



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 7, 1996

No. 62

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HOBSON].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 7, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAVID L. HOBSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for 5 minutes.

THANK YOU, BUSINESS WEEK

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to talk about what is going on in this country vis-a-vis sexual harassment.

As you know, in the past it has been career suicide for a woman to come forward and make any allegation of sexual harassment. But today, I want to congratulate Business Week. Business Week has made their cover story about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I do not normally take the floor to congratulate anyone, but I think when the business press of Amer-

ica takes this issue this seriously, we should really congratulate them, because rather than trying to paint over the issue, paint over the rust and try and deny it, they are saying it is time we get on with dealing with this.

The reason it is so important is how they name the article: "Abuse of Power." That is what sexual harassment is all about. Abuse of power.

America hears all these jokes about, oh, we cannot joke with women. Yes, you can do that; for heavens sakes, we are all human beings. But where you cross the line legally is when someone who has power over you in the workplace, power over you, starts adding all sorts of things to your normal work day world that was not in the work contract. That abuse of power, that is what it is about.

In this article, they talk about what went on at Astra, the pharmaceutical where they found even the highest ranking CEO and officials, people who were to set the tone, and as you know, some of them have now been dismissed and moved on.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission tells us that in the last 4 years, from 1991 to 1995, there has been a 125 percent increase in the filings on sexual harassment.

Why this tremendous increase? Why this flood? Well, first of all, I think because we have not cracked the culture. We have not cracked the culture yet to explain why this is so important and why you cannot do this.

So, culture cracking becomes very critical, but secondly, Members of Congress, the Congresswomen, by taking the lead in 1991, passed a law that for the first time gave many more remedies to women who had suffered at the hands of sexual harassment, or men.

Obviously, there is a small percentage of men who may find themselves in this situation. I am not saying that women are pure. I guess there just are not as many women at the top. I hope

when they got to the top CEO positions they will not do this, but who knows?

Nevertheless, it is wrong if it is done to a man; it is wrong if it is done to a woman. There is no place for this in the workplace, and it is all about power, power, power, power. I hope people pick up this magazine and read it because it is very serious.

And I hope in workplaces across America, as we close in on Mother's Day, people realize these are mothers, these are sisters, these are aunts. We do not want people treating people that way in the workplace as a condition of keeping their job. So often they need that job for the family, and yet they are asked to do things that are not at all family friendly in anybody's book, just because somebody has the power to make them do it.

Mr. Speaker, we used to see this out West where some newcomer came into the bar and everybody shot at their feet to make them tap dance. Well, that is exactly what this type of sexual harassment is. Thank goodness women now have a tool and men have a tool to be able to go into the Federal courts.

I am terribly sorry that the EEOC is backlogged with these, and the Congress, of course the response is to continue to try to choke the EEOC down. I think we ought to have hearings on this. If Business Week has the guts to take this on, this Congress ought to have the guts to take it on.

If we see the EEOC is resource-starved, then we ought to get the resources to them. We ought to be handling these cases expeditiously and moving forward because it appears there is a whole opening of the floodgates on this. If we get these cases solved, if we get the resources to begin to move it, we will crack the culture. Hopefully, this will be something that we can start the 21st century without even having it in our culture anymore.

So, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Members on the other side of the aisle

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H4431

to look for the resources that the EEOC needs to deal with this terrific influx of new cases. I call upon people all across America to look at this very seriously, and realize what it must feel like to be someone who needs a job being asked at that job to do some things that go against their religion, their beliefs, their family, everything. It is outrageous and it must stop.

Thank you, Business Week.

CONCERNS ABOUT THE ETHICS PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that has always been a priority of mine since I first served in the New Hampshire legislature back in 1982, and that issue is ethics. One of my first responsibilities back then was to serve on a task force to make recommendations on the establishment of a permanent ethics committee and guidelines for Members of the New Hampshire legislature and the State senate, by the way, who are only paid \$100 a year.

As a result of this and subsequent efforts, I was pleased as a New Hampshire State Senator to author the law that established a permanent legislative ethics committee, and I served as chairman for 2 years. By the way, part of this process involved crafting the law. We studied other models in other States, including the model here in Washington that is used for Congress.

Because of the work I was able to do with Democrats and Republicans in New Hampshire, including now Governor Steve Merrill, many of the procedures that we used in New Hampshire are based on ethics standards rules that we follow here in Congress. We felt that it was critical that our ethics committee always work on a bipartisan basis and that the actions of its Members be totally above reproach. We adopted language which would require that any Member of our ethics committee recuse himself or herself from any deliberation if there was any possibility of a conflict of interest.

Last week I was surprised to read in the April 30, 1996 edition of the Washington Times an article about a possible conflict of interest involving the ranking minority member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Times be included along with my statement in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the article reveals that the same individual who drafted several complaints filed against the Speaker also helped raise

tens of thousands of dollars for the campaign of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The article also revealed that the political consulting firm header by the individual in question, Mr. Steven J. Jost, also received over \$14,000 in payments from the ranking minority member's campaign committee.

Mr. Speaker, in no way am I implying that the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has acted in an unethical fashion, but in the same manner that questions were raised by the minority whip concerning Republican Members of the committee and alleged conflicts of interest, similar questions should also be raised regarding any connection between the ranking minority member of the committee and the individual who helped raise money for him and also drafted many of the complaints filed against the Speaker.

It is vital, Mr. Speaker, that the ethics process in Congress remain fair and above reproach, and that we retain the confidence of the American people for this important process. I hope that we will receive in the coming days a full and complete explanation of the ranking minority member's association with this fundraiser and this fundraiser's dealings with the ethics committee regarding filings made against the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 30, 1996]

GINGRICH CRITIC AIDED ETHICS-PANEL

DEMOCRAT

(By George Archibald)

The top Democrat on the House ethics committee received tens of thousands of dollars in political contributions raised by a firm whose senior partner spearheaded ethics complaints against House Speaker Newt Gingrich.

Rep. Jim McDermott, Washington Democrat, who says he knew nothing of the fund raising and therefore didn't violate committee conflict-of-interest rules raised more than \$36,000 from political action committees at two receptions organized last year by Fraioli/Jost, a PAC money-raiser for congressional Democrats.

At the same time, Mr. McDermott was the point man pushing for the House ethics committee to appoint an outside counsel to investigate complaints against Mr. Gingrich.

The complaints were researched and legally drafted under the direction of Steven J. Jost of Fraioli/Jost.

Mr. Jost was the chief fundraiser for Ben Jones, the speaker's 1994 Democratic opponent, who launched the anti-Gingrich ethics complaints formally filed by House Minority Whip David E. Bonior of Michigan.

The complaints accused Mr. Gingrich of improperly commingling funds and activities of GOPAC, which helped achieve the GOP takeover of Congress, and a nationally televised political science course the speaker taught from a college in his home state, Georgia.

"We're stringing up the electric chair here, but we didn't make him guilty; he made himself guilty," Mr. Jost told the Wall Street Journal about Mr. Gingrich last year after the complaints were filed.

Documents purported to show ties between the college course and GOPAC were obtained by Mr. Jost in Georgia during Mr. Jones' 1994 campaign. "Mr. Jost decided they would be useful as a campaign weapon," the Journal reported. "So he hired a Democratic lawyer, Bob Bauer, to fashion them into an ethics complaint for \$4,500."

Mr. Bauer represents House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt of Missouri, another Fraioli/Jost client.

The Landmark Legal Foundation appraised the House Ethics Committee last year of ties between Mr. Jost and Democratic House leaders in the anti-Gingrich campaign. The panel, formally known as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, refused to look into the matter.

"Mr. McDermott had a duty to step aside when any complaint with Mr. Jost's fingerprints on it came before the ethics committee," said Mark R. Levin, Landmark's director of legal policy.

"Members of the ethics committee are supposed to consider all ethics complaints with a nonpartisan, unjaudiced eye. The record would appear to show that Mr. McDermott and Mr. Jost are joined at the hip," Mr. Levin said. "We are reviewing this information and seriously considering filing a formal complaint."

Mr. McDermott yesterday denied any conflict with committee rules requiring impartiality and lack of bias in the Gingrich case.

He also denied knowledge of filings by his political committee, Friends of Jim McDermott, listing payments of \$14,160.61 to Fraioli/Jost for last year's PAC fundraising activities.

"I don't know who did the fund raising," Mr. McDermott told The Washington Times in an interview just off the House floor. He then walked back onto the floor, where reporters are barred, to avoid further questions about campaign committee filings by Charles M. Williams, his \$106,044-a-year chief congressional aide.

Mr. Williams, who runs Mr. McDermott's Capitol office, serves as treasurer of Friends of Jim McDermott. Mr. Williams did not respond to inquiries yesterday.

Reports he filed for the campaign committee in December and February list contributions totaling \$36,000 to Mr. McDermott from 52 PACs, each of which gave \$500 or \$1,000 at Capitol Hill fundraising receptions organized by Fraioli/Jost on April 5 and July 15, 1995.

Mr. Jost, who left partner Michael Fraioli in June to start his own fund-raising company, said Mr. McDermott "first approached us" to do his fund raising in the 1993-94 election cycle. "As I recall, one of the other members of Congress referred us to him," Mr. Jost said.

Mr. Jost said his income from Fraioli/Jost, even after Mr. Jones ceased being a client of the firm, enabled him to spend time advancing the anti-Gingrich ethics campaign. "I have never been compensated for any work by anybody on any of the Gingrich stuff, except for news organizations that have reimbursed me for photocopying expenses," he said.

Mr. Jost said he saw no conflict in Mr. McDermott's reliance on Fraioli/Jost for fund raising as his own work in the Gingrich camp while Mr. McDermott was sitting in judgment of the speaker.

"It sounds like the worst thing you could accuse me or Jim McDermott of is being Democrat," Mr. Jost said. He said committee Republicans Porter J. Gross of Florida, Jim Bunning of Kentucky and Nancy L. Johnson of Connecticut, the panel's chairman had greater conflicts.

"Your're alleging . . . a conflict that is far less direct than, for instance, Mr. Goss' giving \$5,000 to GOPAC at the time the ethics