

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say to him that we want to continue the reputation that we have established in the 104th Congress of being the reform Congress. We have every intention of continuing with our plans for a reform week.

We intend to do a campaign finance reform bill. Unfortunately, we are slipping the schedule on our appropriations bills, and our first priority is to get through the 13 appropriation bills and use the precious floor time for them, but we have every intention of honoring our commitments on reforms, to continue the reforms that we have been working on, sometime in July.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would once again ask the gentleman, as I have the gentleman from California, Chairman THOMAS, and others who may have jurisdiction, if we could be given some understanding about what will be coming to the floor during that week, whenever it is.

It is our experience that when we have task force government in the legislative process, we do not always have an opportunity to participate until, all of a sudden, the legislation is before us. So, I am wondering when we may be informed about what will be the composition of reform week in some detail. Could the gentleman inform us?

Mr. DELAY. As soon as we know, we will let the gentleman know.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I consider that a very candid comment, and I appreciate the response.

One last question, and I will not prolong this. I know a good deal of attention is suddenly being focused on the MFN for China. Could the gentleman tell us when that very important debate, which is really bipartisan in nature, might well come before the body?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I would advise the gentleman that we are trying to work with both sides on the MFN issue. We are going to have a leadership meeting next week and we have been in discussion with our leadership team. There is a possibility that we would do MFN next week if we can get the floor time for it and do it.

We would like to get it on to the floor and moving as quickly as we can, and we think we can do that. Although, we cannot, for certain, say it is going to be next week, there is a possibility it will be brought up next week.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Does the gentleman have any idea how long we might have to debate that, how extensive the time commitment to MFN would likely be?

Mr. DELAY. If we do it next week, it would be several hours, but it would not be the 20 hours as required. We will consult with the minority leadership to make sure that every Member's requests are taken care of, but understanding that floor time is very precious.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I will try to wrap this one up and yield further.

If it is possible, after the first two appropriations bills, VA-HUD and Transportation, are dealt with, if Labor-HHS is not ready, we may well then go to Thursday afternoon, Friday morning consideration of MFN; is that correct?

Mr. DELAY. I would say that that is a real possibility.

Mr. FAZIO of California. And Friday is firm, until 2, next week?

Mr. DELAY. Friday we will be out by 2 p.m. no matter what.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the input of the majority whip, and if the Speaker would forbear for just a second, I have been asked by the White House to indicate for those going to the picnic tonight that they are urging people to take Independence Avenue to 17th street, right on 17th, cross Constitution and take the first right turn onto the Ellipse.

There is a tremendous potential for a traffic snarl there tonight. Parking is available on the Ellipse and east toward East Executive Drive. If any Members who are listening to this have some concerns about it, call the cloakrooms of the two parties and we will help try to ease transportation.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 1996

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, June 24, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 25, 1996, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1996

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE FILEGATE INVESTIGATION

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, all Americans should note with pride the fact that the Olympic torch passes through Washington today on its way to Atlanta, GA, but we should issue this warning both to the International Olympic Committee and the U.S. Olympic Committee: "Whatever you do with that torch, please don't stop at the White House." Chances are the torch would get lost and we would not see it for 2½ years. But I am sure that would be just an honest bureaucratic snafu.

Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, this morning I respectfully request that we include in today's Washington Times entitled "The Filegate Investigation." If we include that in the RECORD, we will come to the conclusion that all sober and fair-minded Americans should share, that with all due respect to the FBI, letting the FBI conduct its own investigation into the Filegate matter would be like letting the fox guard the henhouse. An independent counsel is needed to get to the truth on this subject.

#### THE FILEGATE INVESTIGATION

Now that Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth Starr has determined he lacks jurisdiction to investigate White House abuse of FBI background files on more than 400 Reagan and Bush appointees, Attorney General Janet Reno is planning to turn over the investigation to the FBI itself. That is less than a satisfactory solution—to put it mildly.

This unprecedented and "egregious"—as FBI Director Louis Freeh describes it—violation of the Privacy Act could not, after all, have happened without FBI cooperation. And this is not the first time that that agency has overstepped the bounds of propriety, if not legality, in its willingness to cooperate with the Clinton White House. Senior FBI officials allowed themselves to be browbeaten by White House staffers into getting involved in constructing the Clintons' cover story for the summary firing of seven travel office employees in May, 1993. And now it turns out that for months afterwards, without batting an eye, they were merrily handling over hundreds of confidential files the White House had no business getting its hands on.

The White House responded to the initial revelations of these privacy violations with typical disingenuousness. While acknowledging it should never have happened, Clinton spokesmen laid it all at the feet of a low-level clerk, who had no idea who did or did not still need White House access and was using an outdated Secret Service list—and an order form stamped with then-White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum's name. The Secret Service quickly jumped into the fray with the news that their lists of employees are constantly updated, and that active and inactive passholders are very clearly designated—in short, that there is no such thing as an out-dated Secret Service list.

That hardly mattered in any case, once it also became known that the clerk, civilian Army investigator Anthony Marceca, was actually a longtime Democratic hack, who'd been brought on board by and was working under the direction of another veteran Democratic operative, Craig Livingstone, who worked for then-Associate Counsel, Rose Law Firm partner and Clinton crony William H. Kennedy III. All three had every reason to know perfectly well that they didn't need

background files on, say, former Secretary of State James Baker.

None of this painful truth has stopped the White House's spin machine from continuing to maintain with a straight face that the illegal intrusion into confidential files by Clinton employees was nothing more than a "bureaucratic snafu." Nor has it interfered with Democrats' unblushing assertions (which will ring a bell with anyone who followed the Senate Whitewater investigations) that any further questions about this scandalous act—and particularly the hearings that began this week in the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee (with more to follow soon on the Senate Judiciary Committee), are "politically motivated."

It's clear despite the PR, however, that the beleaguered folks in the Clinton White House recognize they're in trouble once again. The president and chief of staff have apologized, albeit in classic Clinton style—without admitting to any wrongdoing. Craig Livingstone, it was announced this week, will be going on "requested" paid leave of absence. And White House Counsel Jack Quinn has decreed that henceforth, all security operations will be put under the control of Charles Easley, a veteran career civil servant who was hired during the Reagan administration.

Admirably free of the Clintonian ethics plague as Mr. Easley undoubtedly is, it's too late to get those 408 FBI background files back in the toothpaste tube. More to the point, his appointment only raises the question why someone like him was not appointed in the first place—if the Clinton administration really had no evil intentions.

And honorable as Director Freeh may be, his agency is too sullied by its part in the Privacy Act violation to carry out a credible investigation. It is troubling, indeed, to say this about yet another Clinton administration scandal, but if anything ever called for the appointment of an independent counsel, this does. Ms. Reno should not delay in seeking such an appointment. Anything else will look too much like setting the fox to guard the henhouse.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

#### HOOSIER HERO

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my report from Indiana.

Every weekend, my wife Ruthie and I travel the second district of Indiana. And so often, people share with me special stories about their friends and neighbors who make our community a better place. These individuals do things all on their own to make us proud.

Now, I like to call these individuals Hoosier heros. Hoosier heros because they reach out and lend a helping hand to those less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, Brandon Scott Privett of Pendleton, IN, is a Hoosier hero. A Hoosier hero because he generously

contributes his time and effort helping senior citizens. Brandon is a 12-year-old boy who moved from Florida to Pendleton—a small Indiana town last May. Brandon, along with his mother and brother, moved in with their grandmother, who is an active member of Pet-a-Pal volunteer program.

The Pet-a-Pal program is an organization that brings animals into the nursing homes, to help brighten the days for lonely seniors. Some 46 volunteers at Pet-a-Pal program bring pets to the nursing homes throughout Madison County. There they visit with the residents and form new friendships and special bonds.

Brandon started visiting a nursing home called the Rawlins House with his grandmother Greta Butts in May. He immediately befriended a gentleman resident of the nursing home, and continued to visit him and other residents daily.

Brandon also started helping the volunteers walk their dogs through the nursing homes and does anything that is asked of him. Brandon has made a special friend with one of the volunteers who is disabled in the use of his arms and has trouble caring for all of the animals himself.

He helps with the dogs and dresses them in their costumes to walk them up and down the halls for the residents to see—sort of a parade. Those who know Brandon will tell you so many good things about this young boy.

Jo Rehm, the Pet-a-Pal coordinator says she has never met a young man who had such an understanding and loving heart for senior citizens.

Brandon is an inspiration to all of us, and he and all of the volunteers in the Pet-a-Pal program are Hoosier Heroes, Hoosier Heroes because they make our communities a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, that is my report for Indiana today, on July 20.

#### PET-A-PAL VOLUNTEERS

Deb Arnold, Pam Bennett, Sally Bilyeu, Lisette and Steve Brenner, Bob and Mary Bridgewater, Howard Wile, Carol Loughridge, Terri Townner, Anna May Davis, Sally Wilding, Charlie Grinnell, Sheri Hineman, Roxanne and Argyl Meeker, and Brandon Privett.

Eulala Roettger, Charlie Safford, Dottie Smith, Carrie Smith, Dawn Truex, Nancy Clement, Lee Ann Wallen, Julie Cox, Meg Spangler, Mary Lou Griffey, Esther Gray, John Coulter, Ron Miller, and Mark Reeves.

Betty Bryan, Betty Wainscott, Greta Butts, Sandy Warden, Amy Burton, Avis Witt, Ingrid and Mark Childs, Debbie Swanson, Rick Garrett, Jo Rehm, Kathleen Buck, Jennifer Kokos, Charles and Marsha Ostler, and Bid Pike.

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

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

#### HEALTH CARE SECURITY

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

Mr. HASTERT. I have to take a few minutes today to just talk to the House and its membership about an important issue coming before this body. It is called health care security.

It is about people being able to move from job to job, whether they are in group health insurance in one job and moved to group health insurance in another job, or they move from group insurance to individual insurance. If you happen to have, or a member of your family has, a preexisting condition, say, a heart situation or some type of long-term illness, you will not be denied health care.

Now, that legislation has passed this House and it has passed the Senate, and it is time to go to conference, the principals in the other body and the principals in this House, and talk about a way to fashion this bill so that it will gain the support of the President and the signature of the President, and will become law.

The American people want health care security, they want portability. They also want availability in health care and they want affordability in health care. It is something that we have addressed in this piece of legislation. People who are self-employed, they may be truck drivers in my district or barbers or beauticians or farmers or real estate agents or insurance agents even. They would like to be given the same break that big business gets, the same break that if they go out and buy health care for themselves and their family, they can deduct the cost of that health care insurance from their income tax.

If they are beyond just self-employed, if they are a small business, they would like to be able to offer health care insurance to their employees that is actually affordable.

The bill that we have passed through the House and the bill that has passed through the Senate basically does that also. It changes how individual insurance is offered. The House provision has a provision for medical savings accounts. Medical savings accounts are something that many companies offer today; as a matter of fact, there are 17 States across this Nation, including my home State of Illinois, that offer medical savings accounts so that people can choose the health care providers that they want.

□ 1815

They also have an opportunity to make their individual choices. They also have an opportunity to shop the market.

Today in health care, if you have an insurance policy, we always say that there is a third party payer. When you go to the doctor's office and the doctor says, you need X, Y, or Z treatment, if you ask the doctor how much does that