

amount that health care providers are getting, will it not make it even more difficult for people like Professor Bergin and the others across Texas, whether it is in Houston, LaGrange, or Lubbock, or anyplace else in this country for that matter, will it not make it more difficult for them to find a physician that will take care of their needs?

Mr. BENTSEN. I think you are absolutely right. I think the fewer doctors who participate in the system, the harder it will be, particularly on rural communities and smaller urban communities, where there will be even fewer doctors who are willing to participate in the system.

I think there is another problem that comes into play here. By moving more people into health maintenance organizations, which again let me say, Medicare Select under current law already provides that choice, but what happens when you move more and more people into that system, basic macroeconomics will tell us that you will start to lose the efficiencies, and you will start to lose the ability to save costs or save money under that system. Therefore, I think that the projected cost savings from moving to an HMO system, where seniors do not have a choice of their doctors, are probably not correct. They are probably inflated. It is very hard to make those projections in the first place.

I think if you move from having 7 percent of the elderly population which are currently in managed care plans going to 90 percent, as is the desire of this legislation, that the cost savings that thus have been achieved will not carry forward at that time.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank you very much for your observations and very helpful comments and, of course, your service here on behalf of all of the people of the Houston area and of our whole State.

My comments, of course, this afternoon and those of my colleagues have focused on the Republican pay-more-get-less Medicare plan. But I want to take just a moment here in concluding to tell people who are out there, who are thinking "Well, they really cannot do that. They really cannot intend to make the kind of cuts that they are making to the American people," that they have not heard it all yet. Yesterday, about the same time that the great American hero, the gentleman from Florida, SAM GIBBONS, was being denied across the hall even a chance to mutter a few words in defense of Medicare and to raise questions about why these hearings were not occurring, another of our committees here in the House was considering a plan concerning Medicaid.

Most people think of Medicaid as being a program that provides assistance to the poorest of Americans, and it is true that it does; but it also, because of some need for improvement in the Medicare system, is about the only way that seniors and people with disabilities can get nursing home cov-

erage. Most of the people that are in nursing homes today, who do not have substantial means, are there with support from Medicaid.

There is another thing that comes out of that system Of Medicaid. That is that the Federal Government establishes some patient abuse standards, some safety standards in our nursing homes that they have to meet in order to receive Medicaid funds.

Yesterday, at the same time that a slash effort was going on with reference to Medicare, another committee was slashing in Medicaid. Now, if that committee's handiwork becomes law, there will not be one Federal regulation on the books to assure the quality of patient care at nursing homes in this country. I think that by itself is an outrage, that there are people who have become so committed to a rigid ideological agenda that they have forgotten their good sense, they have forgotten our responsibility to protect vulnerable seniors. It seems that the only time people get interested in some nursing homes is when someone is found with abuse, with a death occurring. That is not the way it ought to be.

There are many fine nursing homes out there doing their best to provide quality care, but there are always some that try to skim, and it is only with the support of these Federal safety standards, and some inspections, that we have been able to address some of the worst of these abuses, and now that will be totally eliminated.

As if that were not enough, the same Committee on Ways and Means that did not want to hear about Medicare yesterday has, within the last several days, approved a proposal that will encourage corporations to withdraw as much as \$40 billion from their pension plans, \$40 billion from their pension plans, something that people who are not only retired now but may hope, like many of us, to retire some day in the future, should be amply concerned about. There are a number of troubling developments that only by Americans speaking out and making their concerns known are we going to be able to change.

As for the Republican pay-more-get-less Medicare plan, lest anyone think that I have a partisan attitude on that plan, let me end by quoting a Republican who was on the radio this week, September 19, Kevin Phillips. He said of his fellow Republicans' Medicare plan: "Today's Republicans see Federal Medicare outlays to old people as a treasure chest of gold for partial redirection in their favorite directions: toward tax cuts for deserving corporations and individuals. The revolutionary ideology driving the new Republican Medicare proposal is simple: Cut the middle class and give back the money to the high-income taxpayers." That is the problem we face, but Americans can turn it around.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOSEPH M. McDADE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOSEPH M. McDADE, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, DC, September 21, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena for testimony and the production of documents by the Court of Common Pleas, Lackawanna County, State of Pennsylvania in connection with a civil case.

After consultation with the office of the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. McDADE,
Member of Congress.

THE IMPORTANCE OF REDISTRICTING DECISIONS IN GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Madam Speaker, I come again this afternoon as a continuing part of my mission. That mission involves the educational process around the issue of redistricting, and why what is happening in Georgia is so important, not just for the people of Georgia, but for all of the people of this country who value democracy, who value the opportunity for all people who call themselves American citizens to be able to sit at the table of public policymaking and feel that they have an investment in the decisions that are being made about this country.

I want to begin by commending the members of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, who have endured a tremendous trial during the recently disbanded, recently adjourned special session. The United States Supreme Court ruled that Georgia's 11th Congressional District was unconstitutional, and as a result of that decision, the Governor of the State of Georgia called the Georgia Legislature into special session. The purpose of the special session was to redraw the congressional districts to correct those flaws that the Supreme Court found, particularly in the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, but also, in the call for congressional redistricting, the Governor included legislative redistricting.

There had been no lawsuit against the State legislative districts. There had been no finding of unconstitutionality against those districts, but for some reason, some predetermined reason, those districts were included in the call. So begins the tragic story of

the experiences of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus that fought valiantly to protect its three democratic incumbents who are now in Congress, and to protect itself against what some have called a hoax.

I am going to begin by just a discussion of these districts that have been much maligned by supposedly powerful and very intelligent people. The 11th Congressional District was called a monstrosity by the lower court, the court in Georgia, a monstrosity. How can you call a district that allows for the first time people to have representation in the Halls of Congress a monstrosity? The district worked, it worked because people understood that the had an opportunity to elect their candidate of choice. They did not have to always be on the losing end. Those people in the 11th Congressional District chose to send me to Congress to represent their interests, to speak out on their behalf. I have tried to do a good job at it.

The 11th Congressional District of Georgia is no monstrosity. In fact, if there is a monstrosity, it rests with those people who would like to deny these people who have never had an opportunity to have someone walk in their neighborhood and then walk these Halls of Congress, to deny to those people, those people whom I call my valiant warriors, the opportunity to be elected by someone of their choice.

I have some maps here. The first map is the Sixth District of Illinois. Some might say that it is a monstrosity. It certainly is not pretty, but it is an effective district, because it allows the people who live inside this district the opportunity to elect their candidate of choice. This district is comprised of a supermajority. The supermajority just happens to be 95 percent white. This district has gone unchallenged in the courts. What is wrong with this district? Nothing is wrong with this district. This district functions according to our democracy.

I have another map here, Texas' Sixth District. It also might be called a monstrosity, but it has not been. It is composed of a supermajority. The supermajority just happens to be 91-percent white. This district, along with the entire map of Texas' congressional districts, was challenged in the courts.

□ 1530

The Texas court came back with a decision that invalidated the historic district represented once by Barbara Jordan. It invalidated the district that is currently represented by EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Dallas, TX, a new district.

But the court said that this district, that goes from here and all the way around just like this and picks up people here, picks up people there, leaves out people there, that district is constitutional. Barbara Jordan's district is unconstitutional. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON's district is unconstitutional.

But this district, that is 91-percent white, has been declared constitutional by the courts.

What is going on here? Is it that there are only funny-looking black districts? Obviously the answer is no.

Is it that only black districts are declared unconstitutional? Black districts and those districts that are majority Latino so far have been targeted for unconstitutionality.

I have here Georgia's 11th Congressional District, 64-percent black, one of the most integrated districts in the State of Georgia, one of the most integrated districts across the South. This district, that gives rise to voices that have been left out of the political process to finally be heard, this district was declared unconstitutional.

I would have to conclude that when it comes to the issue of redistricting and the shapes of districts, it ain't about shape at all. It is about the color of the representation that is elected from these districts, and the possibility that in the old South we could finally herald in a new era that bypasses, gets us across that bridge of racial divide and allows black people, white people, people of color, women, Latinos to sit down at the table of policymaking and fashion strategies to resolve our communities' problems.

What better America could we want for? The America of promise, the America of the American dream, the America which strives to include everybody? Or do we want to go back to yesterday? To go back to that infamous day when black people, who had been duly elected by the citizens of the various States throughout the South, were expelled for no other reason than the color of their skin?

What we are looking at today is the possibility that I could become the second African-American of the 20th century to be expelled for no other reason than the color of my skin. We cannot afford to allow that to happen.

What happened in Georgia particularly? What happened in Georgia can be summed up by the headline in this newspaper: "Committee Okays One Black District." The bottom line, it appears to me, is that the tolerance level for people from the State of Georgia to have three black people in Congress is not very high, and so there were some people who took an active involvement in trying to make sure that in the elections of 1996, Georgia is no longer represented in Congress by three African-Americans.

Now, I am a Democrat and I am a proud Democrat. I am proud to be a Democrat. But the head of my Democratic Party in the State of Georgia, who is the Governor of the State of Georgia, said he was going to stay out of the redistricting fray. This was not something that was going to occupy very much of his time.

So I wrote a plea to the Democratic leadership of the State of Georgia, "Ain't I a Democrat, Too?" When it comes to this issue of redistricting and

protecting incumbents, protect me, too. Because when I cast my vote here in Congress, my vote counts the same as my Democratic colleagues, my vote counts the same as my Republican colleagues, and when I come here, I speak out on behalf of the people of the State of Georgia who have a valid voice to be heard.

There were some folks in Georgia who had something else in mind, and so before the special session even began, something happened. What happened was the Georgia General Assembly became hostage. It was held hostage by the plaintiffs, along with the Democratic leadership of the State of Georgia, because 17 State house districts and 5 State senate districts were targeted. These were districts that were majority black in the State legislature, and they were said to be unconstitutional. So the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus was told, "Now, y'all don't play ball and you're going to end up in the same boat as CYNTHIA, out of office."

The Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, caught between a rock and hard place, did what it could to protect its members, to protect the three Democratic incumbents of Congress who just happen to be black, and they were fooled. It was a hoax. It was a cruel hoax. They were tricked. In fact, State Senator Donzella James was so outraged—she happens to be with us now, up in the gallery—she was so outraged by what had happened that she felt compelled to put it down on paper.

She concludes:

In this episode of political gamesmanship, Republicans attempted to play the white Democrats against the black Democrats by promising both sides their support in addressing their redistricting concerns.

Further, the struggle within the Democratic Party between competing political interests was transformed into one involving race. The eagerness on the part of the white Democrats to "Republican proof" their districts blinded them to their overall goal. That is, to foster equal and inclusive representation for all of the people of Georgia.

Self-serving individuals on all sides of the debate practiced deceitful game playing and clever trickery and have made a mockery of the reapportionment mandate. The Georgia General Assembly may come to regret this entire ordeal. A number of questions will have been answered concerning our legislative process. For example, was the court order legislative undertaking a hoax? And if so, could this be a needless waste of the taxpayers' money and will the lawyers laugh all the way to the bank?

My fear is that when it is all over and done, will the redistricting issue be remembered as racial rights versus civil wrongs?

The Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, Representative George Brown compiled some information, Representative LaNett Stanley circulated it. After all the dust had settled, the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, along with the other leadership of the State, voted to dismantle nine majority black districts in the House and two majority black districts in the senate.

All in all, in the senate, out of 56 seats, they changed 46 of them. In the house, from a total of 180 seats, 69 were changed.

There was a redistricting legislative free-for-all on the backs of black people in the State of Georgia.

One of the districts that was diluted was a district that I helped to draw in 1992. I was just the vehicle that the people used.

I served on the house reapportionment committee. We had a hearing down in Savannah, and a gentleman came to the hearing, obviously proud to be able to be counted among those who would come, to travel so far to try and get a little justice. He began his remarks. He said, "The name of my county is Liberty, but they still treat us like slaves."

At the end of the 1992 redistricting process, that gentleman had a district from which to elect his candidate of choice. But after this cruel hoax in the special session of 1995 that should go down in infamy, that gentleman lost the opportunity to elect his candidate of choice.

As a result, there is a letter that has been drafted and signed by some of the members of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus. That letter is to Assistant Attorney General Deval Patrick, asking that the Department of Justice deny preclearance to those two bills that were passed by the legislature—the bill that dismantled the State house districts and the bill that dismantled the State senate districts.

I am going to read this letter, because if I have not been clear, I think this letter is.

It says:

Dear Mr. Patrick, I am submitting this comment urging you to object to the reapportionment plans passed by the Georgia General Assembly in its special session in 1995. These plans were enacted by the State of Georgia with a racially discriminatory purpose and will have a retrogressive effect on black voters throughout the State.

The plans for the State senate and State house also violate section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, because those plans dilute black voting strength. In carrying out these redistrictings, the State legislature specifically aimed their sights at legislative districts with majority black voting populations. The decision by the legislature, therefore, was targeted at black voters with the intent to reduce the black voting strength throughout the State.

The legislature undertook this action even though their had been no court decision invalidating our existing plans, nor had there even been a lawsuit challenging any of the districts.

The context in which these new plans were drawn is also important to understand. The special session in which these new reapportionment plans were enacted was called to address also the reapportionment of the congressional districts pursuant to the decision in *Johnson v. Miller*.

The white leadership in our legislature forced the assembly to address legislative reapportionment first and then proceed to congressional reapportionment.

In exchange for cooperation in legislative reapportionment, the leadership promised to work with the black Members of the legisla-

ture on congressional reapportionment. The leadership, therefore, used legislative reapportionment as a stick and forced legislators to make concessions they would otherwise not have made.

The enclosed statistics show the degree of retrogression and discrimination. For all of these reasons, we urge you to object.

□ 1545

This is sad. It is absolutely sad that the Democratic leadership of the State of Georgia would use black people as spare parts to bolster the political aspirations of their favorite sons. And I do put emphasis on the word "sons," because there is no room for women also in the good old boy network.

Who comprises this good old boy network? Well, as it turns out, we also discovered that there were some rich and powerful people that just did not seem to be able to deal with this new black woman who was representing poor folks, some of the poorest people in the country. They could not deal with this black woman from Georgia.

And so, Madam Speaker, seizing advantage of an opportunity, driven by the racist politics of race, they could also move forward on the agenda of greed.

We learned, in fact, State Senator Donzella James was moved once again during the special session to put out a press release entitled "Senator Donzella James Implicates Kaolin Interests in Driving Redistricting Agenda."

State Senator Donzella James expressed concern today that Georgia kaolin companies are exerting undue influence on the State's redistricting process. As legislators slowly hammer out a new congressional map, Senator James is increasingly convinced that kaolin interests in Washington, Jefferson, and Glascock Counties have issued a veto threat over any congressional map which puts them in the 11th District represented by Democrat Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney.

Now, what is it? What is kaolin in the first place? After we came to this floor, we got quite a few telephone calls from folks wanting to know what is kaolin? Well, kaolin has been called Georgia's white gold. I guess Louisiana has oil; Kentucky has coal; Georgia has kaolin.

Georgia's richest mineral resource is kaolin, a white clay used to make chemicals, medicines, and coated paper. Last year, a handful of mining companies, many of them foreign-controlled, dug a billion dollars' worth of kaolin out of Georgia's soil. They pay rural landowners as little as a nickel a ton for it, and after refining it, sell it for \$50 to \$700 a ton. They pay no mineral taxes to the State, whose wealth they are exporting and they operate in virtual, total secrecy.

Reporter Charles Seabrooks spent 5 months reporting the operations of the kaolin companies and their impact on the lives of thousands of poor Georgians, and in this, it says: What is kaolin used for? Glue, newsprint, magazines, cosmetics, china that we eat from, paint. It has a lot of different uses. Toothpaste. Kaopectate. The "kao" is kaolin.

It also chronicles here Grant Smith, who lives in a Milledgeville mental hospital, does not know that he is at the center of a dispute over his family's former farm and its kaolin riches.

Gentleman Gary Chambers: The industry leaves pits and craters and gullies on the surface of Georgia's soil. Ten-mile railway that links the kaolin belt in Georgia to the sea has made some of our richest Georgians. Robert Lee Watkins, a man who was sent to Federal prison, what the Atlanta newspapers may have called a political prisoner, this Grant Smith might have been a millionaire, but his guardians sold the family farm. Gary Chambers turned his land into a rutted ruin. Tar buttons, ten-mile railroad put them on the track to wealth and power.

"Crime and Punishment in Kaolin Country. Businessman who challenged the chalk companies receives a 5-year sentence for another man's lie." Nothing happened to the man who lied.

"Companies versus Landowners in White Gold Country." This is from USA Today. Another picture that I wish I could have blown up. The scarred landscape of my beautiful State of Georgia. "Weak Laws Slow Restoration of Ruined Land."

Shortly after the lawsuit was filed, I had an interesting conversation with one of our State's constitutional officers who told me, "CYNTHIA, you made some rich and powerful people mighty upset with you." And we have been hearing about this impending lawsuit against the 11th District, but somehow it never materialized. And suddenly, a letter appeared in the Sandersville Progress, which is a local newspaper down deep in kaolin country.

The letter was written by the executive vice president of one of kaolin companies. And guess what it said. It said that the 11th District ought to be dismantled. And then, miraculously, folks who do not have much were able to amass the hundreds of thousands of dollars that it takes to take a lawsuit all the way to the United States Supreme Court.

The general assembly came up with some maps, some maps that were pretty darn near the mark. But those maps had one target left out and that was those 7 kaolin counties.

The Atlanta Constitution has done some stories on our plight. "Bring in the Feds to Probe Kaolin." "McKinney Takes on Kaolin Industry. Her nosing around has infuriated the industry." "King Kaolin's Political Prisoner." This is about the story of Robert Watkins.

"This should not be CYNTHIA McKINNEY's fight, but Georgia's politicians are so afraid of the kaolin companies, they do not dare raise a peep." "Taking On King Kaolin."

So McKinney is now trying to get the U.S. Justice Department to look into the problems. Politically, that may not be a very smart move on her part, because kaolin money will try to unseat her. But then again, who knows, maybe McKinney will

prove that a woman with a backbone can succeed in a State run by men with weak knees.

And so Georgia's special session, called for the purpose of redistricting, ended. They adjourned sine die. What did they accomplish? Well, they got rid of some minority districts. They even diluted the district of a sitting Member of the Georgia legislature who is black; dropped his district down to 41 percent. The gentleman who represents the district of the man who said, "I come from a county named Liberty, but they still treat us like slaves."

We do not know if we can even get Reverend Tillman reelected in that district, but we are darned sure going to try.

But congressional redistricting never happened. It did not happen. So now the issue of Georgia's 11th Congressional District is right back where it started: In the hands of the Court. We are, of course, law-abiding people, and whatever the dictates of the Court, I will be prepared to accept them.

However, I do not think anybody in this country ought to have a good feeling about what happened in the State of Georgia. Nobody who cares about diversity, inclusiveness, real deep-down democracy, should be thrilled or even happy about the picture that we have painted.

Now, after Georgia comes North Carolina and Texas and Florida and Illinois and New York and Mississippi, because all of those States now have challenges to their minority districts.

And what happened in the State of Georgia—the trickery and the tomfoolery and the deceitfulness—can happen to good-hearted, well-meaning people in those legislatures across this country.

So the State representatives and the State senators who now understand that they might be called into special session or special duty to address the issue of redistricting also need to understand that something else might be afoot.

□ 1600

My father serves in the Georgia legislature. My dad has been there for 23 years. He is what I call a warrior, too. So I am really just a chip off the old block.

When he got elected in 1972, the first thing he did was file suit against the State of Georgia for unfair hiring practices. State of Georgia continues to be under a court order regarding that lawsuit that is over 20 years old.

And all I have done is to take advantage of a district that was borne of the pain of people in the State of Georgia and to elevate their pain right here on the floor of the House of the U.S. Representatives, and to remember them as I go about my business of casting my vote, speaking out in my committees, speaking to my colleagues, and speaking to the press, to always let people in this country know that in the State of Georgia we still have people who do not

have running water in their homes and it is a crying shame, and that those people need to have representation. And that all of the largesse of the Federal Government ought to be delivered to them, too, that we have people who are suffering from teen pregnancy rates that ought to make us ashamed. And that we need to have an opportunity to help those people, because they are Americans, too. But that is just a little bit too much for some folks. I am just about finished.

I am reminded of a statute on the grounds of the Georgia State capitol, and the name of that statue is Expelled Because of Color. It commemorates the service of 33 African-Americans who, during the period of Reconstruction, were duly elected to serve in Georgia's general assembly.

But something happened. They did not have the right color. And so they were expelled. And this statue is from the slave ship to the ship of state, African-Americans holding up the State of Georgia, holding up the ideals of this country.

In 1901, there was an African-American also who had to exit from these halls. His name was George White from North Carolina. And he said, this is the Negro's temporary farewell from Congress. But Phoenix-like, the Negro shall rise again, and walk the Halls of Congress.

It happened in this country. It happened as a result of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Black people, white people, died. Our own Representative, JOHN LEWIS, had his head broken open at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. No, I was not there.

But I was there 30 years later. And I am here today as a result. A few people in this country want to turn this country around. The majority of us have got to say no. We are not going to allow a few people to take back all that we have gained.

I am pleased that I have a hero right here on the floor of the U.S. Congress. And in 1992, after I was elected, the first person I came to was a Representative from Texas. And I told him, "You are my hero," because his legacy in this body has been one of complete devotion to his constituents, complete devotion to the people of Texas, complete devotion to the people of this country. His name is Congressman GONZALEZ.

I am very proud to yield to my leader.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman very much.

I cannot find the words with which to adequately express my feelings at hearing your words, especially from you, the gentlewoman from Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY. I, of course, cannot describe to you the thrill and the happiness when I first was able to greet you here at your swearing in, and to have followed the course in your native State leading to your election.

For in my own experience, one reason I am in the Congress is in a way acci-

dental. I had never intended to be involved in politics. But this was the issue. And that was that because of laws and constitutional provisions in the Texas State constitution, it was just accepted that a good portion of our citizens in Texas would be deprived of even the elementary right to participate in the most basic of all activities. And that is the right to vote.

So I am proud of the fact that very young and even before I ever even considered a politically active career, my thoughts were certainly not that way, I had my eyes opened early. And I have watched, of course, with great elation what has happened since those sad days, and elections such as yours. I cannot tell you in words how they have thrilled me.

I am saddened to hear of this retrogressive activity, not surprised. The forces of retrogression and return to, no matter what efforts they make, days and times that will not be returned, thank goodness, is always going to be confronted. They will never cease. The forces of retrogression are there. And when there is no forward activity on the part of the progressive forces, they can gather strength and they can set back the clock somewhat.

So I want to praise you for, first, your presence here, your willingness to seek a position of representation on this national body; and then, very happily seeing how through your competency and ability you have mixed right in the middle of the fray. You have not held back.

I just cannot tell you with what sadness I feel pervading in my heart as you report on some of the things that are still happening, 30 so many years ago, that we thought we had at least made it difficult to return even in these areas. So all I can say is that some of us are with you, there are more here now than we used to count on, and that is a very happy thing.

But I cannot begin to describe in words my admiration for your courage and your ability, above all, your willingness to serve, and of course to pledge to you my absolute support and loyalty to your cause.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I thank the gentleman very much. I would like to conclude by acknowledging that in Georgia we have come a long way. But we still have a long way to go.

And in reporting the events of the special session and those events that took place just prior to the special session, it is not my intent to indict anyone who is innocent in this whole play. But there are some people who are very guilty. And those people know who they are.

There were some good people in the legislature who spoke out and said, quite frankly, what the problem was. But their voices were too few, too powerless, too muted. But I do want to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation and my thanks to them, because they did not have to say those kind things and they did not have to say those true things, but they did.

They wear a badge of courage, and they are now my additional warriors, who may not be in the 11th congressional district, but they are warriors nonetheless for that which is right. In the gallery, aside from State Senator Donzella James, who participated in the special session and who spoke out so eloquently against what happened, we also have State Senator Connie Stokes, who represents a portion of the 11th congressional district.

And I would like to take this moment to thank my own State Senator for her actions on behalf of preserving the 11th congressional district of Georgia. The members again of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus worked day in and day out, and they only had one goal in mind. And that goal was to make sure that all of the folks of Georgia at the end of the day had an opportunity to case a vote, a meaningful vote, for the representative of their choice.

And so while the venue has moved to a new place and a new time, the camaraderie, the loyalty, the love, the cohesion of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, and the way that I was able to interact with all of the members, I will never forget.

From that, I know, will come a new and stronger, more lasting relationship. And also a better relationship will come from the Democratic leadership of the State, that saw that under no circumstance were they able to break the glue that struck the members of the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus together. And that was their loyalty to the people of the State of Georgia.

In conclusion, I would just say that it is a pleasure for me to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I have come to love, to truly love many of my colleagues with whom I interact daily. I appreciate all of them for their strong shows of support, for their kind words of support, and I want them to know that no matter how this fight ends, they have a friend in me.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

GRANT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EHLERS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage two freshmen colleagues personal friends and people I have high regard for, in a colloquy concerning grant reform. I want to take this opportunity to publicly thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the chairman of the

subcommittee, for their wonderful leadership on this issue.

Let me begin the colloquy by making an observation. It seems as though there are a lot of people paying attention to what we have done in the House so far, with respect to grant reform, Mr. Speaker. Every major newspaper in the country has editorialized with respect to grant reform over the last few weeks, and we certainly hit a nerve with the American people.

Now I direct my first question to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the chairman of the committee and one of the leaders along with our friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], in our effort, and, of course, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], being one of the more recent victims of the opposition with regard to this issue.

□ 1615

My question to you, my friend, is a lot of people thought we would never get this far. And here we are. We had a resounding victory on the House floor. We are now in the Senate conference committee.

I see the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] putting up a piece of demonstrative evidence we have used on this floor in the past. I know my chairman of the subcommittee wants to make a few remarks at the beginning here, and I will yield to him.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for taking the lead in making the American people aware of what, quite frankly, has been a dirty little secret in this town, that Federal taxpayer money has been going to lobbying groups in the form of grants.

The chart that our colleague [Mr. TATE] has shown how this welfare for lobbyists works. The taxpayers paying \$39 billion, some people estimate it would be as many as four or five times that amount in grants to many special interests.

Now, some of them are very worthy charities who are doing the right things in their communities, but there are a lot of those groups who are really lobbying and political front groups who are taking taxpayer dollars and using them to engage in political tactics.

Now, let me say I think everyone has a right to speak out in this country, but they do not have a right to speak out with somebody else's money and to be funded by the taxpayer.

One of the things that our committee is committed to doing is holding a series of hearings on this, looking into these groups and finding out some answers to some basic questions. Those groups that are lobbyist groups, we want to know, is it true that you are segregating the grant money you are receiving from political activities? Is it true that you have safeguards in place to make sure that you do not violate the current law that prohibits that direct funding? And then we also want to know what plans that group has been

engaged in to encourage lobbying by other groups.

Mr. EHRLICH. Of course, that is the problem. That is really the problem.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Exactly. And it is a continuous cycle that has led to huge deficit spending in this country.

Then there is another group who say, we are not lobbying groups, but we do not like this reform. And what I want to know from those groups is, what do they do to ensure that their donors have accurately been informed of what lobbying they do do?

There are some very highly regarded groups in this country. I am thinking of groups like the United Way, the Red Cross, the Girl Scouts, the Boy Scouts, who also receive Federal grants, and they engage in very worthy and noble activities. Some of them tell us they also want to be lobbyists, not extensively, but part-time. And I think we need to tell their donors, did you know that they also want to lobby with some of the money that you have given them? How much of that money is spent on lobbying? Is there a problem with the Washington groups lobbying, whereas the groups in the States and the communities do not do that but are, in fact, engaged in charitable activities?

We are going to try to develop a record in our committee on those issues.

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman would yield, really is that not the threshold fundamental problem here? It seems as though we have addressed this both here on the floor and at various times we have had to discuss this issue off the floor, and it seems for some reason, and the reason appears to be Federal money, to have developed over the years a distinction between acting as an advocate and fulfilling the mission of the particular organization.

I believe it is fair to characterize our piece of legislation as an attempt to return these groups. And we are not talking about, by the way, many groups out of thousands, tens of thousands of groups, only a few hundred who, in our view, have violated both the letter and the spirit of the law, by trying to get rid of that distinction, trying to limit that distinction to return these groups to their fundamental mission, which is to provide service for the less fortunate in our society.

Mr. MCINTOSH. The gentleman is exactly correct.

We heard testimony in one of our hearings in July from Mrs. Arianna Huffington who told us that there was a serious problem in the charitable community that, rather than doing good works, helping the elderly, helping clean up the environment, helping the young people, and you may remember she talked about Mrs. Hannah Hawkins here in Washington who had used her own money to set up a home for children after school in the inner city neighborhoods. They are moving away from those charitable missions into becoming lobbyists and advocates that