

13, 20-year-old Kevin Pridgen stood outside a neighbor's house on Glenn Road in Durham, NC, in my district, just visiting like many folks do on Sunday afternoon. In an instant, after he had been there just briefly, after 15 rounds were fired by an assault rifle, Kevin Pridgen lay in critical condition with a gunshot wound to the stomach, a victim of a drive-by shooting two doors from his own home.

The alleged shooter in this terrible crime is reported to have been a 17-year-old juvenile whom police arrested and charged with assault with intent to kill. Sadly, episodes like this outrageous crime are no longer rare events but are increasingly part of the everyday routine in communities all across this country.

Over the past several weeks I have taken the opportunity to meet with police officials in Durham and across my district to discuss these disturbing trends. Our brave law enforcement officers put their lives on the line every day in service to the public interest.

They described to me the frightening details, the dangers they and the general public face with sharply increasing rates of violent juvenile crime. North Carolina's finest tell me that the juveniles involved in these crimes are younger than ever, while the seriousness of their crimes has never been worse.

Statistics tell us that, despite the fact that overall violent crime in America is on the decline, youth violence is increasing. In fact, the latest numbers in my State show that overall violent crime is down by 5 percent, but youth violent crime is up by 6 percent.

According to the criminal justice experts, they have projected that the demographic changes will increase the problems of violent crime of young people in record numbers in the coming decade.

□ 1245

We must act now to protect our citizens today and address the long-term problems that are to come. I met with law enforcement officials across my district, sheriffs, police chiefs, small-town cops, juvenile detention officials and youth service providers. The message I received from these officials and from ordinary citizens comes through loud and clear: We must take aggressive action to stem the growing tide of violent juvenile crime, we must crack down on the most egregious offenders, and we must equip local law enforcement and youth services to meet the variety of challenges of our juvenile justice system. We must support Boys' and Girls' Clubs, YMCA's and other efforts to give our young people a positive alternative to the bleak choice of the streets. We must have a balanced approach of tough and smart efforts to deal with the complex and growing problem.

Mr. Speaker, the American people desperately need leadership from this Congress on serious issues like juvenile

crime. The voters of North Carolina sent me to the people's House to help provide that leadership. I call on my colleagues to join on a bipartisan basis to fulfill that mission, in the name of Kevin Pridgen and all our citizens who look to us for leadership to address the urgent issues that confront us in America.

TEXAS WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BILLEY]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let us get the facts straight on Texas welfare reform. In the spring of 1995, the Texas legislature passed State welfare reform. In July of 1996, Texas tried to implement its welfare reform and sent a proposal to Health and Human Services. In April this year, 1997, still no answer from HHS. And guess who is holding it up? The President of the United States.

The State of Texas simply wants to enter into a public-private partnership to streamline, integrate and consolidate its welfare system into a one-stop center. This will not only help welfare recipients, but save taxpayer dollars. It is a forward-looking proposal that would take 21 different State and Federal programs and combine them into one.

No longer would welfare recipients have to go from agency to agency to sign up and receive benefits. It is one-stop shopping to receive all the help they need. It has been estimated that this would save Texas taxpayers over \$10 million a month, or \$120 million a year. That is enough money to provide additional health care to an additional 150,000 children in Texas each year.

Welfare reform in Texas has been stalled out because the President has been taken hostage by the labor unions. Labor bigwigs see any type of reform as antiunion regardless of whether it helps children or not.

The President appears to be losing support for his delay from his own Cabinet members. An April 4 memo to the President from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President's head of domestic policy states,

We must give Texas an answer immediately. The State has engaged in good-faith discussions with various agencies for 9 months.

It is now 10 months. It has been nearly a month since that memo, and still no answer. The reason the unions are holding the President hostage are illustrated in this memo. There is a chart at the bottom that lists three options. The first is the Texas proposal. The second is "the union proposal." And the third is the proposed administration compromise.

I was not aware and I am sure most Americans are not aware that welfare

reform signed by President Clinton called for union approval of State welfare proposals. Since when do unions get to submit proposals on State welfare programs? I guess since they spent millions of dollars helping the President get reelected maybe.

It has also been reported that the Secretary of HHS was ready to release a letter of approval to Texas but was stopped short by the President. The request is now reportedly sitting on the Vice President's desk. What in the world is it doing there? We are all concerned that the administration is not worried about our children or how the program will help them; they are worried about the political relationship with the unions.

I think we all took the President at his word during the signing ceremony for the welfare reform bill last year when he said, "After I sign my name to this bill, welfare will no longer be a political issue."

What happened to that promise? If the administration puts the union's political agenda above the real concerns of the citizens of Texas, we will not hesitate to go forward with legislation to give Texas the approval it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to do what is right. Many States are watching so they can make the same kind of commonsense changes to their welfare systems. The President should grant approval immediately so Texas and all of America can make welfare reform real and help the children and needy families in America.

INVESTIGATION OF ILLEGAL FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to discuss with my colleagues serious issues which have come up in the investigation that Congress has launched into illegal fund-raising activities.

In the past few days, the White House has blurred the issues by claiming to have fully complied with our request for relevant documents. This is just not true, Mr. Speaker. The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has not received all subpoenaed records, and the White House counsel has indicated that the President will be asserting executive privilege over an unspecified amount of documents.

The American people have a right to know. After weeks of seemingly good-faith negotiations with the White House lawyers in which the committee prioritized its request, the White House refuses to provide all documents to the committee. For weeks the White House counsel said documents would be forthcoming once a document protocol was adopted, yet the committee's April 10 adoption of a document protocol was met with continued White House resistance.

The White House proposed an alternative document protocol essentially putting control of subpoenaed documents into the hands of the White House that is being investigated. We are today involved in investigating allegations of illegalities of a very serious nature which must be addressed without delay:

Did the Clinton administration sell foreign influence overseas in return for campaign contributions? The American people have a right to know.

Was America's national security put in jeopardy by foreign money that may have found its way into the Democratic National Committee's campaign coffers? The American people have a right to know. Did foreign governments funnel foreign funds into the 1996 campaign to influence the outcome? The American people have a right to know.

How did a cast of characters, such as John Huang, Charlie Trie, Chinese arms dealer Wang Jun, purported Russian mob figure Grigory Loutchansky, and convicted drug dealer Jorge Cabrera gain access to the highest levels of our Government? The American people have a right to know.

Were there unlawful disclosures of classified information to unauthorized Democratic National Committee employees as the CIA inspector general is now investigating? The American people have a right to know.

I was optimistic after my first meeting with White House counsel Charles Ruff in February that the White House's actions during the last Congress of delaying and withholding documents in the Whitewater, FBI files, and the Travelgate investigations would not be repeated. Yet, now, 6 months into this investigation and a month after the deadline for compliance with the committee's March 4 subpoena, the President is repeating the same dilatory tactics of the past.

Many of the subpoenaed documents which the White House has failed to produce pertain to close friends that the President has appointed to high Government positions, such as Webster Hubbell, John Huang, and Mark Middleton. These people have taken the fifth amendment to our committee. Other documents pertain to individuals who have fled the country, such as former Little Rock restaurant owner, Charlie Trie, another Presidential appointee.

Last week we sent the White House two narrowly targeted subpoenas for documents dealing only with John Huang and the Riady family, nothing else. These documents were first requested by the committee over 6 months ago. Mr. Huang is being investigated for alleged illegal activities involving foreign governments and interests while a Federal employee at the Department of Commerce and his DNC fund-raising practices. Of the \$3.4 million Huang raised for the DNC campaign during the last election, the DNC has pledged to return nearly half of that.

These two subpoenas were a real test case of whether the White House was going to cooperate with Congress or not. The deadline was yesterday, and the White House has not produced the documents. My staff has spent hours working with the White House to respond to its concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD the chronology of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee's efforts to get the White House to turn over the documents regarding John Huang, which has been going on since last October. My predecessor, Chairman Clinger, issued the first request for Mr. Huang's documents on October 3, 1996. Six months, numerous letter requests, and three subpoenas later, the committee has yet to receive all the documents from the White House pertaining to John Huang.

Now we still need to obtain more documents that are outstanding and past due that are related to Charlie Trie, Webster Hubbell, and others. These documents are also being withheld and are important records we will be pursuing in the coming days.

Mr. Speaker, the major purpose of a congressional investigation is to illuminate the facts and not hide them. Congressional investigations are by their nature far different from a judicial inquiry where a grand jury conducts all matters secretly. Public disclosure of the facts is the essence and in large part the purpose of congressional oversight. The American people have a right to know the facts in these matters. The President committed to provide all documents. I hope that all Members, both Democrat and Republican, will join me in asking the President to keep his word and comply with our lawful subpoenas and produce all documents to our committee.

The document referred to is as follows:

GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT CHRONOLOGY OF WHITE HOUSE DOCUMENT/SUBPOENA REQUESTS 1996-97

October 31, 1996—Then Chairman Clinger requested "all records regarding Mr. Huang's activities" including Huang's involvement in trade or foreign policy matters, all of Huang's White House meetings and explanation for Huang's fund-raising activities.

November 13, 1996—Chairman Clinger renewed his request for documents pertaining to John Huang.

November 1996-January 1997—Former White House Counsel Jack Quinn sent out memos to collect documents pertaining to John Huang, Charlie Trie and other key players connected with the illegal fund-raising allegations. White House made limited production of documents pertaining to these individuals.

January 15, 1997—Chairman Burton did a letter request to the White House for records pertaining to John Huang, Charlie Trie, Pauline Kanchanalak, and others. The due date for this request was January 30, 1997.

February 6, 1997—Chuck Ruff met with Chairman Burton and informed him that the President was going to be fully cooperative in providing documents and the President wouldn't claim executive privilege.

February-March 1997—Limited document productions are made and much of informa-

tion provided was previously provided or already made public. Substantive documents were produced in connection with certain Senate nominations.

March 4, 1997—Chairman Burton issued a subpoena to the White House due on March 24, 1997 for documents pertaining to John Huang, the Riadys, Charlie Trie, Webster Hubbell and others.

March 19, 1997—White House Special Counsel Lanny Breuer wrote to the Committee Chief Counsel: "I was heartened when you expressed an understanding that the White House anticipated making its production after the Committee had adopted governing protocols."

March 28, 1997—White House Special Counsel Breuer again wrote: "...the White House anticipated making its production after the Committee had adopted governing protocols."

April 10, 1997—Committee adopts a document protocol for the handling and storage of documents.

April 15, 1997—White House Counsel's office informed Committee that documents would not be provided despite the adoption of the document protocol. Documents pertaining to categories 1-8 of the subpoena were gathered at this point but the White House does not want to turn them over and refused to provide a privilege log outlining the documents that will be withheld. (Only limited production of non-sensitive documents was made).

April 16, 1997—White House Counsel attorneys and Committee attorneys met to discuss obtaining the outstanding documents. The White House objected to turning over "sensitive documents" and refused to commit to providing a privilege log.

April 18, 1997—After extensive discussions with the White House and the minority staff, the Committee sent a detailed letter to the White House prioritizing the March 4, 1997 subpoena. The Committee was told at this time that items 1-8 of the subpoena were gathered. Other priority items were identified pertaining to Webster Hubbell and Mark Middleton and were requested by April 28, 1997.

April 23, 1997—White House Counsel met with Chairman Burton to discuss documents that the White House had not produced. Charles Ruff committed to providing a privilege log for documents the President was going to withhold. Ruff was served at that meeting with two subpoenas specifically requesting all documents pertaining to John Huang and James Riady. (These subpoenas were a subset of previously subpoenaed records and were due to the Committee at noon on April 28, 1997.)

April 28, 1997—White House failed to provide documents pertaining to John Huang, the Riadys or Webster Hubbell and did not provide a privilege log detailing withheld documents, nor a letter from the President asserting privilege.

BALANCING THE BUDGET SHOULD BE OUR FIRST PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACC] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, we have been from the beginning of time, seems like, trying to balance our budget, trying to work on problems that impact on American lives, trying to make sure that children have health care, that working families can be able