

TABLE 1.—CAMPAIGN FINANCE LEGISLATION BEFORE THE 104TH CONGRESS: COMPARISON OF SELECTED PROVISIONS—Continued

Current law	H.R. 3760 (Thomas)	H.R. 2566 (Smith/Meehan/Shays)	H.R. 3505 (Farr)
MISCELLANEOUS			
	Approval for payroll deduction Requires employees who make PAC contributions through payroll deduction to give authorization at least annually, with rights to withdraw approval at any time; employers must inform them of these rights at least annually.	Franking Bans unsolicited mass mailings in election year, until after general election.	
VOLUNTARY SPENDING LIMITS AND PUBLIC BENEFITS IN HOUSE ELECTIONS			
Limits on Campaign Expenditures			
No provision	No provision	\$600,000 limit in 2 year cycle, plus \$120,000 if runoff and \$180,000 if close primary winner; \$60,000 limit on candidate's personal funds; Limit raised (and individual contribution limit doubled) for participant if non-complying opponent exceeds certain limits; Limit raised to offset extent of independent expenditures against participant or for opponent, one in excess of \$25,000 overall.	\$600,000 limit in 2 year cycle, plus \$200,000 if runoff and \$200,000 if close primary winner; \$50,000 limit on candidate's personal funds; Limit raised for participant if non-complying opponent exceeds certain limits; Limit raised to offset extent of independent expenditures, once over \$5,000 total or \$2,500 by one source; limit removed if \$15,000 spent, which parties can match (beyond their contribution limits).
Fundraising Threshold for Eligibility			
No provision	No provision	\$60,000 in individual contributions of \$200 or less, at least 60% in-state, with half of in-state amount from in-district.	\$60,000 in individual contributions of \$200 or less.
Benefits for Participating Candidates			
No provision	No provision	Broadcast rate of 50% of lowest unit rate in last 30 days of primary and last 60 days in general election; 3 mailings per eligible voter at non-profit 3rd class bulk rate.	Broadcast rate of 50% of lowest unit rate in last 30 days of primary and last 60 days in general election; Unlimited mailings at non-profit 3rd class bulk rate.
Penalties for Non-Participating Candidates			
No provision	No provision	No provision	35% tax on receipts of candidates who exceed spending limits; Not eligible for lowest unit rate for broadcast time.

¹ Dollar amounts with asterisks are estimated indexed values.

WELFARE REFORM

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 listened to the debate over the so-called welfare reform legislation today, as well as last night, and I felt very strongly that the Republican leadership bill was not welfare reform, would not accomplish the goal of getting people off of welfare and working into productive jobs, into being productive members of society. I also was very concerned over the fact that it would take away many of the protections for children in this country.

It disturbed me to a great extent to listen to some of the statements that were being made on the Republican side of the aisle on the issue of welfare reform and what we need to do to get people back to work, one of the basic tenets of this Republican leadership bill, and I think that is how it differs a great deal from the Democrat or bipartisan Castle-Tanner substitute, which I supported, is that the Republican leadership bill essentially is money-driven. In other words, its major focus, if you will, is to try to save significant amounts of money that would theoretically help us balance the budget and reduce the Federal deficit.

In its drive to save money, it assumes that by cutting back on programs like food stamps and other types of assistance, that that will ultimately end the welfare system and get people to work and get people productive jobs.

Historically, if you look at successful welfare reforms that have been tried out in many States in this country, and the States really have been good laboratories to experiment with ways to produce welfare reform, in many cases it has actually cost the State more money, and the notion that somehow

welfare reform will at least in the short run result in monetary savings is simply a false premise.

Think about it for a minute. If you are saying that the State is going to get people off welfare, oftentimes that involves job training, which costs money; oftentimes it requires day care, because most welfare recipients, at least those on AFDC, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, are mothers with dependent children.

So it costs money to provide day care. It costs money to provide job training or education. If often costs money to provide for health benefits so that there is health insurance coverage for children.

So where does the notion come that somehow we are going to save money for the deficit, at least in the short run, by providing for welfare reform? I think that is a basic tenet of this Republican bill that is false and is creating the problems that result in less protection and measures in this bill that actually hurt children.

If you look at the Republican bill, the largest share of the welfare bill's food stamp savings would come from across-the-board cuts in food stamp benefit programs. A lot of my Republican colleagues talked about how there were a lot of people on welfare who were fraudulent, or how they wanted to end benefits for people failing to comply with work requirements.

But actually if you look at this bill, only 2 percent of the food stamp savings in the bill, and the food stamps is the largest savings in the bill, only 2 percent of that food stamp savings come from provisions to reduce administrative costs, curbing fraud or ending benefits for people found to comply with work requirements.

Most of the savings is achieved by just slashing the amount of money that goes to food stamp programs. So

even people who legitimately need the food stamps, because they are working in many cases, will actually suffer losses in their benefits under the food stamp program.

The other myth I think that was promulgated by the Republicans was this notion that, well, the welfare system is a failure because the poverty rate has climbed in the last few years under the existing welfare program. I guess the theory is that throwing money at the problem does not work.

Well, the reality is that the reason why more and more people are sinking into poverty in this country is because the safety net is being cut. In other words, the food stamps, the cash assistance, the housing assistance that many of the poor individuals that need this type of assistance receive, in real dollars has actually decreased over the last 5 or 10 years. So the reality is that more and more people are going into poverty because we are not providing sufficient funding for them to eke through an existence, to have a healthy life, to have proper housing, to have enough money to take care of their children.

So I honestly believe that the basic premise, if you will, of this Republican plan, which says that somehow we are going to be able to save money by making the kind of welfare reform that they propose, is a false premise, and one of the biggest problems with their bill.

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

[Mrs. CLAYTON address the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DAY 9 OF MINIMUM WAGE HOSTAGE SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it's day 9 of the holding of the minimum wage increase hostage by Senate Republicans. They are keeping to their threat to stall the minimum wage until medical savings accounts [MSA] are added to health care reform. MSA's in exchange for the minimum wage—it's not right and it's not how we should govern in this Congress.

MSA's are a bad idea. Consumers Union—the people who publish Consumer Reports—has called MSA's a time bomb that will make health insurance less accessible and less affordable for many Americans. MSA's will make us take a step backward in our quest for health care coverage for the majority of Americans. The Republican leadership refuses to let MSA's die—a death they truly deserve—because they are a pay-off to an insurance company that also happens to be a big-time Republican donor.

This is an outrage and its despicable. Over 80 percent of the American people support a minimum wage increase. A minimum wage increase passed both the House and Senate by substantial margin. In fact, a Senate Republican aide told the New York Times that "Republicans don't believe in raising the minimum wage. We voted for it because it was killing us."

So they voted for it but they won't let it be enacted. Not until they get their pay-off for special interests.

Mr. Speaker, over 12 million Americans need a minimum wage increase. Over 12 million Americans are waiting for a minimum wage increase. Over 12 million Americans are counting on that minimum wage increase to put food on their tables, clothe their kids and maintain their standard of living. It is a shame that they have been waiting as long as they have.

But why should that surprise us? It seems like money talks in this Congress. If you contribute, you get your legislation. Just look at MSA's. Since minimum wage families can't afford to donate money to political campaigns they have to wait for the legislation that will help them.

A 90 cent increase is all we are asking for—90 cents. That's it. But the Republicans are firm in their opposition. They don't understand that 90 cents can go a long way. This extra pay may seem small but it translates into 7 months of groceries, 1 year of health care costs, 9 months of utility bills, or 4 months of housing.

In the State of Connecticut 87,158 hard working people earn between \$4.25 and \$5.14 an hour. Each one of those people would benefit by passing a minimum wage increase. But these hard-working Americans in Connecticut and their 12 million fellow Americans continue to wait for a boost in their wages

because the Republican party continues to find new ways to block the increase.

A minimum wage worker makes about \$8,500 a year. That's it. Two-thirds of these workers are adults and almost 60 percent are women. Over 40 percent are the sole breadwinners in their family. The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that the minimum wage increase could lift 300,000 families out of poverty including 100,000 children.

Day 9 of the Republicans hostile holding of the minimum wage hostage. Free the minimum wage and honor the work of over 12 million Americans and their families.

□ 1715

THE SCOURGE OF TERRORISM

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, and anybody who watches the proceedings of this, the world's greatest legislative body, first among equals even with the distinguished U.S. Senate, because all money bills start here, all spending bills, and all tax bills start in this Chamber on the south side of this exquisite Capitol Building.

When people watch this floor, they expect promises to be kept. I made a promise the day before yesterday when I returned from the funeral of the highest ranking Navy ace in history, the Navy's ace of aces, Capt. David McCampbell. I said, because it was only a 5-minute special order, that I would read this beautiful eulogy from a fellow Medal of Honor winner, a fellow Medal of Honor winner to Captain McCampbell. Barney Barnum from a different war won his as a 24-year-old Marine company commander, actually a platoon leader who took over the company when his commander died in his arms. It was such a beautiful eulogy I said I would read it on the floor tonight.

I will read as much of it as I can, but the business at hand that requires some comment is yet what will turn out to be another terrorist horror.

Everybody is holding their fire and their analysis. It is all couched in careful terms because of the unfortunate jumping to the conclusion that the atrocity in Oklahoma City on Patriot's Day, April 19 a year ago, was a terrorist act, which it was. But they assumed no Americans would kill women and children and Army and Navy and Air Force recruiters and law enforcement officers and marshals and FBI agents. We assumed no American would perpetrate a terrorist act like that so that it had to be outside terrorists. Americans of Arab culture, of Middle Eastern background, and that can be Mennonite Christians from Lebanon, like my

great friend, former late great Danny Thomas, family name was Jacobs. My brothers and I went to school with his children, Margie Thomas, later became a television star known as Marlo Thomas. Margie Jacobs was known to us. But John Sununu, a Lebanese family, the great Governor of New Hampshire, great TV debater now.

All the way through all of the countries. Persian, people from Iran, who are Islamic in religious culture but not Arab in nationality. It was very unfair to every American who is Christian, Islamic, or even Jewish of Arab blood. People jump to the conclusion not incorrectly that Oklahoma City, the bomber of the Murrah Building was terrorism, it was, but they assumed it had to be outside evil terrorists, not evil Americans.

Also, the tragedy of ValuJet, my favorite airline at the time because it had lowered its prices and made jet travel so available to so many American families. It was growing so amazingly, up to 51 aircraft when that explosion tore it out of the sky, because people jumped to the conclusion that that might have been a terrorist bomb. And then we found out it was dangerous cargo, improperly loaded. We passed regulations. All the airlines are absolutely at a high state of alert for that not happening again.

All of that focuses in on this tragedy of TWA flight 800, where we do not have to jump to conclusion over what group or what heritage of any group was responsible for this. But all the vectors are coming together here that this was a catastrophic explosion; that in spite of the age of this big giant beautiful Boeing 747, it was over 25 years old, one of the oldest in the fleet, in spite of the fact there was a small difficulty with some part in Athens before it flew back to its home base there at JFK Airport there in New York, that it was on the ground for 3 hours.

I am convinced, until told otherwise, and I am in my 8th year in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, that dogs are going over every aircraft that comes in from foreign airports and that it sat there for 3 hours and that the Los Angeles passengers, including, I am told, a constituent of mine that boarded this flight number changed equipment, that means aircraft, and got on this 747 only 3 hours on the ground from Athens. And off they go to be torn out of the sky by this catastrophic explosion.

We have not found, at least when I left the TV set in the Republican Cloakroom, we have not found the blackbox yet. It will be found. The water is manageable. Half-hour or more, it would have been out over the deep Atlantic. Another few minutes after that, it would have been off the Continental Shelf, and we would be dealing with the depths of the H.M.S. *Titanic*, 15,000 feet at the bottom of the sea. And then we might never have known.