

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 gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman 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.

Human life is too precious not to recognize this devastating tragedy. One life lost is one too many. Sharon is a courageous woman who has refused to give up, despite losing her loved ones. Instead, she has chosen to fight on behalf of the hemophilia community for justice.

It is because of brave, resilient people like Sharon who are willing to share their story that we understand the true impact of hemophilia-associated AIDS. I ask my colleagues on the floor and in the House to join me in acknowledging Sharon Bryson for her bravery and willingness to help others. Sharing her story with me was an act of courage. It certainly brings this tragedy close to home.

We must realize that this tragedy does not only happen in the urban areas or to those who are most at risk. Families from all walks of life are suffering. I am hoping that Sharon's story helps other families and individuals who have been infected through tainted blood products. I also commend her daughter Shelley who, in the face of these difficult medical challenges, continues to want to devote the rest of her life to helping children in need.

As Sharon has so eloquently said:

There is no amount of money that can bring my husband and son back into my life. Perhaps the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act could bring some meaning to this chapter of my life and restore my faith in the belief that the little people of this great country of ours do matter.

My prayers are with Sharon and her family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TIAHRT 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 Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, when I came over today I did not plan to speak. But as I heard the discussion on the supplemental some moments ago, referrals were made to the government shutdown in 1995. The government shut down very briefly, I think it was in 1991, regarding virtually identical causes as was the case in 1995; that is, the unwillingness and/or the inability of the President on the one hand and the Congress on the other to agree on budgetary matters. It was universally

concluded in 1991 that President Bush shut her down. Oh, yes, he shut the government down. But guess what? When the government shut down in 1995, was it universally concluded that President Clinton shut her down? No. The Congress shut down the government in 1995. President Clinton's fingerprints were not to be found thereon, at least it was not reported.

TV talk show hosts, Mr. Speaker, weekend talk show hosts in particular, ask time and again of their weekend guests, well, are the Republicans going to shut down the government again during the 105th Congress? I have heard it asked dozens of times. A more even-handed question, Mr. Speaker, would be, do the President and the Congress intend to shut down the government again? Never heard that asked once.

I will admit we in the Congress sometimes become prisoners or victims of our own rhetoric. But keep in mind both the executive and the legislative branch must assume some blame when it comes to these matters. President Clinton, President Bush, President whoever, unlike Members of Congress, is elected by the American people, by all of the American people. He is the chief operating officer of the Federal Government, and as such, he is compelled to lead.

The media, and I generally am not critical of the media because I have been the beneficiary of pretty even-handed treatment by them, but the media has a way of portraying news this way or that way, and the way it is portrayed, that is the accounts of news, the way it is portrayed obviously has a direct result in the way that viewers or readers perceive it. You have heard it said, Mr. Speaker, and so have I, that perception is 90 percent of it.

So President Bush having closed down the government in 1991, that is the perception because in many instances that is the way the news was portrayed. But, no, not President Clinton in 1995. I repeat, I was not even going to get into this, but much was said about it today as we were getting into the discussion of the supplemental and I felt obliged to at least address it in this small way.

I hope the media will assume a more objective and therefore less subjective role in its subsequent reporting of these matters. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania Avenue runs two ways. We have the Congress at one end, President Clinton at the other end. President Clinton for this time, whoever it may be subsequently. But this is a two-way street. When government shutdowns occur, they involve both the President and the Congress. And the purpose of this message today from me, the gospel according to COBLE, is to remind people it is a two-way street.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for bringing up this point. I think it is very important. We have had an appropriation bill before us, and we had legislative language on it.

But I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle have not been suggesting today that we are the first people in the history of the Congress to put riders on appropriation bills. For 40 years during Republican and Democrat administrations, the Democrats, when they were in the majority, used this as a legitimate exercise of the power of the purse. I think my friend from North Carolina will agree that we were fighting about some very, very important things on this spending bill.

Mr. COBLE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Mississippi, that is precisely my point. That is the way it needs to be portrayed.

ON THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when welfare reform was passed, Congress gave very little guidance to States for determining the applicability of existing employment laws to welfare recipients. This meant that States, counties, employers could use any kind of guideline in applying the welfare reform laws.

We all are in agreement, there should have been some reform of welfare. The time had come for that. But the time will never come when we take away some of the employment benefits from the Federal Government that every citizen of this country needs and desires and really should be given.

Congress never said that the Fair Labor Standards Act, which includes the minimum wage provisions, should not be applied to welfare recipients. Neither did they say it should be applied. So those were questions that were left open.

Each time this piece of legislation came to the floor, I questioned those things. I questioned because of the fact that the Federal Government, which has been sort of the person or the group of people who looked over these laws to be sure that everybody got fair treatment, equal treatment under the law, but with the Welfare Reform Act nothing was mentioned. Congress did not speak about the Fair Labor Standards Act in that particular piece of legislation.

The President and some Members of Congress have tried to determine that welfare recipients in work programs should indeed earn the minimum wage, but some in this Congress want to overturn that decision. For some reason they think, Mr. Speaker, that it is