

of original cosponsors—in supporting the Defense Jobs and Trade Promotion Act of 1997.

WHY GINGRICH SHOULD STEP DOWN AS SPEAKER

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1997

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker. I wish to insert the following statement into the RECORD, regarding my vote in connection to the resolution of reprimand against Speaker GINGRICH in January, regarding his Ethics Committee problems.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN EARL F. HILLIARD

I voted against the House Resolution providing a reprimand and a monetary penalty of \$300,000 for Speaker Gingrich because it was less than a slap on the wrist. The fine itself is insufficient. Paying a simple fine is no deterrent for what the Speaker has done. In his position as Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of the highest positions within our government, and given the amount of power at his control, a reprimand and a monetary fine do not fit the misconduct which has been committed. How simple it will be for this Speaker to raise \$300,000 to pay a fine imposed upon him because of his wrongful fund raising activities.

The Speaker should have been censured, at a minimum, by the House of Representatives. In addition, he should voluntarily and immediately step down as Speaker. In his own words, he has stated that he: "brought down on the people's House a controversy which could weaken the faith the people have in the government." Through an abuse and misuse of power, Gingrich broke laws to enhance himself, strengthen his role within the Republican Party and strategically position himself to be Speaker of the House. Therefore, he intentionally and deliberately created a situation where he could become Speaker. He exists as Speaker today, only because he broke the rules.

Today's vote sends a message to the American people that money supersedes laws. Today's vote tells the American people that it is okay to break laws in order to become powerful because you will only have to pay a fine if you get caught. Today's vote shows the American people that the wealthy and powerful are given preferential treatment. Every time such a situation is allowed, we chip away at one of the pillars of democracy—and that is equal justice for all, regardless of financial status. While the Speaker received less than a slap on the wrist, one of the pillars of democracy received a fatal blow. While the Speaker is free to continue fund raising, the ideal of equal justice under the law is held captive on a \$300,000 bond. I voted against today's House Resolution because it fundamentally failed to adequately address the Speaker's wrong doing.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA GORDON

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1997

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Patricia Gordon, a certified professional secretary, on the occasion of winning the 1997

Secretary of the Year. This award is an honor of distinction based on business experience, education, and Professional Secretaries International activities.

Ms. Gordon has been an office professional for 23 years, with the last 10 years spent in service to East Detroit public schools. She also has earned her real estate license and is the mother of four. She is looking forward to continuing her education earning a degree in business.

She has been active in the Macomb Chapter of Professional Secretaries International organization since 1993 and served her organization as the cochairperson for the 1996 Michigan Division Annual Meeting.

And so, Mr. Speaker, today, I commend and congratulate Patricia Gordon on the honor of winning 1997 Secretary of the Year. I extend my best wishes and good luck in the future.

RECOGNIZING SEARCHY MARSHALL AS THE PETER J. SALMON NATIONAL BLIND EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR

HON. ANNE M. NORTHUP

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1997

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, Congress passed the Wagner-O'Day Act in 1938 to provide employment opportunities for Americans who are blind. Amended as the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act in 1971, today, this program continues to provide employment and other support services to thousands of people who are blind or have other severe disabilities throughout the United States.

Many of the individuals who participate in the Javits-Wagner-O'Day [JWOD] Program are not capable of competitive employment, or do not desire competitive employment. The JWOD Act has been a successful initiative which has provided gainful and remunerative employment to many people who would otherwise have had no employment options.

Many of the persons served have overcome obstacles to lead fulfilling lives. Each year the National Industries for the Blind [NIB], the central nonprofit agency for industries for the blind participating in the JWOD, selects one outstanding worker as the Peter J. Salmon National Blind Employee of the Year. This year one of my constituents, Mr. Searchy Marshall, has been nominated to receive this impressive honor. I applaud Mr. Marshall for his determination to succeed and his dedication to his work. He is truly an inspiration to us all.

TRIBUTE TO NEAL H. BROXMEYER

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1997

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives the story of a man whose life, which ended all too soon at age 43, was dedicated to the pursuit of truth.

Neal Howard Broxmeyer searched for truth with a great intensity. He was long immersed in spiritual work which brought tremendous

peace. A beloved and respected leader of the School of Practical Philosophy, he played a major role in establishing its Abraham Lincoln School for Boys and Girls on the upper east side in Manhattan. His 8-year-old son is a student there, and is very proud of the role his Dad played. Indeed, it was one of Neal's precious dreams to see the school flourish and grow.

Neal's devotion to his family was exemplary. He naturally included within his family the many people whose lives intersected with his. In that sense, Neal's family included his associates and colleagues at Fairfield Properties, where he was a partner. His brothers have said that he was an excellent businessman, known for his honesty and his integrity. He was seen as the "heart and soul" of his business, and he was referred to as "the light of the office."

Neal Broxmeyer was a man who always looked beyond his own needs. He led his life in keeping with the maxim: "Set no limits in service," and encouraged others to do the same. He was always available to others. He cherished the community in which he lived and was very happy to be part of the community association. He led the way in establishing the security patrol in the community, and always said "How could I not take it on?"

Neal was a simple man who was extraordinary. Always there, steady and balanced; never looking for faults in others, but instead finding the goodness in everyone. Everything and everyone who benefited from his attention, concern, insight, wisdom, counsel, and warmth understands that there was "absence of claim." Although not rigid, Neal was highly disciplined. His life, though very short, was filled with a quality beyond most. Nothing, it seems, was wasted.

Neal is survived by his loving family: His beloved wife Susan; their children, Dara, Jennifer, and David; by his parents, Muriel and Joseph; and by his brothers Mark and Gary.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and distinct honor to bring the brief life of Neal Howard Broxmeyer to the attention of my colleagues and hope they will join me in paying tribute to an outstanding human being.

"THE ATTACK CULTURE"

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1997

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the columnist Robert J. Samuelson has written very clearly and concisely about the scandals and the so-called attack culture that we find ourselves in today. I recommend the following column to my colleagues:

THE ATTACK CULTURE

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

"Scandal" is the latest word to lose its meaning. The threshold for scandal has moved so low that Washington is almost never without one. The newest is the "campaign finance" scandal, but we are still dealing with the Whitewater scandal and the Gingrich scandal. We have a permanent apparatus of investigators, partisans and reporters working full time to discover and publicize alleged wrongdoing—and calling everything they examine a scandal or potential scandal. Growing outrage is expressed

over offenses that seem ever more obscure or trivial.

Of course, there are genuine scandals, and the behavior of our highest (or lowest) officials must be open to scrutiny. Government and the people who run it can be accountable only if their activities can be inspected. But the process has become twisted into a parody. At last week's press conference, President Clinton was asked 18 questions; 15 concerned campaign fund-raising. Was that the only important matter?

What we're seeing is the attack culture. By attack culture, I mean a mind-set and set of practices that go beyond ordinary partisanship, criticism, debate and investigation. What defines the attack culture is that its animating spirit—unexpressed, but obvious—is to destroy and bring down. Does anyone doubt that the assorted Whitewater investigations aim to destroy President Clinton and the first lady? Does anyone doubt that the charges against House Speaker Gingrich were motivated less by ethical sensitivities than the desire to annihilate him politically?

Investigation, always a political weapon, is now more so than ever. In a 1990 book ("Politics by Other Means"), political scientists Benjamin Ginsberg and Martin Shefter correctly observed: "American politics has recently undergone a fundamental transformation. . . . [C]ontending forces are increasingly relying on such institutional weapons of political struggle as legislative investigations, media revelations, and judicial proceedings to weaken their political rivals and gain power for themselves."

The attack culture originated with Watergate, and Nixon—destroyed and forced to resign—remains the standard of success. The mimicking of Watergate is increasingly undemocratic and breeds disrespect for the law, politics and (if anyone cares) the press. Most Americans sense that the process is out of control, because no one—no one, that is, who doesn't study these scandals for countless hours—can understand what they're about.

What was Gingrich's great offense? Well, he taught a college course (a sin?). Then, some videotapes of the course were used for political promotion (gee, a politician acting political). But wait: The course was financed by tax-deductible charitable donations, which aren't allowed for politics. Therefore, Gingrich committed a no-no and compounded it by providing false information to Congress (an innocent mistake, he claims; a willful deception, say his foes). Clinton may be guilty of a crime in Whitewater, but three investigations—costing more than \$24 million—have yet to disclose what it is.

I am no fan of Clinton's or Gingrich's; nor am I defending their behavior and certainly wouldn't offer it as a model to my children. But we have elections for voters to decide whether, all things considered, they want to retain their elected leaders. Except in rare cases, that job shouldn't be hijacked by courts, prosecutors or the press with investigations that are increasingly inquisitorial. They aim to prejudice people against their target, even if no serious charges are ultimately sustained. The process is abused, because the investigations are selective (often triggered by the target's prominence) and aim (by adverse publicity) to convict and punish the target.

The attack culture subsists on personal ambition and various political agendas. Reports want a big story; prosecutors seek convictions; partisans crave power. And the mere act of investigation creates pressures for results. Resources have been committed; reputations are at stake. Hardly anyone wants to say: "Sorry, nothing here" or "It's trivial." Every mistake, error or personal ex-

cess is elevated to a great evil. Sinister motives are alleged or implied. If it's not a scandal, why bother?

It's also guilty until proven innocent. Some investigations are self-fulfilling. There are so many laws and regulations that anyone who is investigated exhaustively may be found to have violated something. And some targets, flustered or embarrassed, blunder into criminal coverups. Nor are the targets only prominent officials. The federal Office of Research Integrity recently cleared an experienced scientist of misconduct. But for three years, he was subject to congressional hearings and had his research branded fraudulent. Those years, he said, "have been holy hell. They took away my position, my reputation, my work."

People are smeared because the attack culture is heavy-handed and single-minded. The current furor over campaign financing fits the pattern. It is driven by a coalition of Clinton haters, campaign-finance reformers and the press. The story surely seems compelling: the president (apparently) brokering the Lincoln bedroom for contributions; a host of seedy characters schmoozing at the White House; Al Gore dialing for dollars from his office.

What's missing is perspective. The \$2.96 million returned by the Democratic National Committee constitutes only 1.3 percent of all DNC contributions. Questionable gifts didn't affect the election's outcome, and there's no evidence that donations changed any major policy. Much fund-raising is sleazy. But no one should forget that giving money to a candidate or party is a form of political speech. Donations can't easily be limited without compromising free speech. The present hysteria—nurtured by self-proclaimed reformers—intentionally obscures this point.

All the crusading doesn't reassure the public. Just the opposite. Because most people grasp that the process has been corrupted—being moved by ambition and politics—they put the attackers and the accused increasingly on the same moral plane. A plague on everyone. We become desensitized to genuine scandal because the artificial variety is so common. All democracies need to examine their officials; an enduring dilemma is how to prevent legitimate inquiry from sliding into sanctioned tyranny. When everything's a scandal, we're losing the proper balance.

THE ECONOMY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 5, 1997, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE ECONOMY

One of the nation's leading economists recently said that the economic performance of the United States today is like being at the top of a mountain. He said, "There is an exhilaration form getting there and the view is great, but all paths are downhill." In a fundamental sense, of course, he was right, because the challenge confronting policymakers today is to preserve the expansion and the economic good times we are now enjoying.

STATE OF ECONOMY

The fundamentals in the American economy today look very solid. Experts tell us that the economy is on track with no imbal-

ances, only moderate inflation, an outlook for solid growth at sustainable levels, with nothing obvious on the horizon that would throw the economy off track.

The facts are impressive. The economic expansion has been growing at a solid, non-inflationary pace in recent years, last year growing by 2.5 percent. Much of the recent growth has been fueled by stronger investment and exports. The 70-month expansion that the economy is enjoying has outlasted all but two of the other eight post-war expansions. The unemployment rate stands at 5.4 percent, down from 7.5 percent in 1992. Much of the job growth has been in sectors paying above-average wages. Inflation, which peaked at 6.1 percent in 1990, has remained below 3 percent in recent years. The combination of low unemployment and stable inflation has given the U.S. the lowest "misery index" since the 1960s. The federal budget deficit, which peaked at \$290 billion in 1992, was down to \$107 billion last year. That has helped keep long-term interest rates low.

There is a broad consensus among the experts that the nation's growth, inflation, and unemployment rates this year will be similar to those of 1996, and that unless something unexpected develops, interest rates will fluctuate within relatively narrow ranges. So the U.S. economy is heading into its seventh straight year of expansion.

OTHER COUNTRIES

It is not hard to find good things to say about the American economy, especially when comparing to what's happening in other countries. The United States was again recently judged to be first in international competitiveness, and our global market share of goods continues to increase. Our trade deficit is still too large, but it has declined by almost 50 percent as a percentage of our gross domestic product (GDP).

In addition, the United States continues to lead the world in per capita GDP. We lead the major industrial nations in growth, and have achieved the lowest budget deficit as a percentage of GDP of any of the industrial countries. Job creation in the United States has exceeded all the other major industrial countries combined, and the U.S. unemployment rate has dropped below that of all industrialized countries but Japan.

CONCERNS

But we ought not to spend too much time congratulating ourselves. The U.S. economy still shows some vulnerabilities and there are some areas of concern.

One is wage stagnation and inequality. Although we have seen some improvement recently, median family income has in recent years stagnated and the wage gap between the rich and the poor has widened. Wage inequality in the United States is more pronounced than in all the other industrialized countries. It bothers me that large segments of our population have seen little or no growth in their own incomes.

Even though the federal budget deficit has been reduced sharply in recent years, it is important to remember that the United States is still the world's largest debtor. I am very uneasy with the fact that the world's largest and richest economy, the great superpower, has become such a huge and chronic borrower.

We continue to have shortfalls in savings. We have the lowest personal savings rate among the industrialized countries and it has declined from 4.9% in 1985 to only 4.4% in 1995. The domestic savings simply are not meeting the nation's investment needs. That means we have to rely more on foreign capital and we reduce funds available to invest in future growth.

Although investment has increased in the 1990s, we are still not investing enough. Real