

should not have permanent welfare benefits for illegal aliens, because when people come to our country for the benefits, they need emergency care, we should help them out, but then they ought to be on their way.

Now, block grants are something that the command and control Washington bureaucrats cannot stand, but basically what State grants would do is give local welfare caseworkers options on how to care for children.

Here is a true story in Savannah, GA, a welfare family. Two girls. One of them is 15 years old. She is in the eighth grade. The other one is 18 years old. She is in the 10th grade. Now, remember, 18-year-olds should be seniors and 15-year-olds should be in the 10th grade. The 18-year-old has a baby, the 15-year-old does not have a child. She is in school and doing well. The girls live with the common-law husband of their biological mother. He is not their biological father.

Now, the mother does not live at home anymore. She does not provide for them anymore. She does not come around because she is hooked on crack. The only time she has come by the house in recent months was to get in a fight with her common-law husband, which ended up her throwing ash at him and blinding him. So now he can no longer see and he can no longer work.

The girls have a brother who is not by their same biological father, but a step brother, and he is in jail. The question is where is their biological father? Their biological father was killed when they were small children.

This is a real case. This is a complicated case to keep up with, I realize, but this is not an unusual case. This is what is happening out there on the street today. It is a sad case. We have to help these girls.

If you remember what it was like when you were 15 and 18 years old, it was very difficult to get through school and all the pressures in a normal household much less in a situation like this. But the caseworker's problem, and he told me personally, here you have to have child care, and that is one agency; then you have to have health care, that is another agency; you get WIC, you have food stamps, you got job training, you have education, you got transportation needs, and all these have to be handled by a different bureaucracy.

Would it not be great if this caseworker working on this one family could take them from A to Z and have all their problems handled by himself or through one phone call, one-stop shopping, so to speak? That is why the block grants, which would give flexibility to the State, are so important, because that is all it would do.

What are some of the other issues we need to deal with? Crime. Truth in sentencing. We are getting better now, but it has been that when people have been sentenced for 8 years or 10 years, that they have only served 35 percent of

their time. I believe, and I know most Members of this body and people in America right now believe, that if an individual is sentenced for 10 years, they ought to serve their full sentence. They ought to serve at least 85 percent of that 10 years, if they do not serve 10 out of 10.

We have passed a law that says if a State wants Federal money for Federal prison construction then their State needs to have truth in sentencing. That is something that we are still fighting about with the President and the Washington liberals, but, again, it gets our streets safer so that people can walk down their streets.

We are putting more money into drug interdiction and antidrug programs. I read a statistic the other day that said that the No. 1 age for trying marijuana now across the Nation is 13. We debate here about our children starting to smoke cigarettes early, and I believe that is a very serious problem. We cannot let our children start smoking cigarettes early. But let us do not forget about the 13-year-olds, Mr. Speaker, who are lighting up marijuana, because that is an illegal drug with all sorts of ramifications.

So while we are focusing so much time on the welfare of our children, we better remember how important it is to have a good antidrug program; to have DARE programs and so forth like that.

Mr. Speaker, all this stuff leads to some uneasiness of the American population, and it is something that we have got to deal with, but one thing that I have not mentioned up till now is the fact that all of this is for naught if we go bankrupt. We have a budget right now that 16 percent of it is going to interest on the national debt. About \$20 billion each month goes to just interest. Our national debt is about \$5 trillion.

Now, here are some interesting numbers, and this is from the February 6, 1995, Wall Street Journal. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker: \$1 trillion has 12 zeros to it. A trillion is a million times a million. A million squared. It would take more than 1½ million millionaires to have as much money as is spent by Congress in a year.

Actually, that statistic is not true because this was written when the budget was a trillion dollars and it is now about a trillion six.

Here is another statistic. Here is an experiment, reading directly from the article. What if we were to try to pay off the \$4 trillion national debt? Now, let me pause again. Old article. The national debt now is about \$5 trillion. But this still is a good illustration.

What if we were to try to pay off the \$4 trillion national debt by having Congress put \$1 every second into a special debt buy-down account? How many years would it take to pay off the debt?

Did you want to guess at this, Mr. Speaker? Okay, I will go ahead and tell you the answer.

One million seconds is about 12 days. One billion seconds is roughly 32 years.

But one trillion seconds is almost 32,000 years. So to pay off the debt, Congress would have to put dollar bills into this account for about the next 130,000 years, roughly the amount of time that has passed since the Ice Age.

I will give you another illustration, since you are begging to one, I can tell.

Even if we were to require Congress to put \$100 a second into this debt buy-down account, it would still take over 1,000 years to pay the debt down. So here is another one. Imagine a train of 50-foot box cars crammed with \$1 bills. How long would the train have to be to carry the \$1.6 trillion Congress spends each year?

About \$65 million can be stuffed into a box car. Therefore, the train would have to be about 240 miles long to carry enough dollar bills to balance the Federal budget. In other words, we would need a train that stretches the entire Northeast Corridor from Washington through Baltimore, Delaware, Philadelphia and New Jersey and on to New York in order to carry that much money.

That is just mind-boggling in terms of numbers. I think one of the biggest problems we have with our national debt, Mr. Speaker, is that it is an inconceivable amount, but if we could conceive a trillion, I think we would be so horrified, that we as a Nation would be horrified into immediate answer.

We have to balance this budget, Mr. Speaker. We have to do it for our kids. We have to cut out Government waste. We have to increase privatization. We have to increase efficiency, and we have to do it in a nonpartisan, non-political way.

□ 2215

If you do balance the budget, Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, has testified that it could bring down interest rates as much as 1.5 percent. If it dropped it down 2 percent, you could save \$37,000 on a \$75,000 home mortgage over a 30-year period of time. You could save \$900 on a \$15,000 automobile loan.

These are things, Mr. Speaker, that will help the American public. It will do it now, and the time is now to balance this budget and to continue the work that we have started in this Congress.

HOUSE ETHICS INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to talk about the process of the Ethics Committee. I have sat on the Ethics Committee for 6 years. At various times I have been a member, a ranking member, and, in one 2-year period. I was the chair. So I speak with a broad experience on the affairs of the Ethics Committee.

For me to speak on this issue is an unusual circumstance but these are unusual times. The charge of the Ethics Committee is to protect the integrity of the House and to deal fairly with the Members charged before this committee. A part of fairness is dealing expeditiously and thoroughly with charges brought to the committee. The appearance of fairness and thoroughness and impartiality is essential to any effort by the committee if the committee expects either the Members or the public to accept the results of the evaluation of any charge.

To adequately fulfill these two obligations, there has evolved a process for responding to allegations against a Member. The standing Ethics Committee is a relatively recent phenomenon. Before 1968, ethics complaints were handled in a variety of ways. There was a use of special committees or subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, but since 1969, the Ethics Committee is a relatively recent phenomenon. Before 1968, ethics complaints were handled in a variety of ways. There was a use of special committees or subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, but since 1969, the Ethics Committee has functioned on a bipartisan basis, composed of equal numbers of Democrat and Republican Members. This structure is unique in this partisan body because neither side by force of majority can exert its will. There must be cooperation.

Now, undeniably, in controversial cases, partisan feelings arise and cooperation becomes strained. Over the last 20 years, a mechanism has been developed to deal with such complicated or contentious cases and that is the appointment of a special outside counsel.

When partisanship has disrupted reasoned evaluation of the facts, the committee rightly has resorted to independent outside counsel on 10 occasions over the last 20 years, the Ethics Committee has chosen to seek outside counsel to resolve partisan differences and to ensure that the truth is presented to the Congress and to the American people.

Doing so is nothing new, extraordinary or prejudicial. It is instructive, I think, to review those 10 instances.

Here is a list of the cases in which outside counsel was appointed by the House Ethics Committee:

In the matter of the complaint against Representative L. F. Sikes in 1976, the Ethics Committee hired William Geoghegan.

In the Korean influence investigation in 1977, the Ethics Committee hired Phillips Lacovara and John Nields.

In the matter of Congressman Charles C. Diggs, the Ethics Committee hired William Geoghegan.

In the matter of Abscam in 1980, the Ethics Committee hired E. Barrett Prettyman.

In the matter of Congressman Daniel J. Flood in 1979, the Ethics Committee hired David M. Barrett.

In the matter of Congressman George V. Hansen, 1984, the Ethics Committee hired Stanley Brand.

In the investigation of financial transactions participated in and gifts of transportation accepted by Congressman Fernand J. St Germain in 1987, the Ethics Committee hired Johnnie L. Cochran.

In the investigation, pursuant to House Resolution 12, concerning alleged illicit use and distribution of drugs by Members of the House, the so-called page scandal in 1983, the Ethics Committee hired Joseph Califano.

In the matter of Speaker Jim Wright in 1988, the Ethics Committee hired Richard Phelan.

And lastly, regarding complaints against Representative NEWT GINGRICH in 1989, the Ethics Committee hired the firm of Phelan and John.

The results are history. In every instance, outside counsel treated the accused Member fairly but got to the truth when the committee itself was unable to. In many instances, outside counsel's recommendation on specific charges were accepted and in others they were narrowed or dropped.

This is not unlike disputes in a variety of settings where parties are unable to reach an agreement and an arbiter is sought. In families, in churches, in universities, in legal disputes, and even in sports, the ref's or the ump's decision is final.

Committees in most situations are set up with odd numbers of members so that differences of opinion can be resolved by a majority rule. That is how this body operates in most situations. In those areas where committees are set up with an even number of members, the obvious hope is that decisions will be reached by consensus or the committee will resort to an outside arbiter.

The advantages realized by the House and the committee in seeking outside counsel are numerous. The House receives the advice and counsel of a jointly selected examiner who comes to the investigation devoid of the discomfort and understandable bias that committee members might bring to such an investigation.

In addition, the counsel assists the committee to understand and to winnow the allegations and the application of overlapping rules, statutes and standards of conduct to very complex facts. Counsel selected in such a manner can be both fair and thorough, which in turn, in my belief, offers the best chance that the concluding decision of the committee will be deemed a just result.

Once counsel is selected, the question before the committee is, what shall be the scope of the counsel's investigation and what shall be his or her authority.

Mr. GINGRICH, in 1988, wholeheartedly endorsed the answer to this question proposed by former Attorney General of the United States, Archibald Cox, who as head of Common Cause suggested the following in a letter to Chairman DIXON:

The outside counsel, and I quote, shall have full authority to investigate and present evidence and arguments before the Ethics Committee concerning the questions arising out of the activities of a member.

The outside counsel shall have full authority to organize, select and hire on a full or part-time basis in such numbers as the counsel reasonably requires.

The outside counsel shall have full authority to review all documentary evidence available from any source and full cooperation of the committee in obtaining such evidence.

The committee shall give the outside counsel full cooperation in the issuance of subpoenas.

The outside counsel shall be free, after discussion with the committee, to make such public statements and reports as the counsel deems appropriate.

The outside counsel shall have full authority to recommend that formal charges be brought before the Ethics Committee, shall be responsible for initiating and conducting proceedings, if formal charges have been brought, and shall handle any aspect of the proceedings believed to be necessary for a full inquiry.

The committee shall not countermand or interfere with the outside counsel's ability to take steps necessary to conduct a full and fair investigation.

Mr. Cox goes on to say: The outside counsel will not be removed except for good cause.

Because Congressman GINGRICH felt the committee was not going to adhere to the principles outlined by Mr. Cox, he wrote Chairman DIXON to raise his concerns and closed his letter with the following statement:

The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of a Speaker of the House, a position which is third in line of succession to the presidency and the second most powerful elected position in America. Clearly, this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity.

As usual, Mr. GINGRICH was eloquent and his logic was unassailable. I think, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of this body would heartily and readily agree with the words of Mr. GINGRICH.

With respect to unresolved matters, the committee has only three options. Either to refer to the outside counsel those issues which remain unresolved or to leave those issues unresolved or to report back to the House the committee's inability to resolve the charges before it and ask for further direction.

The first option, that of referring to the outside counsel, has been used in the past on a number of occasions, as I outlined, and has been used in a bipartisan way to resolve very thorny issues. The process has been led by an individual whose livelihood and success does not depend on the good graces of

the chair or the ranking member. In short, the Member, the committee, the House and the public must have confidence in the professionalism, integrity, open-mindedness of the outside counsel. Referral to an outside counsel must, and I emphasize, must be considered a judgment that the matter merits further inquiry, nothing more.

The second option, that of leaving the matter unresolved, is totally unacceptable, since it reduces the Ethics Committee to the Committee on Frivolous Complaints and Rule Interpretation.

The committee is able to deal only with issues over which there is no controversy because either party can, by a 5-to-5 vote, prevent the resolution of any serious or difficult issue before it. If one side feels there is an issue that merits further inquiry and the other does not, the issue will simply die in the lap of the chair. If that happens, the chair of the committee will have destroyed the Ethics Committee by failing to lead the committee to a resolution of an issue of major importance.

The third option is reporting back to the House the committee's inability to resolve an issue either by consensus or by referral to the outside counsel. The report to the House can be made either in open session or in executive session in the House Chambers. This latter course could be followed since an ethics charge could arguably be considered a personnel matter and the Member is entitled to have it aired in secret, as the Ethics Committee operates.

In a session before the House, the committee could receive direction by the House as to whether the matters should be referred to the outside counsel or follow some other course of action, such as dismissal of all remaining charges by a vote of the House in secret session.

Being on the Ethics Committee is not a sought-after plum assignment in the House of Representatives, but it is a job that must be done. Attacks on members of the Ethics Committee by either side of the aisle must be viewed with great skepticism.

Recently, on July 27, some of my colleagues put out a Dear Colleague letter in which they said, Over the past two years a systematic and coordinated effort has been undertaken to impugn the integrity of Speaker GINGRICH.

In fairness to the Speaker and with respect to the ethics process, they suggest that I recuse myself from this process.

These recent attacks on me are simply attempts by zealous and uninformed Members of the House to destroy the Ethics Committee before it completes its work on unresolved matters.

□ 2230

This kind of misguided activity will accomplish nothing but damage to the reputation of every Member of the House.

I am really quite honored that after a thorough review of my office and

campaign and financial disclosure forms, those who seek to destroy the committee could come up with so little in their vain attempt to discredit the committee. I am here tonight to state that the House should have a report from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct on matters unresolved before it, so that the House can further instruct the committee on how to proceed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and for the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of personal business.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and Wednesday, July 17, on account of a death in the family.

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. PALLONE to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARR of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each day, today and on July 17 and 18.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today and on July 17.

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, on July 23.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today and on July 17 and 18.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, on July 17.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. SERRANO.

Ms. HARMAN.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Mr. VOLKMER.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. MATSUI.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

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

Mr. COX of California.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. FORBES in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. TORKILDSEN.

Mr. DORNAN.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

Mr. WHITE.

Mr. ESHOO.

Ms. DANNER.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1757. An act to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act to extend the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

OMISSION FROM THE RECORD

The following is a reprint of remarks in their entirety, both printed and omitted from the RECORD of Thursday, July 11, 1996, at Page H7447:

□ 0145

Women could not own property. There could not be marriage between the races. Many things change over time, Mr. Chairman. This, too, is going to change.

I would like to pay tribute, special personal tribute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], to Dr. King, to all those of both parties and no parties. There was nothing partisan about that movement; there is and ought never to be anything partisan about this, the final chapter in the history of the civil rights of this country.

I wish I could remember, I used to know the entirety of that "I have a Dream" speech, but we will rise up and live out the full meaning of our Creator. It may not be this year and it certainly will not be this Congress, but it