

the merits, because what we are seeing tomorrow is one of the worst abuses of the legislative process that I have seen since I have been in this body. The first time in the Nation's history we are going to have a stand-alone waiver request. And are the committees of jurisdiction going to be asked to consider this? Absolutely not. Are we going to have any public hearings on this? Absolutely not. Is a single public American going to be able to have their concerns addressed? Absolutely not.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I was on a radio program in my district and the question came, well, what happens to the Indians in the State of Wisconsin who are affected by this? What if this violates one of the treaties? Have you looked at that? I explained to them that there is not a single legislator outside of the State of Wisconsin who has ever looked at these waiver requests. There are 600 pages of waiver requests that are going to be approved by this body tomorrow, and no one had looked at them and there has been no public hearing on them.

All we are doing is denying the people of the State of Wisconsin and the people of every other State in this country the ability to have their voice be heard. That is not the way this institution should operate, Mr. Speaker. That is not the way this Government should operate.

Now, when this piece of legislation passed the State of Wisconsin's legislature, it did so on a bipartisan basis. But the Governor changed it in some significant ways, but at the time that he signed it, the law of this land was that this body, or this Government more correctly, the Federal Government, would examine those waivers to make sure that they were consistent with the U.S. Constitution, that they were consistent with Federal law.

Now the majority is saying, forget about it, it does not matter to us whether they are consistent with the U.S. Constitution. It does not matter to us whether they are consistent with Federal law.

But perhaps the most galling part of this entire process, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a situation where the State of Wisconsin has come to this administration numerous times asking for waivers, and each and every time it has come to this administration asking for waivers, what has happened? President Clinton has granted the waivers.

We are not dealing with a situation where President Clinton has been unresponsive. We are not dealing with a situation where he has denied the request for flexibility or the chance for States to act as laboratories of democracy. No. He has worked together on a partnership. He has worked together to allow the State of Wisconsin to experiment. But that is not enough, because now we are dealing with Presidential politics.

So instead of the State and the President working together in a partnership to try to improve the lives of the peo-

ple of Wisconsin, we have the President of the United States who has offered an olive branch.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle probably did not like the fact that he agreed that he should have the waiver request approved. They did not like it because they felt that he was stealing their issue, that welfare reform is somehow a Republican issue and President Clinton has decided that he agrees with this experiment in the State of Wisconsin. They feel like he pulled one over on them.

But there is not what the American people want. The American people do not care if it is a Republican issue or a Democratic issue; they care if we are making progress.

□ 2330

So it was wrong, Mr. President. When President Clinton offered an olive branch, the Republicans should not have taken that olive branch, broken it, and stuck it in his eye. That is not the way this body should operate.

REPUBLICANS VIEW ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we wanted to talk tonight in response to some of the things that have been going on in Washington. I have with me the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

I think our first topic that we will go ahead and talk about is this Wisconsin waiver, which basically is saying it gives the State of Wisconsin the right to make their own laws on governing and reforming welfare. President Clinton went out there 2 weeks ago and said, "I support the waiver for you, I like what you're doing, it's great," and when the cameras were on, he was 100 percent for it. Then when the cameras turned off, he backed off.

But the second thing that happened is the Republican Party said, "Great, a bipartisan chance to work on welfare reform. We welcome it." Here is a President who said he wanted to end welfare as we know it, not extend welfare as he has been doing, so let us give him the Wisconsin waiver.

It has been debated, as I understand it from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], 18 months in the Wisconsin Legislature. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] was in the State legislature. What is your comment on this?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was in a border State in Minnesota. We have been debating welfare reform for a long time. I think you have characterized it absolutely correctly, that this bill that passed the Wisconsin Legislature, it is

a giant step forward in terms of encouraging more work and personal responsibility.

The President went to Wisconsin, said that he supported what was happening in Wisconsin, would grant them the waiver, and then somewhere between getting on the plane in Madison to fly back to Washington, something happened and all of a sudden some of the bureaucrats here in Washington apparently got to the President and said well, maybe we cannot support all of those waivers, and all we are trying to do is actually help the President to keep one more campaign promise. I am really surprised at the characterization we heard here just a few moments ago.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would join my colleague from Minnesota, and I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding. Yes, I would have to take issue with the statements of our friend from Wisconsin, playing off some of the philosophical biases of some of the self-appointed potentates and pundits around the Beltway as if issues are there to be stolen or plagiarized.

That is not the issue in this case. What is the issue is something that is seemingly oft repeated in this dynamic which exists between the legislative branch of government and the executive branch, and that is, unfortunately, and I say this not with any glee nor with venom or vitriol, there simply is an inconsistency between the President's words and the President's deeds.

And so again what we are doing in the new majority, with sincere folks from the other side of the aisle, is to step beyond partisanship and give the President the vote of confidence, I think we could almost say, to move forward with the very waivers he so willingly embraced. My friend from Georgia recalls that twice now we have passed welfare reform, mindful of the President's words to end welfare as we know it. We have done it twice and twice we have seen that legislation vetoed.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to make the point that the liberal media has given President Clinton a free ride on just about any issue. What the Congress is saying, "We're giving you a chance, Mr. President, if you're going to talk the talk, walk the walk."

You mentioned that we have passed welfare twice and it has been vetoed by this President twice. In fact, the last bill passed the U.S. Senate by a vote of 87 to 12. That is a very strong bipartisan statement, particularly from the Senate which is not exactly letting a lot of legislation go.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would just add to that, the discussion we have had today and we have heard tonight on special orders is really again sort of back to this fundamental debate between those who believe that in the final analysis Washington knows best and those of us who would like to see, whether we are talking about Medicare reform or welfare reform, to decentralize this thing and allow States and individuals to

make many of the choices themselves. It is really, and you hate to get back to this debate about Boris Yeltsin and some of the comments the gentleman made about the former Soviet Union, how we are encouraging them to move to a more market oriented system.

Yet here in Washington it is easy to be in favor of welfare reform and Medicare reform when you are out on a campaign swing, but somehow when you get back to Washington, the influence of this city just says no, we must keep the decisionmaking, we must keep the power here in Washington.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And even despite the considerable influence and pervasive atmosphere of this city, which seems to have a fundamental disconnection with the rest of the country, there is another disturbing development. Again our friend from Wisconsin who preceded us asked, almost plaintively, "Why can't Republicans and Democrats get along?"

I would contend that on many issues there are many folks on the Democratic side who want to find solutions. What is troubling is that there are many in this Chamber who, even in the act of despairing and disparaging partisanship, turn right around and engage in the same type of partisanship.

You mentioned earlier, and the example was especially unfortunate and egregious, our good friend and colleague from Connecticut stood up again, mischaracterizing and misquoting one of the prominent Members of this institution with reference to Medicare, attributing a quote to that individual, saying this individual said that Medicare would wither on the vine. And indeed the record reflects that the speaker in question was talking about the Health Care Financing Administration, not the Medicare Program. I would simply repeat the quote:

You know, we tell Boris Yeltsin, get rid of centralized command bureaucracies, go to the marketplace. What do you think the Health Care Financing Administration is? It is a centralized command bureaucracy. It is everything we are telling Boris Yeltsin to get rid of.

No, we do not get rid of it in round one because we do not think it is politically smart. We do not think that is the right way to go through a transition. But we believe it—the Health Care Financing Administration—let me add that emphasis—we believe it is going to wither on the vine because we think seniors are going to leave it, are going to leave it voluntarily.

It is most disturbing. And as much as we want to move forward in a bipartisan fashion, when there are those who repeatedly come to this floor and either through misinformation or deliberate disinformation choose to mischaracterize and unfairly characterize the facts in this debate, then it is our duty to point out the inaccuracies of those statements, not for playground taunts or to score debating points as if this were some super sophisticated debating society, no, not at all. Because we are cognizant of the fact that this is the Chamber in which our constitutional Republic must talk out issues and must find solutions.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that we do have a very difficult time here approaching issues and the resolution of those issues on a rational basis because of the rhetoric.

Here on this chart is a quote by the Democrat leader, DICK GEPHARDT. This was on CNN September 30, 1995, last year. "It is a big lie to say that Medicare is in trouble."

This is not an ordinary rank-and-file Democrat here speaking. Okay, everybody may say something one time. But here again, "Meet The Press," July 30, questioned by a reporter.

"Isn't it true that we cannot allow Medicare to grow at 10 percent a year?"

Congressman GEPHARDT says, "Now the Republicans are saying because the report says the fund will have insolvency problems in the year 2002 there's a great urgency. This is a hoax."

This is the health care program that my mother is on, not just my mother but all of her friends and my parents' friends who raised me and helped me in my formative years. The Democrat leader says that it is not going broke.

Here is the report which came out today. Last year this yellow line says that Medicare would be going bankrupt in the year 2002. This was the report of April 3, 1995. Well, that yellow line going bankrupt in 2002, that is what Congressman GEPHARDT was saying, "That's a lie."

Well, he turned out to be right. It was wrong. It actually is going to go bankrupt, according to the new report, which just came out today, about 2 years earlier than that, and there is a steady decline in dollars already. Medicare is losing money. The very program that our mother's health care depends on and you do not want to fact up to how we are going to protect and preserve it? This is extremely important. It is a high priority for me. It is beyond partisan politics. These are the people who helped raise all of us. We owe them a debt. We have got to crack down on the fraud and the abuse and the waste. We have got to give them a choice of health care plans, a choice of physicians, the same choices that you and I have when we go out into the health care and insurance market. Let Mom and Dad have those choices.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I just want to reiterate a couple of things that Mr. KINGSTON has just said. First of all, seniors especially but indeed all Americans have a right to the facts. Frankly I think that there have been too many of these distortions and half-truths and mistruths and outright lies. Frankly the quotes that you have used tonight from the minority leader, I do not think they were taken out of context at all. I think for a number of months I think it was a calculated position by one side in this debate to basically say there is no problem and that the Republicans have made this up and they are trying to cut Medicare so that they can give this tax cut to the rich, which

is bogus, anyway, but the point is this is serious, it is real, and the program is going bankrupt at an even faster rate than we were told last year.

But the other point that was made, and it needs to be restated, this is not the time and this is not the issue for partisanship. This is an issue that deserves real statesmanship. But the first thing we have to do is face up to the facts. We have to get the facts. The American people and seniors have a right to the facts.

The other point that Mr. KINGSTON made, and I think this is even more important, I think we have got to address this, and I personally do not address this as a Republican or even a Member of Congress. First of all I address it as the son of two parents who are both on Medicare, who both depend on the Medicare system, and hopefully will well into the future for their health care.

A fellow came up to me at a meeting a couple of weeks ago and he said something so beautifully and so simply. He said,

With the issue of Medicare and so many of the other issues that you're debating out in Washington, it's not a debate between the Republicans and the Democrats. In fact, it's not so much a debate between the right and the left. It's a debate between right and wrong.

It is wrong to conceal the facts from the senior citizens when we know the facts. The fund is going bankrupt. Let me just finally say that it is also wrong to tolerate a system that is rife with abuse and waste and fraud. I do not care which study you use. When I have my town meetings, I have had people come up at my town meetings and talk about being billed \$321 for a toothbrush. I mean, there is so much waste, fraud and abuse. The GAO, I think, said it was \$23 billion. Somebody else said it was \$30 billion. We do not know what the exact number is, but we know that the system we have today, with the centralized control bureaucracy, is wrong.

Let me also say that the system we have, it is wrong for us to tolerate a system that is so complicated that my parents, and indeed I do not think most seniors can understand their bills. I mean, that is just wrong. They ought to at least know what they are being billed for.

My father had surgery a few months ago and he got a stack of bills this deep. I could not understand them. So I am sure he could not understand them and I doubt if many people can understand them. We need a simpler system that is built on market forces, that gives people real choices and allows the market to help control those costs. Everybody who has looked at this, every independent objective observer who understands the health care delivery system says that our plan will work and it will give people those choices.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to make a point about this fraud and abuse. Right now Medicare does not pay people like your father with that stack of bills, if he finds out that three or four of them are erroneous, he does not get any kind of reward for that at all. In fact many

times when you say don't pay a bill to Medicare, you have to really be proactive or they resist you.

But here is an example. This is a kind of a dressing, and I am not sure, a salesperson gave this to me, and said that the cost, the actual manufacturing cost, is like 9 cents and it sells under Medicare for about \$28.

□ 2345

It is a total abuse of the system. And I just want to say that under our reform plan, seniors who are getting billed for this kind of thing right and left would have the opportunity to crack down on it. Let me yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Georgia. Even as we lament the inaccuracies and what some, including those of us here on the floor would believe are downright distortions coming from some folks who do not appear really committed to finding a solution to this, in the spirit of true bipartisanship, in the spirit of finding a constructive path to solve this problem, let us state what has happened that has been constructive.

First of all, the President today called on us to find a bipartisan solution. I know we would say to the President, Mr. Speaker, we would say welcome to this. Now let us own up to the problem and let us move to solve it. Let us also note for the record that many Members of this Chamber on both sides of the aisle lament the waste, fraud and abuse the system has wrought. So we understand that fact.

Now again, not in the spirit of one-upmanship or political advantage but in the spirit of truly trying to solve this problem and save this program for our seniors, I believe we need to point out some honest differences of opinion on this issue. No. 1, gone are the days and indeed we see with the release of this trustees' report that the crisis has grown more acute, that now we are looking at the fund going broke in 5 years, but quite possible in 4.

Now again, our colleague from Connecticut stood in the Chamber and said that the new majority was rejecting out of hand a commission. Well, again, a closer check of history would indicate that that was part and parcel of our solution program a year and a half ago. But moreover, again those of us who are new to this town, I think, come in perhaps without the experience of the so-called insiders but with clear enough vision to understand that in Washingtonese, when you are dealing with a program that is sensitive politically, one tactic that is quite often used to pacify the citizenry until the next election is a blue ribbon independent panel.

Mr. Speaker, again, I say this not in the spirit of criticism but in the spirit of solving this problem. The problem is far too acute to delay again or to put off or to somehow postpone until we get through the next election. What we are talking about is health care for our

senior generations. My folks go on it next year. My 92-year-old grandfather has prospered from his health care and is living an outstanding life now, as indeed many senior citizens are.

The very thing we need to do is to move to save this program, and I dare say at the end of another year and a half or another 2 years, after we go through the pomp and circumstance of a commission, we will be no closer to a solution when right now we have the blueprint which exists to make the change. We passed it last year, last October, the Medicare Preservation Act.

Now, again, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of bipartisanship, I would call on the President to join with us. The one thing we cannot afford is any type of convenient Washington way out or gimmick that would again seem to pacify or mollify seniors and try to take care of this program. We do not need to play a shell game with \$55 billion moving from the Medicare trust fund to the general fund or vice versa or any type of legislative sleight of hand to try and satisfy this problem.

We need to be up front. Many of us in this Chamber had the courage to confront this a year and a half ago. We do not do that to ask for the gold star of good partisanship. We simply recognized that fact and the Medicare Preservation Act is a framework which offers choice, which offers quite candidly what many seniors are comfortable with and that is Medicare status quo which cleans up the waste, fraud, and abuse, which introduces the concept of choice and which moreover actually adds money to the beneficiaries every year, from \$4,800 this year to well over \$7,000 a few short years from now, and actually increases at what is basically twice the current inflation rate.

It is a prudent policy to follow to save this program. It is vital we do so. So it is in that spirit of bipartisanship that we call on the leadership of the minority side, that we call on the President of the United States, that we call on the Members of the other body to move forward to solve this problem. As today's report indicates, this is far too important to put off because of political considerations.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I wanted with the few minutes left to talk about another serious problem that we are facing in America today, mostly with our young people, not completely, and I am talking about drugs.

Now, I believe the two of you are familiar with the Clinton appointed judge Harold Baer, the Federal judge. That case, as you know, involved a woman who was in a high-crime area, pulled up to an area, I think at 4 in the morning. Four men stepped out of the shadows. She opened her trunk. They put into the back of her car in the trunk two duffle bags. The police moved in on this suspicious behavior. All five of them ran. The police apprehended all of them and found out later that the duffle bags were filled with co-

caine, and this Clinton judge said that the cocaine could not be used as evidence because to run from the police was rational behavior in that neighborhood because the police were known as oppressive. That is the kind of people that we are getting to fight the war on crimes by the current administration.

Now, that is in the face of the fact that the average age for marijuana usage in America right now is 13. Marijuana usage for 12- to 14-year-old kids is skyrocketing. This is a headline from the Charlotte newspaper today as I was going through the airport: Teen girls use drugs like boys. It talks about a new study showing that young American women are closing the gender gap in drug use, and today's daughters are 15 times more likely than their baby boomer mothers to have begun illegal drugs by the age of 15.

Now, can you imagine, we have got these kinds of things going on in America today, and then we have judges like this appointed to the bench to defend us and keep our streets safe?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield, I think the issue of crime and drugs, it is interesting, it is not just the big cities anymore. You can go out to the small towns. I remember the newspaper editor in one of my small towns last year. You have to be from a small town to relate to this. He said: You know, even here in Hayfield, Minnesota people are starting to lock their doors.

I mean, this is a big issue. People no longer feel safe in small towns. Rochester, Minnesota, which is a beautiful city and we are all very proud of it, but even in Rochester we have had several murders just in the last week and a half. So whether they are drug related, some are, some are not, but the whole notion of appointing judges who do not believe that people are responsible for their own behavior, that is a very, very scary notion.

I think the American people are saying very loudly and very clearly that we want a criminal justice system and we want judges appointed who understand that people who would prey upon other people need to be held accountable, and the innocent people need to be protected from those who would prey upon them.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think our colleague from Minnesota makes excellent points, points worth echoing, because I can attest in the Sixth District of Arizona, a district in square mileage which is a little larger than the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with vast rural areas, with not a great population density in those 46,000 square miles, we are finding similar problems in the rural areas in the less densely populated areas.

We are finding indeed, and it troubles me to even say it in this fashion, but you know how many reputable businesses are built on franchise. I dare say that gangs, part and parcel of our drug problem, seem to be replicating or franchising far faster than any reputable business organization. Now it is

coming into rural, sparsely populated Arizona.

We have many of the same problems and, indeed, both of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have addressed this point. We have to ask this question as well: One of the undergirding concepts of western law and, indeed, whether it is British or American case law, is the notion of what is reasonable.

That is, put in a particular situation, what would a reasonable person do? As our colleague from Georgia points out, it is especially troubling that a judge would move or would opine from the bench that fleeing the police in a certain neighborhood should ever be considered reasonable behavior.

□ 2355

It is especially troubling, and indeed causes great concern, as we look to our third branch of government in our separate but coequal branches, as we try to address the problem of crime and the rise of drug use among young people, we must move not for what is radical, despite the playground taunts and the labels that we hear from so many within here on the banks of the Potomac, but what is reasonable. That must define what we do.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield, I think the irony of this, and someone else pointed this out to me, that we currently have some 20,000 or 30,000 troops patrolling the streets of Bosnia to make the streets safe over there. But I daresay it is not safe to walk the streets here in Washington, DC or in many of the cities in this country.

Frankly, if we are willing to commit troops to make the streets safe in Bosnia-Herzegovina, we should be willing to do whatever it takes to make the streets of the United States safe.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is one reason we passed the truth-in-sentencing laws, as the gentleman knows, because as of a few years ago, the average criminal was only serving 35 percent of his sentence. And we are now saying if States want new Federal money to construct jails in their State for violent criminals, then they have to serve their full sentence, which makes the streets safe.

We are arresting people not for the 2d time or the 3d time, but for the 9th, 10th and 11th time. It is not safe even if you are a police officer.

We only have a few minutes so why do we not have some closing comments. Mr. HAYWORTH.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Georgia and I thank my colleague from Minnesota for joining us this evening and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, those across our great Nation who are looking in this evening.

We are confronted by profound problems. The test for us is not posturing for an election in November but moving to solve these problems. So once again, despite the challenges of some deliberate disinformation, we call on our colleagues from the liberal persuasion and the President of the United

States at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue to join with us to save Medicare, to adequately address these problems, to deal with the crime issue, to deal with genuine welfare reform, and to do it because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would just say that this debate tonight, this discussion tonight, has been constructive, and it reinforces what I really believe, and that is the fundamental debate that is going on here in this Congress and in this country is really between those who believe in more Washington control and more Washington responsibility. Whether we are talking about welfare or crime, or whether we are talking about Medicare, I do not care what it is, the issue is whether we will have more control and more responsibility in Washington or are we going to reinforce more personal control and more personal responsibility.

Those are the policies we ought to pursue. That is what the American people expect, that is what they want, and that is what this Congress is trying to deliver.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HAYWORTH, I agree with you completely. It has been 60 years since there has been a status quo shakeup in Washington, and we need to change this liberal command and control bureaucracy and return power back to the people, back to the local governments so that we can do a more efficient, more effective job of running this country and have a Government that works.

Mr. Speaker, we yield back the balance of our time, and again I thank Mr. GUTKNECHT and Mr. HAYWORTH for joining in this special order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BONILLA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 4 p.m., on account of attending his daughter's graduation.

Mr. CRAPO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 5 p.m. on account of attending his daughter's graduation.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 4 p.m., on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SCHIFF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of death of her father.

Mrs. LINCOLN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin) to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NADLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANTOS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WARD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on June 10.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOLBE, for 5 minutes, on June 6.

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, on June 6.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Ms. DELAURO.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. FRAZER.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. POMEROY.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. SANDERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. WHITE.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. EHRLICH.

Mr. SOLOMON in three instances.

Mr. BOEHLERT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

Mr. UPTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

Mr. EWING.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mrs. CUBIN.

Mr. MCINNIS.