

be helpful for our colleagues if they knew when we would be meeting next week and when we can expect our first votes. If we do not have the substance of the schedule next week, I understand that, but if we can get some sense.

I have been given a tentative schedule, Mr. Speaker, that says we will have a pro forma session at noon on Monday; and then on Tuesday, we will go in at 12:30 for morning session, 2 o'clock for legislative business, and no recorded votes before 5 p.m.; and then also on Tuesday, the Private Calendar, five suspension bills; and on Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will meet at 10 a.m. and we will do the Sea Grant bill and the National Defense Authorization bill. That is a tentative schedule, and if that is helpful to our colleagues, I would like to have that verified by the other side, if they could.

Well, we will assume, Mr. Speaker, that that is the schedule for next week, and I wish all my colleagues a good weekend.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, June 16, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 1997 for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING ORDER OF HOUSE OF MAY 7, 1997 THROUGH JUNE 24, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of May 7, 1997, be extended through Tuesday, June 24, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS FOR FATHERS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, with Father's Day coming up, what can we do to help dads and to help parents and help children? Our tax burden right now is one of the biggest problems of raising kids. I know. I have a family of four. If you have a combined income of \$55,000, \$22,000 of that goes to taxes. Indeed, there are 62 taxes hidden in a gallon of gas and 109 in a loaf of bread.

The Republican bill gives much needed middle class tax relief, for capital gains tax, HOPE scholarships, IRA expansion, death tax penalty, and, most importantly, to the fathers on Father's Day the \$500 per child tax credit.

Tax relief gives dads more time to stay at home to spend time with their children and impart values for the next generation. Unless the critics continue with the class envy that they are so clever at and so good, let me say that 71 percent of these taxes go to people with incomes of \$75,000 or less and only 1.2 percent with incomes over \$200,000. This is a middle class tax cut for fathers, and it is the Republican tax plan. I hope our Democrats will join us in supporting it.

The following shows the amount of tax relief received by people of various income categories over a five year period, according to data provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation: Under \$20,000, —\$5.5 billion (4.7%); \$20,000 to \$75,000, —\$83.5 billion (71.7%); \$75,000 to \$100,000, —\$19.3 billion (16.6%); \$100,000 to \$200,000, —\$6.7 billion (5.8%); \$200,000+, —\$1.4 billion (1.2%).

□ 1715

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ATTEMPTS DURING BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS TO COME THROUGH THE BACK DOOR ON ISSUES OF WORKER PAY AND PROTECTIONS

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of this House the fact that we have some actions that are going on as we attempt to bring together this budget and to reconcile the differences in the deliberations that have gone on, attempts to come through the back door on some very important issues.

I am very concerned about attempts to treat welfare recipients who are

would-be welfare workers differently than we treat other workers in America's workplace. I am concerned that there is an attempt to pay welfare workers less than minimum wage. I am also concerned that there is an attempt to deny workplace protections for recipients who go to work. I am also concerned that along with these two mean-spirited denials of protections in the workplace we find an attempt to deny protection from discrimination.

One would ask, how could this be in 1997, when all of these gains that have been made are gains that were hard fought for, gains that individuals made tremendous sacrifices for? How could we in 1997 have attempts to turn back the clock?

We know that in the last Congress there were some attempts by Republicans to deny an increase in minimum wage. That issue was hotly debated. We had the American public join in that debate in ways that we have not had the American public involved in in a long time. We engaged the citizens of this country in that debate. The citizens spoke in a loud and clear voice.

What did they say to us? They said, not only do we want an increase in minimum wage, we want the American people to be paid fairly for their labor. We do not think this increase is enough. We think it should be more. We do not like the fact that major CEO's in America are making a million dollars while there is an attempt to continue to squeeze the workers at the bottom. We do not like the fact that entry-level wages have gone down. We do not like the fact that more and more Americans are on part-time labor. We do not like the fact that American workers are going to the negotiating table, not fighting for increases, but are forced to have to fight to hold onto the gains that have been made historically.

So the American people spoke, and they spoke loud and clear. When the American people spoke, we discovered that even some of those on the other side of the aisle who had been attempting to deny this increase in minimum wage got the message. They got the message and they joined with us in the final analysis and supported the increase in minimum wage.

I thought all of the Republicans had learned a lesson. I thought they had heard the American public. But obviously that is not the case, because what we see now is a back-door attempt, a back-door attempt to not only deny that increase that we made for low-wage workers, but an attempt to single out a category of workers and pay them less than the minimum wage. What they could not do in the front door they are now trying to do through the back door.

What they are literally doing is sending a message out to workers, many of them who only make minimum wages, your job is in jeopardy. Your job is in jeopardy because we have found a whole new class of people that we are

going to pay less than what we are paying you, so all of those low-wage workers, all of those people working for minimum wage in many of our industries, in our restaurants, in our hotels and places, we have a Republican Congress that is trying to create workers who make even less than they make.

I want the American public to pay attention as we fight this battle. We are going to stand up for low-wage workers. We are not going to allow this back-door attempt. I would like for the American public to stay tuned in to this battle. In the final analysis, if they join with us, we can win again.

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

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

INVESTIGATION OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE FUNDRAISING EFFORTS

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, Members might recall that a few weeks ago I discussed some of the participants in the investigation that is about to be undergone by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. We talked about Web Hubble, we talked about the Riadys, we talked about a number of people.

Today I want to talk about some of the remaining individuals. Mr. Huang has come up. Mr. Huang has refused to work with the committee in this investigation. Here is Mr. Huang. His former employer, Mr. Riady, no longer lives here. We have no alternative but to ask

the White House to produce the documents concerning him. They have produced some documents, grudgingly at each step of the way. Those documents are now being analyzed by staff.

The basic principle here is the American people have the right to know what happened in the fall of 1996 in terms of campaign money being delivered to various candidates in the Democratic National Committee and others from foreign sources that violate existing law.

At one Democratic National Committee fundraiser Charlie Trie, who is from Little Rock, AR, Mr. Trie was a restaurateur, a close friend of the President as Governor, and he became a Democratic National Committee fundraiser and raised more than \$100,000 for the party, which the Democratic National Committee has returned. He also contributed \$640,000 to the President's legal defense fund. That money was later returned. Mr. Trie has left the country. He is rumored to be in China.

I do not know if this would ever work in China, but for missing people in America it has been helpful for young children. This is Mr. Trie. Maybe that is what we have to do is talk to the Chinese about seeing what we do to find Mr. Trie on milk bottle caps and tops. What his role was and whether or not he was a conduit passing money from the Chinese, we do not know completely yet. All White House documents concerning him are obviously absolutely crucial to this investigation. Again, the American people have a right to know.

Mark Middleton, who we have in the other chart, was a friend of the President's from Arkansas. He also met John Huang and Charlie Trie there. Mr. Middleton, who has taken the fifth, is there. He raised \$4 million for the Clinton campaign in 1992 in Arkansas. After the election he came to work in the White House as a Presidential aide and business community liaison for then-Chief of Staff Mack McLarty.

Middleton was a key go-between at the White House, meeting frequently at the White House with Charlie Trie, John Huang, and Pauline Kanchanalak. After Middleton left the White House in 1995 to start up his own consulting business, he was a frequent visitor to the White House, and even retained his White House voice mail for 1½ years after his White House position had ended. That is, of course, the lobbyist advocate's dream.

Mr. Middleton's outside business specializes in deals between the United States and Asian businesses. Mr. Middleton has invoked the fifth amendment, and refuses to testify. What does he know about the foreign sources of the campaign money that has amounted to millions of dollars? The American people have a right to know.

Who is Pauline Kanchanalak? She is from Thailand, married into a prominent Thai family. She and her sister-in-law contributed more than \$560,000 to the Democratic National Committee

and the affiliated State parties in 1996, of which the DNC, Democratic National Committee, has pledged to return \$235,000. She was a frequent visitor to the White House and brought three representatives of a large Thai business conglomerate to one White House fundraising coffee hosted by the President.

On at least two occasions Pauline has been identified as part of the Deputy Prime Minister of Thailand's official party, including once as an adviser to the Deputy Prime Minister. She and John Huang created the United States-Thai Business Council. President Clinton attended the grand opening. She has left the country and is believed to be in Thailand.

What was her role in fundraising? Did she also funnel money from a foreign government to the Democratic National Committee? The American people have a right to know.

Here we have six people, three of whom I have concentrated on today. They have invoked the fifth. They have left the country. It is crucial that we get the records. It is crucial that the American people learn what happened.

A TRIBUTE TO SHARON BRYSON

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a woman of tremendous resolve, Sharon Bryson. She has survived an enormous tragedy and somehow has managed to rise above it and to become a humanitarian and spokesperson for others who share her anguish.

Eight years ago Sharon lost her 13½-year-old son and 2½ years ago she lost her husband to AIDS. Her daughter, Shelley, who is a student working on her master's degree and intends to pursue her Ph.D., is also infected with HIV. The terrible injustice is that Sharon's husband and son died from HIV after being given blood byproducts considered safe. At the time the individuals said they could be used like water, and individuals who spoke with some authority.

□ 1730

It was not until later that they were warned that the products may contain the HIV virus, too late for Sharon's husband, son, and daughter. It is an outrage that the government allowed tainted blood products to be given to innocent people, destroying entire generations of families. The government must own up to its failure to warn hemophilia patients about the possibilities of the HIV virus in our national blood supply.

In the 1980's, nearly 8,000 hemophiliacs were infected with the HIV virus. Of those infected, two die every day. Although no amount of money can ever replace a family, they must be compensated for their suffering, their anguish and the enormous expenses that they have had to incur.