

misuse question and also serve on the subcommittee that deals with our national drug policy, and until today I never thought that the two issues would meet until I sat and heard the testimony of those who work for our Secret Service and viewed the proceedings in the White House.

What I learned was most disturbing and concerns me as a citizen, as a Congressman, and someone who has always held the White House in the highest respect. It is the Chief Executive Office of our land.

First, we heard the tales of an admitted drug user who ended up as the chief personnel security officer for the White House, an unbelievable tale in the White House Legal Office of ignoring the details of this individual's past in placing him in such an important position.

I have come to the House and talked with my colleagues and tried to call to the attention of the Congress and the country the situation with drug abuse and use and the lack of leadership from the White House, and today it really struck home what has been happening.

First, we saw the President take office, and then in a startling move, he cut the White House drug czar's office. He cut the staffing in the White House of the drug czar's office by 85 percent. That did not make sense. Then he cut drug interdiction programs, decimated them, that stopped drugs at their source countries, and that did not make sense and I wondered why. And then the President appointed as the chief health officer for the Nation, the Surgeon General, an individual who said to our children and the American public, "Just say maybe. Maybe drugs are OK." And that did not make sense and I wondered why.

Now I see this pattern of people who are in the White House, and most disturbing we learn today that the situation got so bad with people coming in that even the Secret Service, and these are people coming in with drug use and abuse histories, and some, it appears, current activities, that, in fact, the Secret Service demanded that some action be taken. And only after, through what has been called some remedial action, instituting a program within the White House, was something done.

This administration has talked about regulating cigarettes and the harmful effects of nicotine, and this, I am afraid, has been a diversion. The real question is what has been happening with drugs, and we can look at the results. The results are that marijuana use among our children, our children, 50 percent a year each year since this administration took office. These are not idle statistics. These are facts.

If we look at what is happening, this chart shows here that in 1980 is when President Reagan just said no to drug use, and President Bush, and drug use with our children dropped. Here in 1992, it starts going up, and we see why.

Cocaine, heroin, designer drugs are at epidemic proportions with our young

people, 8th, 10th, 12th grades, and we see that the lack of leadership is the lack of a policy in the Chief Executive Office of this land.

If you are a parent, you should be concerned. Our children's drug use is dramatically up. If you are a minority, you should be concerned. Our jails are packed with minorities. In Washington, DC, we have a record number of killings. And throughout our land, every time you turn on the news you see the mayhem created by drugs, and 70 percent of those in prisons today are there because of a drug-related incident, and the President has failed to mention this or make this a priority.

Let me cite this statistic here. He gave 1,628 statements in 1993 and only mentioned drugs 13 times. In 1994 he gave 1,742 Presidential statements and only referred to drug use or drug abuse 11 times.

We see this pattern that has not been a priority of this President. It has not been a priority of this White House. What we must have is a President that will lead this Nation and people in the Chief Executive Office of this land to lead by example.

WELFARE REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to spend my 5 minutes tonight talking about the so-called welfare reform legislation that we will be voting on tomorrow, and that debate was started on tonight.

I intend to be very critical of the Republican leadership proposal which has been brought up on the floor and to praise, if you will, the bipartisan alternative that has been put forth by the gentleman from Delaware, Congressman CASTLE, who is a Republican, and also the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman TANNER, who is a Democrat.

When I talk about welfare reform, and I discuss it with my constituents in my district in New Jersey, what I hear is that most of my constituents feel that in the process of welfare reform children should not suffer, children should not be harmed in any way.

What my constituents say they want is they want to get people off welfare to work and to have a future for themselves and a certain pride in the fact that they are working for their families. They do not necessarily think that welfare reform should be money driven; in other words, that we should use welfare reform as a way to save money. They seem to be more concerned about the need to change the social fabric, to eliminate the so-called welfare mentality.

My point tonight is that the Republican leadership bill, which we are going to be voting on tomorrow, I think falls short in terms of what my constituents want. In fact, it is tough

on kids. It makes kids suffer. It does substantial harm to children, and it is very weak on work. It does not really do very much to get people to work or make it possible for them to work.

The Castle-Tanner bipartisan substitute, I think, is just the opposite. It achieves the goals of trying to get people off welfare and working, and, at the same time, making sure that kids are protected, that they are not suffering in terms of food nutrition programs, housing, or the other things that would keep them healthy and prepare for their future.

Now, let me just give an example. The Republican leadership bill would probably push more than 1 million children into poverty, just the opposite of what most of my constituents would expect it would do.

When it comes to the work program, which I say is rather weak, the Congressional Budget Office says that no State would be able to meet the work requirements in the Republican proposal given the resources or the lack of resources that the bill devotes and gives to States so that they can train people and get them into productive jobs.

The worst example, though, is with regard to the Food Stamp Program. I do not think that any American would think that the purpose of welfare reform would be to cut back on the amount of money that the average welfare recipient has available to pay for food, particularly for their children.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities did a study, which was issued today, and it says that the Nation's poorest households, those with incomes below half of the poverty line, would lose an average of \$650 a year in food stamp benefits under the welfare legislation now before Congress, the Republican leadership proposal.

The study also found that working poor households, and these are people that are working, that receive food stamps, because we know many people get food stamps who are not on welfare; in other words, they are not on Aid to Families with Dependent Children, they are actually working, but what the study found is that working poor households that receive food stamps to help supplement their low wages along with the elderly poor and poor families with children would lose several hundred dollars a year in food cash assistance as well.

The welfare bills coming this week to the House and Senate floors contain \$28 billion in food stamp reductions over the next 6 years, with many of those reductions being achieved by across-the-board cuts that affect all groups of the poor. What the report basically says is that a large share of the welfare bill's food stamp savings would come from across-the-board food stamp benefit cuts with only 2 percent of the food stamp savings in the bill coming from provisions to reduce administrative cost, curb fraud or end benefits for people failing to comply with work requirements.

I think that is what most Americans think, that with reform we would say that if you do not work then you lose your benefits or that we would try to get at the welfare fraud or curb the cost of the bureaucracy administering the program. That is what is happening here.

What was supposed to be a historic effort to balance the budget has deteriorated into legislation that does relatively little to reduce the long-term deficit, but would substantially increase the depth of poverty and likely cause substantial numbers of poor children and elderly people to fail to secure adequate food and nutrition.

Now, the Castle-Tanner substitute, which I will be supporting tomorrow, basically ensures that States would be able to meet the work requirements in the bill by providing \$3 billion in additional mandatory funds that States can access in order to meet the cost of moving welfare recipients to work.

It costs money to get the States to train people to get them to work. That is why we need the Castle-Tanner substitute. We need a program that is going to get people to work and not hurt the children.

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. MANZULLO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM POSTPONED

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight during this hour of special orders to bring to the attention of this country, and particularly to my colleagues in this House, what is going on here in Washington, what is going on here in this Congress at this moment.

We heard earlier speakers talk about this was going to be the week that has been postponed, and it had been postponed that we were going to have Reform Week, where Congress was going to address all of those issues that the constituents of this country, the people, have said are broken and need fixing. This was the week to fix things.

Just hours ago we were told that the issue that we have all been waiting for, one of the biggest issues facing the United States in this election year, campaign reform, has now been taken off the table.

□ 2145

Postponed until next week, and who knows, if not taken up next week, maybe indefinitely. I am here tonight to talk with some of my colleagues about the importance of campaign reform. I am serving in my 21st year of elective office, having been in local government, State government. I do not think there has been a time in those 21 years when people did not ask me what we are going to do about campaign reform.

In California, a big State, we have done a lot. It certainly is not enough because there are two measures on the ballot this November that will radically change campaign law for election to State and local office. Perhaps the one that is most focused on is the Federal law that governs all of us who get elected to the United States Congress.

This is an issue that we have been working on for many years. My colleague, MARTY MEEHAN, from Massachusetts, has been a strong voice from the moment he arrived, talking about the need for Congress to address campaign reform. Indeed, he led a bipartisan effort to put together a bill that he spoke about earlier tonight that had about an even number of Democrats and Republicans cosponsor it.

The Republican leadership will not even allow that bill to come to the floor for a vote. Why? Perhaps Mr. MEEHAN might want to join me here in discussing why his bill cannot even get to the floor, and I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California not only for reserving an hour of time but also for his efforts on campaign finance reform.

The Committee on Rules is meeting right now and taking all kinds of testimony, so you never know, maybe they will come up with a rule that will allow a debate on this bill.

I think that one of the things that many on the Committee on Rules are afraid of is that the President will sign the bill. President Clinton has said when he spoke in the State of the Union address that we needed campaign finance reform and he specifically mentioned the bill that I have been working with LINDA SMITH from Washington and CHRIS SHAYS from Connecticut. It is a bicameral and bipartisan bill.

He challenged the Congress to pass that bill. I cannot help but think that part of the reason is, President Clinton has said, I am going to sign campaign finance reform if it limits how much money is spent in congressional elections and begins the process of trying to lessen the influence of special interests.

There are some times, with all respect, I think that the Republican leadership down at the Committee on Rules are afraid the President will actually sign the bill. Would that not be something?

Mr. FARR of California. Well, I think what your bill and my bill, which is very similar to it, very minor differences, frankly, our bills, we are relatively new to Congress, but our bills are based on what this House has been able to produce in the 103d Congress, the 102d Congress, the 101st Congress, going all the way back to 1988 to the 100th Congress.

The Democrats have led in putting our campaign reform bills that are very much similar to the bill that we are trying to get on the floor now and in fact had gotten through this House, and every time they have been blocked by the Republican leadership. In fact, in one case in 1992, President Bush just before the Presidential elections in 1992 vetoed the campaign reform passed by both the House and the Senate.

We are back at it again, and I think what is so shocking about where we are now, because some of the controversies in that bill were that you had vouchers, essentially the process where taxpayers would help pay for the cost of campaigns and that was always very controversial. Took those out. No longer in the bill.

And what do we see come along from the other side? Nothing about reform. There is no reform in the Republican leadership bill. There is no reform in the reform week of the Republican dialog. We are here tonight, three colleagues who are down in the trenches fighting for these issues and I think we are befuddled, we are just amazed that the bill they brought forth this week essentially allows you to auction off seats in the U.S. Congress.