

the President. The White House IG, like other IG's in the executive branch, would serve as the principal watchdog of White House financial management procedures and fiscal resources. This legislation would provide the President with an essential tool for rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse in the White House.

As many of my colleagues know, the Inspector General Act of 1978 established offices of inspector general within certain Federal departments and agencies to protect the integrity of Federal programs and resources. Inspectors general are appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of a strong background in accounting, auditing, or financial management. They are provided the authority and independence to perform audits and investigations in order to combat waste, fraud, and abuse.

More specifically, the three principal responsibilities of inspector general are, first, to conduct audits and investigations relating to Federal programs and operations; second, to issue recommendations that promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Federal programs and operations; and, third, to keep agency heads and Congress fully informed of problems and deficiencies in Federal program administration and operations.

Today 61 Federal entities have an inspector general, including all 14 Cabinet departments. Of these 61 IG's, 29 are appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation and the remaining 32, primarily in smaller agencies, are selected by their agency heads. The Presidentially appointed IG's have a total of 10,000 staff and an aggregate budget of approximately \$900 million.

According to information gathered by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, funding for IG's is indeed a sound investment. In 1994, IG investigations and audits led to over 14,000 successful criminal and civil prosecutions. Furthermore, IG's returned \$1.9 billion in investigative recoveries to the U.S. Treasury and made efficiency recommendations that could save a total of \$24 billion.

As I mentioned previously, IG's have significant authority and independence to conduct their audits and investigations. They have direct access to all records and information of the agency, and possess the power to issue subpoenas and administer oaths for taking testimony.

With regard to their independence, IG's have full control over hiring and managing their own staff and resources. Moreover, they can be removed only by the President or the agency head who appointed them, and the President or agency head must communicate his reason to Congress when exercising this authority.

As I already mentioned, my legislation will establish an Office of Inspector General for the Executive Office of the President. The White House IG

would be appointed by the President and could be removed without cause by the President. All the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 would apply to the White House IG, but the bill also includes special provisions relating to sensitive information in matters that would protect the constitutional prerogatives and operational effectiveness of the Presidency.

The first exemption assures that the White House IG will not interfere in areas relating to policy, intelligence or national security interests, similar to the IG's in the defense area, in defense-related departments. The second broad exemption assures that the White House IG does not hinder the President in carrying out his constitutional responsibilities.

Under the IG Act of 1978, agency heads are strictly prohibited from obstructing an IG audit or investigation. However, under my bill the President would have the authority to prohibit the White House IG from conducting an audit or investigation.

I do hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this important piece of legislation.

SORTING THROUGH THE REPUBLICANS' VOTING RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as we go into any election, one of the hardest things is to figure out where the candidates really stand on issues. And when we go into any third-grade class in America and we ask the 8-year-olds, "Okay, what is the best predictor of what someone is going to do if they get elected, how they have been voting and what they have been saying or what they say in the last 6 weeks before the election?" every third-grader in America will tell us that the best predictor is what they have been doing, not what they were promising as the heat turns up in the last few weeks. So the difficulty is to find out and to sort through that voting record.

No one has ever elected a President or a Member of Congress or a Member of the Senate who was for big debts, loved war, hated kids, wanted to tromp all over the elderly, could not stand trees. No, no one has ever done that. So when we see the promises and then we see the performance, it is very different.

I must say, after saying that, I am very troubled about the debate we have been having here on the floor today, because no matter who the candidate Bob Dole selects for his Vice President, his real Vice President is going to be the Speaker of the House. People know this is a team and whatever comes out of here is going to be signed by President Dole, if he becomes President Dole. So that is why all this great concern about what the Speaker said about Medicare.

The Speaker said about Medicare, and all sorts of the written press reported it, The Washington Post and all sorts of other newspapers, he said, "we don't get rid of it in round 1 because we don't think that is politically smart." Get it? Members do not want to let them know exactly what they think about it.

Then he goes on to say we are going to go through this transition period and "we think it's going to wither on the vine," because they are going to offer these little goodies that we have seen that will lure out the wealthiest and the healthiest, so that the thing will suddenly be left with the sickest and the poorest and suddenly folks will say we cannot afford it, let them go.

Now, we know what that is. The gentleman from Texas just went through and pointed out that when his press secretary was asked about it, he indeed said yes, yes, that is what we meant, we were talking about Social Security. When he was home talking in Atlanta, the Atlanta Constitution got the same confirmation, yes, that is what he means, not Social Security but he was talking about Medicare, so he clarified it over and over again. It was on TV. We have got tapes of it.

Now there are people trying to run ads so the American people will know what President-elect or Presidential candidate Dole's real Vice President, Speaker GINGRICH, really thinks about this issue.

If they continue to try and take these ads off TV, we are going to be in the same position Red Riding Hood was, because what they are trying to do is let Speaker GINGRICH dress up in grandma's clothing. That is exactly what they are trying to do. They are trying to now take their words back and get the wolf in bed looking like sweet little old grandma until this election is over, and then they can go back to round 2 and take on Medicare the way they hope to.

So I really hope that America's news media does their research, looks at this and continues to let people know what third graders want to know when they vote, and that is what do they really think and how did they really vote and what did they really do, rather than what are they now trying to cast themselves as we go to cast our vote.

WELFARE REFORM CONCERNS OF MY CONSTITUENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the important thing about representation is to ensure that Members go home and relate to those who have elected them. As I go home every weekend, I try to solicit from my constituents their concerns or reflections on the past week's legislative activity,

and it has been eye-opening and certainly they have been extremely responsive.

Last week was, in fact, the week that was, first of all with the tragedy of TWA flight 800 and the condolences that all of us extended to their families along with our prayers. Certainly my constituents wanted to solicit from me the response that whatever was the occurrence, that if it was found to be something that was criminal in nature, that justice would be had, and I committed that to them.

But also they reflected on the welfare reform and to a one, coming from a diverse district, as I do, with African-Americans and Hispanics and Anglos and Asians in Texas, indicated that we can have welfare reform without being harsh and terminating individuals' ability to survive. So they were inclined to say that we needed job training and child care and that we needed an opportunity for those individuals to have health care and, yes, we needed a job; quite contrary to the welfare reform of our Republican friends who simply believe that the harshness of saying no, no to teenage parents, no to the seniors in senior citizens' homes who need Medicaid, no to those who need job training and child care, is the way to go.

I rise today to say there has to be a better way, so I have supported President Clinton's method of enforcement of child support payments and giving to the Nation the list of deadbeat parents, because we all must show responsibility and that is a real part of welfare reform. So I would argue to my Republican colleagues that one does not always have to hit someone upside the head, but one can soften the blow by saying we will give them an extended hand of assistance.

Then as I have listened to the debate this morning about Medicare, I think it is important to respond to those who might say that the Speaker's comments were taken out of context. I would only offer to say that when we are in places of responsibility, we have to mean what we say and say what we mean.

The Medicare proposals by the Republicans last year were in fact to eliminate \$245 billion for a tax cut for those making over \$100,000, \$187 billion taken out of Medicaid. Might I remind Members that 60 percent of Medicaid is indigent senior citizens in nursing homes, your parents and my parents.

Mr. Speaker, it is important when we begin this debate to tell the American people the real facts so that we can get the job done.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

Rev. Dr. Daniel R. Leslie, Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, Vineland, NJ, offered the following prayer:

Creator God, You call us to manage the world You have made. You bless us with the abundant gifts of life, liberty, and love for which we are most grateful. You grant us a nation comprised of people from many nations. Guide those who lead our Nation, especially those who now gather in this body to deliberate and make decisions for the common good. Instill in our leaders wisdom, courage, and compassion so that the actions they take will lead to justice and peace on Earth. Empower us so that the seeds we sow never be seeds of discouragement that lead to discontent, but rather seeds of hope that lead to Your shalom. All this we pray in Your name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHABOT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

WELCOME TO REV. DR. DANIEL R. LESLIE

(Mr. LoBiondo asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LoBiondo. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of welcoming to the Chamber this morning Rev. Dr. Daniel R. Leslie. I want to take this time to thank him for initiating today's proceedings as guest Chaplain.

I first met Dr. Leslie when he and his family moved to Vineland, NJ, nearly 7 years ago. Dr. Leslie was called to serve as pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Redeemer in my hometown of Vineland, NJ. Redeemer has been involved in ministry to the greater Vineland area for more than 72 years and I was pleased to participate in its 70th anniversary festivities just 2 years ago.

In addition to Redeemer's ongoing spiritual ministry among members and family, the congregation is active in its involvement with three community outreach ministries. Dr. Leslie serves on the boards of all three.

Luther Acres is a 100-unit, low-income housing facility for senior citizens. Little Acres Learning Center provides education and day care for 200 children each day. Together with three other Vineland congregations, Redeemer sponsors the Vineland Regional Counseling Service which provides family and individual therapy to those in the community with emotional and mental distress.

Dr. Leslie also tirelessly contributes his time to important community organizations and services. He is vice president of the Vineland Ministerial Fellowship which is made up of local churches and a synagogue. The ministerium sponsors numerous programs to feed the hungry, house the homeless, advocate justice for the needy, and provide special times during the year for the people of Vineland to gather and worship God. As a matter of fact, I worship with Dr. Leslie at the communitywide Thanksgiving service each year in Vineland.

Dr. Leslie is also on the Board of Directors at the Vineland YMCA and a fellow Rotarian. Dr. Leslie is joined today by his wife, Bonnie, a math teacher at Vineland High School, and their daughters, Jennifer and Laura, who will be a freshman at Bucknell University this fall. Their son, Dan, attends medical school.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to welcome Dr. Leslie to the House this morning.

GAGGING THE TRUTH ON MEDICARE

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