be Paula Casey, the long-time Friend of Bill who first received criminal referrals from the Resolution Trust Corp. allegedly naming the Clintons and Mr. Tucker. After making some crucial decisions, Ms. Casey belatedly recused herself from the Madison Guaranty case, in November 1993, in the midst of a six-week period which saw Treasury contacts with the White House, Bruce Lindsey informing the President about the referrals, two Clinton Tucker meetings, and Associate Attorney General Webster Hubbell's own recusal from Whitewater matters.

The problem, of course, is that everyone from the Arkansas political culture comes from the Arkansas political culture. When it come time for Mr. Hubbell to plead guilty to a scheme to defraud the government and his former partners at the Rose Law Firm, he stood before U.S. District Court Judge William Wilson in Little Rock. Two days after the plea, Judge Wilson stepped down from the case, saying his contacts with the Clintons over the years might be misconstrued. "Not only must you do justice," Judge Wilson said, "you must have an appearance of doing justice."

Naturally Judge Woods has the same sort of associations. Now 77, he was for some 40 years a close associate of Arkansas financier and legislator Will Stephens—head of the Stephens Inc. investment giant until his death in 1991. * * * Mr. Woods later fought segregationist Gov. Orval Faubus and was a supporter of current Sen. Dale Bumpers and Rep. Ray Thornton, among others. Messrs. Clinton, Tucker, Hale, and James McDougal of Madison Guaranty fame all got their early political education from one of the towering

figures in Arkansas politics, former Sen. William Fulbright. It's a tight, if sometimes feuding, family.

Mr. Woods actively supported Mr. Bumpers' 1970 gubernatorial run. In 1974, Gov. Bumpers knocked Sen. Fulbright out of the Democratic primary and went on to the Senate; Mr. Fulbright went to work for the Saudis and Stephens Inc. In 1978, Mr. Woods supported Mr. Stephens' nephew, Mr. Thornton, in a three way primary race against then U.S. Rep. Tucker and David Pryor for the Democratic nomination to the Senate. President Carter nominated Mr. Woods to the federal bench in 1979; when he was sworn in, Gov. Clinton saluted him, saying he was a man who would "feel the pain" of the people.

The defendant to the contrary, the Tucker case is not just another case, but one pregnant with implications for the President, the First Lady and the whole circle of the judge's friends and associates. Judge Woods can best honor his distinguished record on the bench by following Judge Wilson's example and stepping aside.

WEBSTER HUBBELL AND GOV. JIM GUY TUCKER

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk today about the conviction of Webster Hubbell, the indictment of Gov. Jim Guy Tucker—both close friends of President Clinton—and the two Arkansas judges overseeing these cases.

The judge in Webster Hubbell's case stepped aside because of his close ties to all of Arkansas' top Democrat politicians. The judge in Governor Tucker's case has made no move to recuse himself, even though many observers believe he has even more conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker, about a month ago former Associate Attorney General Webster Hubbell was sentenced to 21 months in prison. On December 6, 1994, Mr. Hubbell pled guilty to one count of mail fraud and one count of tax evasion to the independent counsel investigating Whitewater, Kenneth Starr. Last week, Mr. Hubbell, who a little more than a year ago was the Nation's third highest ranking law officer, testified before the Senate about the death of Vincent Foster and the obstructions of the investigation at the White House.

I would like to talk for a moment about Webster Hubbell. He is often characterized in the media as the President's frequent golfing partner. But he is much more than that.

Mr. Hubbell was a partner along with Hillary Clinton, William Kennedy III, and the late Vincent Foster at Little Rock's powerful Rose law firm. In fact, Mr. Hubbell served as the firm's managing partner. He also served as mayor of Little Rock, and was appointed by then-Governor Bill Clinton as interim chief justice of the Arkansas State Supreme Court.

He came to Washington with the Clintons after the 1992 election and, in the opinion of many Washington insiders, ran the Justice Department until Janet Reno was confirmed by the Senate. Mr. Hubbell resigned as Associate Attorney General in March 1994, after his former partners at the Rose law firm began to investigate him for overbilling some of his clients, including the Federal Government for work done in a case against the auditors of Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan. Now, like many of the President's friends from Arkansas, Mr. Hubbell has left the Government in disgrace and legal trouble.

On June 23, 1995, Mr. Hubbell asked the judge presiding over his case for leniency, stating that he had made proper restitution to

his former firm. Under the sentencing guidelines, Mr. Hubbell was required to serve a mandatory minimum sentence unless the independent counsel asked the presiding judge for leniency. Mr. Starr replied to Mr. Hubbell's request by stating that he had no intention to ask for leniency.

The fact that Mr. Starr had no intention of asking for the court to be lenient with Mr. Hubbell leads us to believe that Hubbell did little to help Starr's investigation.

After he left the Justice Department, Hubbell landed a new job at G. William Miller and Co., the law firm of Michael Cardozo. Cardozo is the former Clinton Justice Department official who handles the Clintons' legal defense fund. He became notable in the summer of 1993 because he spent the entire weekend with Vincent Foster 3 days before Foster's death. Webster Hubbell and Michael Cardozo spent the weekend at the Eastern Shore secluded with Mr. Foster and his wife. Both have claimed that Foster did not seem unusually depressed, even though investigators have cited Foster's depression as the reason for his suicide 3 days later.

And somehow, Mr. Hubbell's wife was offered a job at the Interior Department after Mr. Hubbell entered his plea. We now know that Mrs. Hubbell's hiring was orchestrated by talks between the White House and the Interior Department. Since Mr. Hubbell and his wife were both being employed by their friends, many people wonder whether he cooperated with the Starr probe as much as he might have.

The judge originally assigned to preside over the Hubbell case was one William Wilson in Little Rock. However, as is so often the case among the political and social elite of Arkansas, Judge Wilson had close associations with Bill and Hillary Clinton, and before becoming a judge was very active in the Arkansas Democrat Party. Judge Wilson realized the possible conflict of interest, and 2 days after Mr. Hubbell's guilty plea he recused himself from the case. In doing so, Judge Wilson stated, "Not only must you do justice, you must have an appearance of doing justice." I take that quote from an editorial in the June 21, 1995 edition of the Wall Street Journal and ask that this editorial be entered into the RECORD.

This editorial raises an interesting question, because we are awaiting the trail of Bill Clinton's successor as Governor of Arkansas, Jim Guy Tucker. On June 7, 1995, Governor Tucker and two associates were indicted by a Federal grand jury in Little Rock. Governor Tucker was indicted for fraudulently obtaining a federally-backed small business loan and evading taxes and is facing up to 12 years in prison if convicted.

On October 6, 1993, Jim Guy Tucker and President Bill Clinton met privately at the White House. About a week before this meeting, White House counsel, Bernard Nussbaum, and White House advisor, Bruce Lindsey, and other top administration officials were informed of the fact that the Resolution Trust Corporation had forwarded criminal referrals regarding Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan to the Justice Department. These criminal referrals named not only Bill and Hillary Clinton but also Jim Guy Tucker.

The White House has stated that President Clinton and Governor Tucker never discussed these criminal referrals, neither at the White House meeting nor at a later meeting in Se-

attle. But we have no way of knowing. That is why so many people are so concerned about the many improper contacts between the White House staff and the Treasury Department.

The judge assigned to preside over the Tucker case is Judge Henry Woods. For some background on Woods I refer my colleagues to the Wall Street Journal editorial I quoted earlier, as well as a column by former elected Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Jim Johnson that ran in the June 23, 1995, edition of the Washington Times. I ask that these articles be entered into the RECORD.

Judge Woods is a longtime member of the Arkansas political elite. He is a major power broker in the Arkansas Democrat Party. He served as chief assistant to Democratic Governor Sid McMath. He freely admits that he is good friends with Bill and Hillary Clinton. Judge Woods named Mrs. Clinton to a State panel to work toward racial balance in schools. Woods and McMath later went on to form a law partnership, McMath, Leatherman and Woods. McMath's son, Sandy McMath, a member of the law firm, was an instrumental leader in the early political campaigns of Jim Guy Tucker. So even if Judge Woods and Governor Tucker are not the best of friends, they are undoubtedly members of the same tightly knit network from which Bill Clinton emerged.

In the Webster Hubbell case, Judge Wilson realized immediately that he had no business trying the case. Even if he could have been completely objective, many people would still question what they saw as the appearance of a conflict. In the Jim Guy Tucker case, Judge Woods has given us no indication that he intends to recuse himself, despite his multiple potential conflicts of interest. With Judge Woods, the conflict of interest is more than just an appearance. it is a very serious matter.

QUESTIONS

If Jim Guy Tucker's attorneys move to throw out the indictments claiming that Kenneth Starr has exceeded his jurisdiction, would Judge Woods' many ties to the State Democrat Party color his decision?

What other connections exist between Judge Woods and Governor Tucker that we do not know about?

With Judge Wilson's recusal due to possible conflicts of interest in the Hubbell case, is it not in Judge Woods' best interest, after a long and illustrious career, to follow his example and recuse himself?

What did Jim Guy Tucker and Bill Clinton talk about at their meeting at the White House in 1993? How can we ever know for sure whether or not they shared confidential information about the RTC criminal referrals that had been revealed to the White House?

What did Jim Guy Tucker and Bill Clinton talk about in their meeting in Seattle?

David Hale.—When Jim Guy was indicted, the media were quick to proclaim that the indictment was not connected in any way to Bill and Hillary Clinton. But this is not the case. The charges brought by the independent counsel against Governor Tucker are the direct result of testimony and documentary evidence provided by Judge David Hale.

Judge Hale is the same man who has accused the President of pressuring him to approve an illegal loan in 1986 to obtain funds to help the failing Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan.

Judge Hale pled guilty to defrauding the Small Business Administration. He has testified to a Federal grand jury that he was pressured by Gov. Bill Clinton and his Whitewater partner, James McDougal, and by Jim Guy Tucker, to provide an illegal \$300,000 loan to McDougal's wife, Susan McDougal. This loan was never repaid, and more than \$100,000 of the loan reportedly ended up in Whitewater Development Company's account.

The day after the Tucker indictment, Mr. Starr secured a guilty plea from Stephen A. Smith, who was one of Bill Clinton's top aides during his first term as Arkansas Governor. Smith pleaded guilty to defrauding the Small Business Administration, lying to obtain \$65,000 from David Hale's lending agency, Capital-Management Services.

The indictment of Jim Guy Tucker and the guilty plea of Stephen Smith show us that the grand jury—made up, incidentally, of normal citizens of Arkansas, not a bunch of right-wing Clinton critics is looking closely at the documents and listening very carefully to the testimony offered by David Hale. The actions taken by Mr. Starr tell us that both the independent counsel's office and the grand jury consider David Hale a credible witness.

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

[Mrs. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN MAJORITY REGARDING APPROPRIATIONS MEASURES

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we move forward to the fiscal 1996 legislative branch legislation dealing with the budget, I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report to the legislative branch appropriations bill, H.R. 1854, ends 40 years of bloated congressional bureaucracy. The bill shows that House Republicans are keeping their word to make Congress less costly and more accountable to the American people. We are doing that by cutting our own spending first before cutting any other Federal programs, with the principle in mind, of course, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that vital services are retained, but where there is duplication and waste, that is removed.

By way of recapitulation, Mr. Speaker, let us look to see what has been accomplished. First we have put our own House in order by reducing congressional funding of \$207 million below the fiscal year 1995 levels, which was a 9-percent cut. We also eliminated duplicative bureaucracies. The bill eliminates the Office of Technology Assessment, whose functions have already been duplicated by CRS, Congressional

Research Service, and GAO, and the National Academy of Sciences. This saves at least \$18 million.

We downsized bloated bureaucracies. The bill cuts, again, the duplicative Government Accounting Office funding by 17 percent, which will save \$75 million. It cuts the number of congressional staff. Some \$57 million was cut from House operations, Mr. Speaker, including committee staff, Members' allowances, and the House support offices. It cuts by one-third the House franking privileges for the congressional mail. It further eliminates three committees and 25 subcommittees.

While this is a good start, and there have been millions of dollars saved here in the House, and we know it will also happen in the Senate, we know as we move forward to look to each of the Federal agencies that are in existence we will downsize, privatize, consolidate, and make sure that we are giving for the American taxpayers real services for the tax dollars and eliminating waste, just as we have seen in local businesses all across the country. Where people at their own homes are trying to save money, we can do no less for the American taxpayer here in Congress.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. Having just returned from a series of meetings, what people have said is they are interested in consolidating, eliminating, reducing programs, but at the same time they want to make sure that Congress has stepped forward.

If I heard the gentleman correctly, the bottom line of the congressional cuts, about \$67 million—is that the number the gentleman mentioned? I was off the floor and I was not sure. I think that is about the figure we are talking about.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is about the figure.

Mr. KINGSTON. We have 163 different Federal job training programs. We have 240 different miscellaneous education programs that the Federal Government funds, 30 different nutrition programs. There is clearly room to consolidate. Yet, if you picked up the headlines and heard that FOX or KINGSTON moved to cut 25 different job training programs, people back home would think you have gone berserk, but yet you still have some 135 other job training programs left.

I think what Congress is doing is trying to set an example that, in eliminating 25 committees, we are taking this real serious. I was a member of two of the committees that were eliminated. Last year I served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. In the coastal area of the district I represent we have a lot of marine issues, shipping issues, dredge issues, Corps of Engineers, and so forth. However, that committee has been eliminated, those

functions rolled into other committees that were duplicating what the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries were doing.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Frankly, the gentleman from Georgia has led the way here in Congress, I would say. What we are trying to do is take a page out of the American industries' book. If you are running a corporation, you want to make sure the bottom line is that, "We are doing our services and we are not wasting, because if we are wasting, then we are not delivering for the taxpayer," or in the case of business, a customer, what is a fair return on their investment.

We want to make sure we are doing exactly what the American public wants, I think whether it is the downsizing of the Federal bureaucracy and agencies duplicating each other's work or whether it is the line item veto, which the House has now passed. We are waiting for the conference committee from the Senate's passage of a slightly different bill, and eventually the President's signature, that line item veto will cut out the wasteful pork barrel which every taxpayer in every jurisdiction knows has caused a great deal of harm, along with unfunded mandates, which we passed.

Mr. KINGSTON. The other thing I think is important to emphasize is that we are not sitting around waiting on the line item veto to be responsible, nor are we set back by the fact that the other body did not pass the balanced budget amendment.

It is clear that the American people want the budget balanced, so every one of our 13 appropriation bills moves us in the direction of balancing the budget by the year 2002.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. This is the first year since 1969 that we have actually had a balanced budget here in Congress, and we did it without having, as you say, even though we passed the balanced budget amendment and it has not been passed in the Senate, we did not wait for that to happen, we made sure we moved along. I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] for his leadership in allowing us to move along in this dialog in the progress of reducing the cost of the Federal Government.

AVOIDING THE TRAIN WRECK OF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the train wreck about which everyone is speaking these days is to occur if the Congress fails to pass the 13 appropriations bills, or having passed them, if the President of the United States vetoes them. Then we will have reached the point where, with no budget, the Government shuts down. This is an absolute crime against the people of the