

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a very significant date. August 2, 1991, was the day Mr. Hussein and the Iraqi Army invaded the city of Kuwait. That was just 6 years ago. At the same time in 1965, August 2 was the date of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution.

I mention that because as a Persian Gulf veteran I certainly can appreciate the significance of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and as a veteran, I can appreciate the sacrifice that resulted from that resolution back in the 1960's. I also can respect the sacrifice that many other veterans have made, not just in Vietnam or Desert Storm, but also Korea, World War II, and many of the other various and sundry conflicts in which American troops have been engaged.

One message that is very clear to those who have served in the military is that you come to understand that there is a form of a compact between the veteran and your country: That you serve your country, and then in exchange, your country is going to take care of you and provide for your family in the event that you need that care, particularly as a result of your service. When you are on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces, Uncle Sam provides health care for you and for your family. If you are no longer a member of the Armed Services since the 1930's, the Government has met its health care obligation to disabled and poor veterans through the Veterans Administration health care system.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the VA health care system is not functioning in quite the manner it should. There are questions today as to whether it is receiving adequate funding. There are other questions that relate to whether in fact it is adequately structured to meet the needs of today's veterans as we move into the 21st century. It is interesting to note that eligibility rules are so strict that most of our Nation's 26 million veterans do not have access to the VA system. In fact, a suggestion has been made that in many cases the rules are so strict and complicated that much more time, energy, and resources are devoted to the complex question of sorting out whether or not a veteran is qualified for care, perhaps more funds than would have been necessary to provide the care itself. That is a significant issue for today's veterans.

If you are a military retiree and the nearby base hospital closes, too bad. If you are just returning from Bosnia and you and your family need health care while you search for a job, again, you are not able to use the VA system. If you are a veteran who thinks the VA hospital should be open to you, guess again: Exclusions, restrictions, barriers, limitations; confusion, complexity. It has become absurd.

The system in many cases is failing to serve the veterans it was designed to care for and those who sacrificed for their country. Today I introduced a bold new idea, a new way of thinking about VA health care delivery. I think

it is the potential solution to the VA health care crisis. It is called the GI Bill of Health, H.R. 3950, and it presents a vision for change in how health care should be provided to veterans.

The measure seeks to authorize the Department of Veterans Affairs to receive third-party health insurance reimbursements, as well as to incorporate innovative managed care principles to provide for increased medical care options for veterans and their dependents. It attempts to build on what I think are significant increases in funding for the VA.

I might note for the record that in 1995 total funding for VA medical care was in the vicinity of \$16.1 billion. In the 1996 budget we provided an increase of over \$400 million for VA medical care, and just in the most recent budget we approved for the Veterans Administration, another \$500 million increase in the provisions for VA medical care, or well over \$1 billion, excuse me, almost \$1 billion in increased annual medical care funding. Yet, as I look at the veterans hospital in my district, the Togus Veterans Hospital, located in Togus, ME, just outside of Augusta, and when I sit in Washington I see two different perspectives. When I look at what we are doing for VA medical care here in Washington, and I see an increase of almost \$1 billion in annualized funding for VA medical care, it does not jive with the cuts and threats of cuts and cutbacks and loss of essential services that are being discussed and potential layoffs of key personnel that are being discussed back at the hospital in my own district.

Clearly, something is amiss. I have a feeling that the something that is amiss is that the system is not being as responsive to the needs of veterans on the receiving end of medical care as it needs to be. But I think, building on what we have attempted to do for funding for VA medical care, as well as two recent pieces of legislation, one that passed, both that passed within the last 2 weeks, first H.R. 3118, the Veterans Health Care Eligibility Reform Act and the Health Care Coverage Availability and Affordability Act which we passed just yesterday, each provides an opportunity to increase the access to veterans by creating a seamless medical care system that will serve all of our veterans in the context of what we are doing in our health care system.

TO BE PRO-CHOICE MEANS TO RECOGNIZE THE INDIVIDUAL AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD the words of Governor Pete Wilson of the State of California from the Los Angeles Times of yesterday:

"How do we reverse 50 years of growing out-of-wedlock births and deteriorating families?

"We must begin by recasting our culture. That will not happen by advocating an anti-abortion constitutional amendment that has no hope of being enacted because it is overwhelming opposed by the majority of Americans.

"What we must do is say to every teenage girl that it is morally wrong for her to get pregnant and to bring a child into the world unless she has a father for her child. Both parents must be prepared—emotionally and financially—to raise that child. Their child is their responsibility, not the taxpayers'. . . . We must also focus on the men who are making them welfare mothers. If young men who impregnate women lack the basic decency to send love to their children, then they must at least send money. If they do not, in California we track them down and dock their pay. We lift their license to drive a car or to practice law.

"We also prosecute the older men who victimize young girls. More than half the babies born to teenage girls are fathered by adult men, not by boys.

"Government must never decide who can have children, but society does have a responsibility to discourage from having children those who cannot or will not accept the responsibility of parenthood. We are using mass media to teach abstinence to our children. For those who choose to have sex but reject the burden of parenthood, we must make contraception the available choice and the moral obligation to prevent unwanted pregnancies."

"The objections to even the modest tolerance language Bob Dole has proposed in the abortion plank of the GOP platform is further evidence that many of my fellow delegates to the Republican National Convention later this month will be absorbed by the debate on the rights of the unborn child. Though I am pro-choice, I share with them the desire to greatly reduce the number of abortions performed in America. It is a shocking 1.6 million per year.

"But with all respect to their concern for the unborn child, they and others on both sides of this issue are ignoring the even greater and more urgent challenge to America: How we deal with all the children born to parents who are either unwilling or unable to accept the responsibility of being parents.

"In 1945, the incidence of out-of-wedlock births was 1 in 25. Today, it is 1 in 3. In our inner cities it rises to more than 3 out of 4. Children born into fatherless homes are five times more likely to live in poverty, twice as likely to drop out of high school. Fatherless girls are three times more likely to end up as unwed teen mothers. Fatherless boys are overwhelmingly more likely to end up behind bars.

"We are forced to build too many prisons instead of libraries and laboratories because absent fathers have defaulted on their fundamental responsibility to their sons. At the same time, we have witnessed an explosion in the number of single women on welfare because women without education, marketable skills, or self-esteem can earn little money and less respect."

Nothing will have a more profound impact on the future of this Nation than successfully reversing the irresponsible behavior that sentence children to lives of wasted opportunity and despair. The best answer for curbing the social pathology of fatherless America is abstinence, contraception, and mentors. This will have a far greater impact on the number of abortions performed in America than any party platform can ever hope to have."

Mr. Speaker, Governor Pete Wilson has received more votes than any other political figure in the country on the Republican side, with the exception of our retired Presidents. Governor Wilson is pro-choice. Mr. Speaker, so am I. To be pro-choice is not to be pro-abortion. To be pro-choice is to recognize the individual and the responsibility of the individual.

I think Governor Wilson says, in words that should echo to every delegate to our convention, that it is individual responsibility that is the hallmark of our party, individual responsibility which is the solution to the problem of unwanted pregnancies, unloved and uncared for children in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues at the convention to heed with care the words of the Governor of California, Pete Wilson.

THE PRESIDENT BEARS FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEGAL BILLS OF FIRED TRAVEL OFFICE EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about a statement President Clinton made yesterday that he would not support legislation which would reimburse Billy Dale and the other White House travel office employees' legal bills. His statement is contrary to other White House statements, and I urge him to reconsider this position.

Without rehashing the developing Travelgate saga, Members will recall that Billy Dale and six other White House travel employees, all career employees, one a constituent of mine, were fired so that the President's cousin could take over the operation. Those career Federal employees had their good names and their reputations destroyed. One of those employees was charged and the other six were not charged. One was forced to fight the full investigative and prosecuting power of the Federal Government, and

was finally acquitted of any wrongdoing by a jury of his peers.

Billy Dale and his colleagues racked up hundreds of thousands of dollars of legal fees. According to news stories, the President snapped at a reporter who asked a question about the legal fees, because the President is concerned about his own staff's mounting legal bills. Unlike those others who hold high political offices, however, the fired travel office employees are not able to hold glitzy Hollywood fundraisers and have the beautiful people donate \$1,000 to their legal fees. Again, my constituent was never charged with anything.

So I call on the President to make sure that this is signed. The Golden Rule says, do unto others as you would have them do unto you. The President ought to be sure, because of the actions of the White House, these people have been hurt, that they are reimbursed. It is the fair thing to do. It is the right thing to do.

I said on this floor one other time, when talking about this case, everything that goes around comes back around. One could almost say, the administration's action with regard to these Federal employees began all of the White House's legal problems. History will judge whether this is right or not, but regardless, career Federal employees should not be punished for a political action taken by any administration, Republican or Democrat.

WARNING AGAINST POTENTIAL POLITICIZING OF THE FBI

Mr. Speaker, I also want to express concern for the potential politicizing of the FBI. I will be inserting two articles in the RECORD whereby it talks about how Mr. Shapiro, who is the general counsel of the FBI, has been doing and involved in activities that the general counsel of the FBI ought not be involved in.

I have been one of the strongest supporters of the FBI and the employees of the FBI in this body. Many of the FBI agents live in my district, and I have been supportive with regard to the benefits and pay raises and other things. But it is chilling, it is chilling when the general counsel of the FBI, Mr. Shapiro, does what he did.

The one FBI agent, Dennis Calabrini, who is also a constituent of mine, he sent two FBI agents out to interview him at his home; very, very chilling. Then he made the data with regard to the Livingstone data available to parties that should not have seen it. This is a conflict of interest. This is inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker, the FBI should be above and beyond all partisan politics. Under no circumstances should any high officials in the FBI use FBI agents to encourage or be involved in anything that could even smack of political partisanship.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following article.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1996]

MANY NOTIFIED AFTER FBI 'HEADS-UP'

(By George Lardner Jr.)

The White House sent out what amounted to "an all-points bulletin" warning at least 16 people, including lawyers for embattled former White House personnel security chief Craig Livingstone, after the FBI alerted it to politically damaging information in Livingstone's FBI file, House Republicans complained yesterday.

"Those who needed to do damage control were notified first. Those who were investigating were notified last," Rep. William F. Clinger Jr. (R-Pa.), chairman of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, said at the windup of a six-hour hearing. He said FBI general counsel Howard Shapiro, who alerted the White House July 15 to the file's contents, should consider resigning.

FBI Director Louis J. Freeh said last night that Shapiro "enjoys my full confidence."

Democrats dismissed the disclosures as a sideshow ginned up after Republicans failed to document their original suspicions; that Livingstone's office had been seeking dirt on political enemies when it wrongly collected confidential FBI reports on hundreds of Republicans from the Bush and Reagan administrations.

"The committee has come to the end of the road and is now looking for new allegations to embarrass the Clinton White House," said Rep. Cardiss Collins (D-Ill.), the panel's ranking minority member.

Shapiro, the hearing's main witness, acknowledged making "a horrific blunder" in telling the White House of an FBI report that Livingstone had been "highly recommended" for his job by first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton.

A protégé of Freeh, Shapiro gave White House deputy counsel Kathleen Wallman the "heads-up" shortly before Clinger's chief investigator was scheduled to inspect the material. He said he had only been trying to be fair and emphasized that the decision was his alone.

Asked what Freeh thought, Shapiro said: "He wishes I hadn't done it."

"So do we," Rep. Dan Burton (R-Ind.) said. "So do I," Shapiro said.

Committee Republicans accused Shapiro of being "too cozy" with the White House on other occasions as well. Last February, he said, he gave White House counsel Jack Quinn a draft copy of the book "Unlimited Access," by Gary Aldrich, a former FBI agent who had been assigned to the Clinton White House. Laced with allegations that have been widely discredited, it depicted Hillary Clinton as a driving force at the White House, usurping control of domestic policy and hiring decisions.

Shapiro said he gave Quinn the draft, four months before publication, because it was "replete with sensitive internal information" and because he suspected it would be published, as it was, without the requisite FBI pre-publication clearance. He said Aldrich made some changes the FBI wanted, but there were objections to "six somewhat lengthy passages" that were still in the book when it was published last month.

The FBI has recommended that the Justice Department file a civil suit against Aldrich to make him turn over his profits to the government. "It's the only recourse we have," Shapiro said.

Shapiro, 36, also came under attack for giving Quinn advice about a July 25 letter he sent to Freeh. Shapiro told Quinn that one reference to the possibility that an FBI agent had "falsified" a report would be offensive.

The section was an allusion to FBI agent Dennis Sculimbrene, who conducted the 1993