

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE, PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATERIAL IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1997, THROUGH TODAY

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for Tuesday, September 30, 1997, Wednesday, October 1, 1997, and for today, all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks."

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,  
OCTOBER 6, 1997

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS  
BOARD

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the testimony presented last week in the Committee on Education and the Workforce and in other recent hearings makes it apparent that the National Labor Relations Board is an out-of-control Government bureaucracy.

Under the direction of the current Chairman and general counsel, the Board appears to be liberally interpreting the law and appears in many cases to be getting involved in labor disputes in order to promote the agenda of organized labor.

In our committee last week, hard-working business people spoke about the questionable NLRB actions in labor disputes and testified that the Board ignores illegal union tactics which result in substantial cost to the employers and disruptions and uncertainty in the workplace. The Board's conduct also allows unions to harass companies until they give in and agree to rep-

resentation, despite the wishes of the employees.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should rightfully be concerned that the National Labor Relations Board is not acting as a neutral referee in labor disputes as required by law. This behavior should be unacceptable to anyone who values the traditional concepts of fairness and balance in the labor-management relations in the United States.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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.

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

[Mr. MCKEON 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 Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington 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 Montana [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HILL 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 Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF 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 Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LEACH 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 gen-

tleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DOOLITTLE 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 New York [Mr. PAXON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PAXON 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 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 Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HUTCHINSON 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 Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### FRUSTRATIONS OF DOING THE PEOPLE'S BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today, I have to say, a bit saddened by some of the events that have occurred this past week. I came to Congress in 1994, and like many of us who came here, we had never been in government before, certainly had not been in Federal Government service before, and I have to say over the past 3 years I have had a wonderful opportunity to see the way that Government works, to see the way that Congress works, to see the way Washington, DC, works, and there have been a lot of highlights.

I have seen a lot of good, decent people on both sides of the aisle who care about this country, who care about their children's future, and who believe that America can do better, and I have been very proud to serve here. I think most Americans who, like me, had really just gotten their news from sitting on the couch watching TV their whole lives would be pleased if they came up here and saw a lot of things that happened. But regrettably, as is in

any profession, there are some who do not really carry themselves with as much dignity as others.

I have to say, this past week I was deeply saddened by some of the events that occurred on this floor during debates regarding a seat in California, and it was Ms. SANCHEZ's seat, and it had to deal with the challenge that Bob Dornan was placing on Ms. SANCHEZ.

Just putting aside the facts of this case, what bothered me the most was that there were several Members on the Democratic side that came up and chose to use race as an issue, and they have been using race as an issue over and over again. In fact, I think it would be safe to say, and I saw some journalists report that their activities could be described as race-baiting, basically calling anybody who followed the Los Angeles Times observations and who followed the observations by the House panel on this election, suggesting that anybody that raised tough questions about this election somehow was racist against Hispanics. I have to say, all we have to do is wave the race flag and one does cause a lot of people to retreat.

The reason I come to the floor today not retreating is because, regrettably, I think this is just another tactic by a very scared minority, the Democrats, political minority, who are trying to do their best to change the subject instead of changing America for the better or instead of changing the law for the better.

The Los Angeles Times reported early on about this election that the corruption and the vote-buying and the number of illegal aliens voting was so widespread that one of Mr. Dornan's opponents, not Ms. SANCHEZ, but one of Mr. Dornan's opponents, actually held a raffle for a car for illegal immigrants and told illegal immigrants that if they signed up for this raffle, all they had to do was vote, and the winner of this raffle would win a new car. And so the gentleman, the illegal immigrant that joined this, actually entered a raffle, voted illegally in the election, and then won a car because of it, according to Los Angeles Times reports.

There have also been documented up to 350 to 400 illegal immigrants voting in this election, with the possibility of many more voting, but regrettably, because the Justice Department has not moved swiftly enough, this matter continues to drag out.

But I guess what it highlighted to me was a continuing trend, and it was a trend to obstruct justice, politically obstruct justice, instead of seeing to it that the American people found out what was going on, and of course this is happening in campaign finance debates across Washington and across America. Every time somebody is charged with a new crime or a possible crime, or every time the news media comes out and attacks somebody for questionable behavior, they immediately turn around and try to change the subject.

This morning's New York Times writes, on the front page, top headline:

"Democrats Used State Parties To Bypass Limits." Over \$32 million was sent to local and State officials for the Democratic party to illegally, possibly, counteract FEC laws. This is a violation. So what happens? What do they do? They immediately change the subject and say, let us talk about campaign finance reform. This has been happening for some time.

On September 10 of this year, the headline for The New York Times said, "Democrats Give \$2 Million to Candidates, Records Show." Down below, a Democratic party contributor said, whoever did this should go to jail. This is illegal, and they knew it.

Yet, all we have heard are member after member of this party come to the microphone and do procedural motions to adjourn and all of these other things that are supposed to delay us from doing the business of the people's House, which is costing American taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars, if not more, and none of them will step up to the microphone and say, I am very concerned about the abuses and the laws broken that have been reported in The New York Times or The Washington Post; I am very concerned that American democracy may have been influenced by illegal foreign money; I am very concerned that the Chinese Communists have their top leaders sketch out a plan on how to influence elections in America. We do not hear that. Instead, we just hear people changing the subject.

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee last year, it was reported a week ago, admitted arranging access for donors, and what he did in one case, one particularly offensive case, is he used his power as chairman of the Democratic National Committee to get an international fugitive an audience with the White House because this international fugitive said that he was going to give the White House \$300,000.

Now, how did he do it? The first thing he did was, he called the international fugitive and they set up a dinner. Then the international fugitive said, I am having trouble getting into the White House because the National Security Council will not let me in the White House because I am an international fugitive. That seems to make sense to me.

Well, the Democratic National Committee chairman then, according to his own notes and records, then called the CIA, this is unbelievable, using our Central Intelligence Agency for political purposes to get an international fugitive into the White House to meet the President of the United States. They called the Central Intelligence Agency, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and told the CIA to call the Committee on National Security to get them into the White House.

Now, of course what happened? The international fugitive did get to the White House. His name is Mr. Tamraz.

He gave the White House \$300,000, because he wanted to get a pipeline overseas.

□ 1015

Now when the DNC chairman was asked by the Senate panel on whether he did try to get an international fugitive into the White House by using the CIA, by calling "CIA Bob," as he called him, he said, and this is no surprise, he said, "I have no memory of any conversations with the CIA."

It seems this amnesia trend is sweeping Washington, and I think if we mix a subpoena with Washington tap water and media requests for interviews, all of the sudden people's memory starts to go. I could sort of refresh his recollection by simply using his own words. When he was meeting with an international fugitive, in the notes of the meeting with the international fugitive he wrote, "Go to CIA." And that is the Democratic National Committee chairman Donald Fowler's handwritten note reminding himself to go to CIA to intervene on behalf of an international fugitive for Democratic National Committee fundraising. "Go to CIA."

And, Mr. Speaker, this guy says "I don't remember." Now, I believe, and call me crazy, but I believe if I am chairman of the Democratic National Committee and an international fugitive comes to me and says, "I want to go to the White House and give the President \$300,000," and then I picked up the phone and probably called the Central Intelligence Agency and spoke to Bob. He is on a first-name basis with CIA Bob. And then said, "Bob can you help the National Security Council understand the need to give this international fugitive an audience with the President of the United States?" And I broke arms at the National Security Council and it eventually happened, I think I would remember.

I do not know how many laws were broken here, I think probably an awful lot, but I would remember. And yet we hear time and time again, "I have no recollection." "I have no memory." And I think I really do need to introduce a bill called the National Amnesia Relief Act that would somehow study the effect of water and subpoenas on Washington, DC, officials, because I have got to tell my colleagues, amnesia is sweeping the Capital this year like never before.

Mr. SALMON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. One gentleman who never has a problem remembering is the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], a good friend of mine, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more worthy project to pursue than a national study on the effects of the Potomac water on the brain, because apparently amnesia is running rampantly through this place.

Let me just make a couple of comments. First of all, the gentleman talked about this last week and the

idea that there was a lot of race-baiting going on; that whenever the other side, the Democrats, seem to be losing an argument, they always throw out this trump card that purportedly gives them the upper hand, and that is to call us racist when they are losing on the merits of the argument.

I found that same thing to happen just the other night when we were about to adjourn and we were trying to get through the work, and that we had scheduled to do yesterday, and they got up and raised the issue several times that we were not concerned about the Jewish Members of this body. It was a very, very special Jewish holiday and it was fast approaching, and they wanted to know why we terrible racists over on the other side, or anti-Semites, would not be more sensitive to the needs of these Members of Congress, when they themselves were moving every time they got a chance to adjourn, knowing full well that it would take up extra time, knowing full well that it would cause those Jewish members of this body to miss or to be late for this holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is despicable. We were doing everything that we could to try to get through, and they were pursuing these dilatory tactics time and time and time again, and yet the American public lets them get away with this.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time just for one moment, I thought what was so telling about yesterday's episode, and I didn't bring that up. I thought the race-baiting a few nights ago was bad, but yesterday they raised the ugly specter of anti-Semitism and that somehow we were unfeeling toward the Jews to observe this very, very holy holiday, which of course we were not, and they knew it. But it was, again, win at all costs, which concerns me.

I thought it was very telling at the end of that debate that we had a very honorable Jewish gentleman from New York, a Democrat, stand up and plead. He pleaded.

Mr. SALMON. With his own people.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. He pleaded with his own Members of his own party, "Please, let us enter into an agreement with the majority leader." It was a good agreement. He said it was a fair agreement and it was the best way for us to move forward to do the people's business, but at the same time respect one of the holiest of all holidays for the Jewish people.

Unfortunately, the goodness and decency of the Jewish Member from New York was ignored by other Democrats who, I guess, regretfully saw this as an opportunity to gain political advantage.

Again, it was a very sad moment. But I thought the gentleman showed a lot of courage, and I must say that an overwhelming majority of the Democrats agreed with him and agreed with us, agreed with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] and agreed with us that this was a good idea.

Regretfully, we had Democrats, and I have not seen it in 3 years since I have been here, we had Democrats screaming at each other, yelling and fighting. Obviously, we had Jewish Members who were concerned that other Members may not have been as sensitive as they should have been. I saw it going on and I was saddened by it.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I think it was interesting to note that yesterday, and one does not have to be a math teacher to figure this out. I think my son who is in remedial math in the third grade could figure this one out. If we would have not had all of the dilatory tactics pursued by the Democrats yesterday, the motions to adjourn every time they got a chance to stand up, we would have been done by 12 o'clock. As it stood, because of all of the dilatory tactics that they employed yesterday, we did not finish until, what was it, 3:00 or 3:30?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time again, we actually finished at about 3 o'clock. We started to calculate the dilatory tactics that they have taken over the past month and how much it would cost the American taxpayers, and it is a remarkable number.

Now, they have that right. And let me just say right here, right now, the rules of this House allow Members to do that. And if they do that, that is their business. That is fine. If they want to delay for their own political agenda, that is their constitutional right and it is their right under the rules of this House.

But do not tell me when delaying from allowing Members to get home, delaying us to do the people's business, do not tell me that I am being insensitive in keeping people here when it is their dilatory tactics that are more responsible.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, it reminded me painfully of a time in my young life when I had a very, very traumatic experience. I remember when I was a little boy and my brother and his friends were playing in the living room and they broke a very, very special vase that was very, very important to my mother. And, frankly, they framed me for it.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. That has happened.

Mr. SALMON. I was the one who got blamed for breaking this vase, and my father came home, and I said, "Daddy, I didn't do it. I didn't do it." Well, he did not believe me because all the evidence seemed to suggest that I was the one that did it, and so I got a spanking. Finally my brother came clean on it.

Mr. Speaker, I am just hoping that they come clean some day. Frankly, for them to be doing all of these dilatory tactics and being the reason that all of these Jewish Members were threatened at not being able to participate in their very, very special holiday, which all of us wanted them to do it,

and then trying to blame us for it when they are the ones extending the time and playing gamesmanship on the floor, it brought back those painful memories all over again.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it would be very interesting to see what would happen if some of these people broke their parents' vase at home. They probably would have changed the subject and said, "Yes, what this tells me is that we need to sue the vase makers to make sure they make the vases stronger." We have seen the changing of the subject.

Let me go back to what we were talking about. We were talking about how amnesia is sweeping Washington, DC, on not trivial matters, but very important matters of substance.

This is a headline, again talking about the international fugitive, that the chairman of the Democratic National Committee used his power to influence the CIA to influence the National Security Council to allow this international fugitive to get into the White House and give the President \$300,000. The New York Times wrote a story on September 18, and it says, "Ex-White House Aide Tells of Pressure Over Donor," and her name is Sheila Heslin, testified under oath before the Senate investigating committee that the Energy Department officials and the CIA, as well as the Democratic National Committee, pressured her as a National Security Council member to let an international fugitive into the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that is so shocking, not just to me but to most reasonable people, that the American people have set up a National Security Council to protect the White House from international fugitives like this gentleman, and then the chairman of the largest party of the United States of America, and the Department of Energy that was formed to help Americans with energy crises, and then we have the Central Intelligence Agency which is supposed to protect our national security, being used to actually break down this wall of security that the American people placed between the White House and international fugitives.

This is what Sheila Heslin, who was a National Security Council aide who gave a very valiant effort to keep these people from the White House, said under oath. "I was shocked. I said what the hell is going on? Why are you guys working with Fowler?"

And that was National Security Council aide Sheila Heslin in testimony before the Senate on her reaction to the CIA's intervention on behalf of an international fugitive. This is what the New York Times says.

I will yield to the gentleman in one moment, but I wanted to tell what they said the next day in their editorial about this shameful episode in American history. The New York Times wrote of the international fugitive's testimony before the Senate

committee, and he by the way was very proud that he was able to buy influence.

Mr. SALMON. Buy influence.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Buy influence and muscle his way into the White House. The New York Times wrote, "He," the international fugitive "was affirming that in the shadowy reaches of the international business world it was believed accurately that during the 1996 election, dubious entrepreneurs could buy White House audiences, particularly if they did not quibble about the cost of the ticket."

Again, the New York Times is saying that in the shadowy reaches of the international business world, the White House was for sale. The Times editorial concluded, "That so many high level people even took the party's role into consideration is one of the most shocking lapses of judgment."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of people on the other side, and even some who have written letters to the editor, say we are wasting time and we should get on with the business of the people, we should stop this investigation of the White House.

My response to them is, do those same people believe that all of the investigation of Watergate was not time well spent? In fact, as despicable and as sad of a time as Watergate was in the history of America, and I believe justice was served there, I do, there were never any allegations at that time of espionage, of treason, of bringing people in and possibly selling secrets to the enemy.

If Watergate was bad, then what potentially could these investigations yield? We are talking about very, very important matters and the White House has established a very, very disturbing pattern. Here is how it goes: It is a three-part, three-step pattern. No. 1: "I unequivocally was not there, did not do it. I did not do it."

□ 1030

I did not do it. That is in regard to raising money from Buddhist temples or making fundraising phone calls from the White House, which is in strict violation of U.S. law. OK. Then when the facts come out and the Washington Post and other media outlets find out through their investigative techniques that that is not accurate, that you in fact were there, that you in fact did do what you said you did not do, then the next response is, well, I cannot recall. I cannot recall whether I did that or whether I did not do that.

Then when the proof is in the pudding and you know exactly that they did what they said they did not do or they cannot recall whether they were there or not, the third response is, well, if I did it, it must have been legal. And there might even have been a fourth response now that Janet Reno is helping them. Well, the law is really kind of a stupid law in the first place.

It really should not be on the books. Is that really the kind of people that we want leading our country? People that go through that kind of self-denial?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. That is what the Washington Post has editorialized about time and time again. What they call it is telling the truth in dribs and drabs. They said, you paraphrased what they said, how the White House starts with a denial, then they say they cannot recall. Then they deny it. Then a little bit of information comes and they limit it to that, and then more information comes out later on and then they say, big deal. It happened time and again. It happened with Web Hubbell. It happened in a lot of the China investigation. Craig Livingstone. You were talking about how there is possible espionage. Newsweek reported that John Huang, when working at the Commerce Department and at the DNC, he would regularly get briefings from the CIA and then talked about times that he would get in a taxicab and go immediately over to the Chinese Embassy and talked.

It is, again, very, very disturbing. You brought up the name of Janet Reno. The New York Times has been very critical of Ms. Reno. I have been very critical. I know a lot of others have. I think in a way she has acted as shamefully as John Mitchell has in not moving forward as quickly as she should have when every reasonable person across the country knows of the abuses. Like you said, there are denials from the President that he raised money from the White House and then he says, if I did raise money, I did not break the law, when records show that he did, through the Post report, raise at least half a million from the White House.

You have a Vice President, AL GORE, who said that he had never done it before. Then we find out later that he placed at least 47 calls. Now we are over 100 calls. We were told that the coffees were not fundraisers. They were admitted to be fundraisers. Democratic Senator LIEBERMAN, in the hearings, stated as much, said we have to say that at least conclusively 103 of these coffees were fundraisers. So they have retreated.

Now the position they retreat to, and I have to tell you, the position that Janet Reno is supposedly debating this week is, it is insulting to the intelligence of me, you, the American people, that is, that, OK, there was a law that said do not raise money on Federal property, but it was an old law. And it was even before telephones were invented, and it had nothing to do with phone calls or anything like that. I wish I had the exact quote from the L.A. Times, but I can tell you what it said. It talked about how Judge Abner Mikva, who was the President's attorney, White House counsel in 1993, wrote a memo and said specifically, it is against the law to raise money in the White House. It is against the law to use White House phones to raise

money. Avoid raising money at the White House at all costs. It is illegal. That is what he wrote in 1993.

Why have we not heard that from the Attorney General? Why have we not heard that from news reports? I have to tell you, the news media, not print media, but the media, ABC, CBS, NBC, the evening news have been circling their wagons, as Brent Bozell has reported very well in his daily updates, and been avoiding the story. They talk about it is an old law, they talk about how it may not apply. They never talk about how the President's own attorney in 1993 told the White House, do not raise money at the White House. It is illegal. You never hear that, do you?

Mr. SALMON. No, you do not hear that. In fact, we all have copies of the memo that he sent to the President wherein he told the President that fundraising from Federal property, it was illegal. It is the same for you and I. As freshman Congressmen when we came in 3 years ago, one of the very first things that we were told was do not make fundraising phone calls from your office. It is illegal. How long did the Vice President serve in the Senate before he went into the White House?

It gets down to this. I believe that pretty much what I am about to say has been editorialized over and over again, and I will paraphrase, you are down to either one, if indeed as all the evidence shows there were fundraising phone calls from the White House, and that is illegal, you are left with two very painful answers or a choice between two very painful answers. No. 1, there is some crooked behavior going on; No. 2, they are not very intelligent. And it might be a combination of both. I am not sure. But either one is very disturbing.

Let me comment, or ask you a question. As to saying I cannot recall, I cannot recall, I cannot recall, have you ever had a speeding ticket or a parking ticket?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Since I do not have a subpoena and have not been drinking Washington, DC, tap water, I can remember. Yes, I will admit here that I have had a speeding ticket.

Mr. SALMON. I remember I had a speeding ticket. I was going about 10 miles over the speed limit. I remember this was over 12 years ago. It was the last speeding ticket that I got. I remember exactly what day it was. I remember, I am not saying I remember exactly the date but I remember the time of year. I remember my nephews were in the car with me. And I remember being very chagrined because I was trying to set a better example for my nephews and being pulled over. It was a very embarrassing thing. This was 12 years ago that I got this speeding ticket, yet I remember all of the circumstances surrounding that speeding ticket. We are talking about a violation of Federal law, far more important than a speeding ticket or a parking ticket. I think most Americans out there can remember if they have gotten a speeding ticket or parking ticket.

They can remember the circumstances, the emotions that they felt. They can remember what they were doing at the time that they received that speeding ticket.

Do you think that we should really believe that with the commission of this serious a violation of Federal law that these people cannot recall?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Again, it goes back to what the gentleman who chaired the Democratic National Committee said when he said he could not recall whether he helped get an international fugitive into the White House by using influence over the CIA, the Energy Department, the National Security Council, the White House itself. It absolutely strains credibility. I have to say that I am personally offended that the Justice Department has taken as long as it has in making its decision. I have to also say that I am offended that they continue to walk this fine legal line saying, we need to check and make sure that this one law about fundraising applies. This scandal is so huge, this is the largest fundraising scandal in American history, even if the media, even if TV media does not want to report it. It is the largest fundraising scandal in American history. If the media decides to pursue it aggressively and if the American people tune into it, I think they will see that it is every bit as damaging to the structure of American democracy and the structure of this constitutional Republic as what happened during Watergate, which was, I have to tell you, Watergate was an absolutely shameful period in this Nation's history and one of the heroes out of Watergate was a Senator from Tennessee named Howard Baker, who during the hearing had the guts to put aside partisanship in a way that JOE LIEBERMAN has done for the Democrats and asked the question, what did the President know and when did the President know it. I wish there were more Howard Bakers. I wish there were more JOE LIEBERMANS on both sides of the party, both sides of the aisle, who would ask tough questions and put the interests of America over the interests of the party.

I have to tell you, I did not come to Washington, DC, as a Republican. I think I prove that every day. I came to Washington, DC, as an American to be part of, be a positive part of a process to get money, power, and influence back to the States, back to the local governments, to balance the budget, to cut taxes, to do the type of education reforms we need to do to empower parents, teachers, students, local school boards, and take the power and authority and money out of the bureaucracies in Washington, DC.

I did not come here as a Republican, as a partisan Republican. JOE LIEBERMAN from Connecticut did not come to Washington, DC, solely as a cheerleader for the Democratic Party. Howard Baker did not come to Washington, DC, as a cheerleader for the Republican Party back in the 1970's. I

have yet to hear one Democrat in this Chamber go before that microphone and say, yes, I am concerned that we were allowing international fugitives to abuse power, that the Democratic Party skimmed \$2 million, as reported by the New York Times, that China may have bought influence in the White House and that there may have been espionage going on, that so many people that were contributors to the White House and now have fled this country and will not be recalled. It is a frightening spectacle.

Mr. SALMON. I think you make a really good point. I have been really proud that at least there is one Senator over on the other side, on the Democrat side that seems to be interested. I have been very impressed with Senator BOB KERREY and his willingness to try to pursue at least truth and justice. I do not believe anybody could accuse us of being partisan hacks or flunkies for the Republican leadership. There probably has not been two more vocal people on the floor in challenging our own leadership and in bucking the tide with our own leadership when we feel that they have gone astray.

I think we have earned the right to question whether or not this administration is engaged in an illegal activity. I think you make a really good point. Not one Democrat has stood up and asked for justice to be sought or found in relationship to the alleged illegal fundraising and selling of secrets and possible espionage going on in this White House, not one Democrat has stood up. I challenge them. I will buy whichever one does a steak dinner if they will have the moral courage to stand up and ask that we at least get to the bottom of the truth.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I think the gentleman is now starting to strike a nerve because maybe if you go to cash instead of money and maybe if you can get cash from a foreign friend and offer them some foreign cash, maybe that would be the type of thing they understand because they certainly understood it during the 1996 election. Tamraz understood that they understood that because this international fugitive, when questioned what mistakes were made and what laws were broken, his only response was, I think next time I will give \$600. That is international fugitive Roger Tamraz commenting on his ability to buy White House access.

You are exactly right. We have not been partisan Republicans. We have questioned our leadership, I would say tougher this year than we certainly have questioned the Democrats. We have held them to a higher standard. We have the gentleman on the floor with us today that questioned them on the pay raise. We had some tough questions on how we thought they were trying to slip the pay raise through with the help of the Democratic leadership. We have questioned them on a lot of other things. I am very concerned about the \$600 million that the IRS was

given this week. I do not think they should be given anything. But these concerns continue to grow.

We asked tough questions of both sides. Again, it seems to me we have the right to ask the President and the Attorney General what they are doing. I have got to say, the Attorney General is going to be making a decision this week. She will be making the decision on whether to appoint a special, an independent counsel to look into it, and the New York Times editorialized a week or two ago that they did not believe that the President nor the Attorney General could be trusted to look fairly into this matter. The New York Times, who usually sides with more liberal Members of Congress, they did not this time. They said we cannot trust Janet Reno and we cannot trust the President to look into this, an independent third party needs to be sought.

□ 1045

Mr. SALMON. If the gentleman will continue to yield just a few seconds, this situation with Janet Reno is so disturbing: That she cannot get by the fact that she feels she has to protect her boss more than she has to represent Justice or the needs of the American people to get to the truth and to find justice in this matter. I think we should pass a bill on the floor, if she does not appoint a special counsel, to call her the Enabler General instead of the Attorney General.

And frankly, just finally, the phrase, "A day late and a dollar short," we are talking about several million dollars here, and, frankly, she has a responsibility, a constitutional responsibility, to get to the bottom of this and to find truth and to find justice.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman.

She does have that responsibility, and she needs, again, to review the situation.

As the New York Times wrote in an editorial on September 10, 1997, yesterday's testimony yet again punctures the fiction that the abuses that occurred were solely the responsibility of the Democrat Party and not the White House. That is very important for Janet Reno's decision, how much the White House was influenced.

And, again, the front page of the New York Times today talks about how the White House and, I think, Dick Morris had a scheme to funnel money to State parties to do it. And the New York Times editorialized about Janet Reno's faulty fix and stated, the Attorney General mistakes efficiency for integrity. And we hope, like the New York Times and others hope, that she will find the integrity that she needs to make the decision.

I would like to yield now to a gentleman that has been very helpful in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in investigating these things, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his leadership in

pointing out the problems with this administration.

We have seen them from the days we started, first with the Travel Office and as we moved through the FBI files and as we moved through Whitewater and Craig Livingstone, and we have watched this in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight relatively stunned.

And as we start to get the depositions, as we prepare for the larger investigation of campaign finance scams, I was so outraged about a week and a half ago to see that the President of the United States was proposing to call Congress into a special session on campaign finance reform. Talk about gall.

Rule No. 1 for campaign finance reform should be, follow the current law. What good does it do for us to pass a bunch of laws if they do not follow the current law? Today I wanted to share a couple of stories to illustrate this point.

Story No. 2: Last month, the Democratic National Committee returned \$85,000 in funny money, this time to help repay victims of the \$38 million fraud using President Clinton's photo. The pyramid scheme, set up by Unique Gems International Corp., has been called one of the costliest credit card rip-offs in U.S. history. Here is how it happened.

In October 1996, at a Florida fundraiser, President Clinton took a photo with executives of the Miami-based jewelry-making company who coughed up \$85,000 to the DNC. So the price tag for this picture was \$85,000.

When you start going after money everywhere as fast as you can get it, you forget to do some background checks. The pictures were featured in company newsletters to gain credibility with investors. The caption read, "The company has been honored by President Clinton for its role in helping many people with real opportunities to earn a well above average income."

Potential marks were told by one company boss, "We met with the President. If it were not a good company, the President would not have invited us to dinner."

Soon, investors were lining up to buy worthless beads to assemble into necklaces, which the company promised to market to retailers. At one point, when Unique Gems was using the President's picture most extensively, it was raking in \$1 million a day.

By the time the operation was shut down, 15,000 people had been bilked, most of whom were new immigrants hoping to turn their \$3,000 investment into a small fortune. The Democratic National Committee bilked new immigrants indirectly through this type of scheme.

Unique Gems apparently used third parties to donate \$85,000 to the DNC, despite Federal law prohibiting such donations. Four of Unique Gems principals, who have, surprise, surprise, left the country, are foreign nationals prohibited by law from donating to U.S. campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, this is yet another example of campaign finance reform. Rule No. 1, follow the current law.

Former leader of Common Cause Fred Wertheimer put it best: "This is one example, and it is a classic example, of an attitude that led to the Clinton campaign saying, 'if you give us money, that is all we care about.'"

Just so everyone gets this story straight: DNC got the cash, swindlers got a photo with the President, and 15,000 people got stuck with \$38 million of worthless beads.

The second case is Jorge Cabrera. As we know, the Vice President has been a good student of President Clinton's in more ways than one. In December 1995, Vice President GORE attended a fundraiser in Florida for 60 wealthy contributors. Among them were several guests more fitted to Shawshank than southern Florida. Consider the following attendees:

Jorge Cabrera, a drug trafficker with links to a Colombian cartel.

Dr. Joseph Douze, a fugitive who once blew up a bridge.

Great background checks on these people.

And the host for the evening, Jerome "Jerry" Berlin, was indicted in 1990, and later acquitted, on Federal conspiracy charges of bribing Federal officials. One of the politicians allegedly targeted was then Senator AL GORE, who prosecutors said did not know of the alleged plot.

One guest, who paid the minimum \$10,000 cover charge, said, "Maybe the reason I got to sit with the Vice President is that I was the only honest person in the room."

To be fair, the Vice President was disappointed to learn that his picture had been taken with a long-time drug dealer. "He never wants to be associated with people who break the law."

That makes for interesting Cabinet meetings. In fact, sometimes you wonder how he looks in the mirror, since he violated the laws in campaign fundraising from the White House.

Some of the same donors at the Florida fundraiser later received personal greetings from the President and the First Lady. Only days later, the Cali-connected Cabrera was sipping eggnog at the White House Christmas party.

Cabrera, who gave \$20,000 to the DNC, was later sentenced to 19 years in prison for helping import 6,000 pounds of Colombian cocaine that was killing kids in the streets of Fort Wayne, IN, and western Florida, and in Kansas, and he did not get a background check. This man was a drug cartel dealer, for crying out loud.

At the time of the Gore fundraiser and the White House visit, he had already been arrested twice on drug charges and pleaded guilty to non-drug-related charges. Court papers said that by 1995 he was already deeply involved with the Cali Colombian drug cartel.

Ross Perot put it nicely: "I never thought I would live to see a major

drug dealer give 20,000 bucks in Florida and then be invited to a big Democratic reception by the Vice President of the United States, AL GORE, and then be invited to the White House for a Christmas party."

An invitation to the White House Christmas party was also sent to Dr. Douze, although the Government had confiscated his passport and restricted his travel after his arrest on 11 counts of Federal mail fraud and conspiracy.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for a second, I have to ask a question. Did the gentleman just say that a man who had his passport seized because he was a felon was invited to the White House even after we seized his passport?

What I am saying is, is the gentleman saying that basically the standard of getting in the White House is below the standard of actually being able to stay in the United States of America?

Mr. SOUDER. I think that is what I am saying. And, furthermore, a convicted drug dealer was let in. So it was not as though they did not have a record, it was not as though they did not have background checks on these people, it was the classic cannot see, cannot hear, and, therefore, there is no evil.

A Federal judge also denied his request to leave the area, Douze' request to leave the area, to visit the White House. But Douze, who was arrested in 1988 for blowing up a bridge in Haiti, received the judge's permission to visit his dying mother in Haiti a few weeks after the Gore fundraiser. Surprise, surprise, he has not come back.

How does it happen? They let it. They do not follow rule No. 1, which is to follow the current law.

I would like to, if I can, take a few more minutes here to go to the third case, Johnny Chung. This is his quote: "I see the White House like a subway; you have to put in coins to open the gates." That is how Johnny Chung explained his \$50,000 contribution which was delivered to the First Lady's office in 1995 to buy access to the President.

Chung said he was seeking VIP treatment for a delegation of visiting Chinese businessmen when he was asked to help defray the First Lady's White House Christmas receptions that had been billed to the DNC. Chung's visit to Washington in March 1995 raised concerns in the Clinton administration's National Security Council.

So in answer to the gentleman from Florida's question, here the National Security Council at least warned them. The Passport Office did not. The other, presumably State Department, did not, on the case from Haiti. They did not warn the White House on the drug dealer's connections, but here the National Security Council did warn them.

One aide described Chung in the memo as "a hustler" trying to exploit his contacts at the White House. And we already saw in the first case what the contacts in the White House can do for bilking poor immigrants.

Chung essentially paid \$7,000 a head to have six businessmen and himself watch Bill Clinton deliver an 8-minute radio address followed by photos with the President.

Chung knows his way around the White House. In December 1994, he escorted a Chinese beer executive through the West Wing, carrying two six-packs and taking pictures as they went. A photo with the First Lady with the beer executive is on display on one of Beijing's busiest street.

"He became an irritant," says one White House official. He took unfair advantage of the First Lady's office." At least he never came away empty handed.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman could stay to answer a few questions, first of all, the first question I have is, how did the White House respond to the National Security Council's warning about Mr. Chung?

And I ask that because I had been speaking previously about how actually the National Security Council had said, do not let Mr. Tamraz in; he is an international fugitive. Then, of course, we saw the Democratic National Committee chairman improperly use his power to influence the Energy Department and influence the CIA to put pressure on the National Security Council.

And of course Ms. Heslin was tough and told them that he was an international fugitive, he could not get in, so they went around her.

How did the White House respond when the NSC also said this international business gangster was dangerous?

Mr. SOUDER. With benign neglect, would be kind. With overt refutation and opposite action, would be the correct way, because not only did they allow him in, they allowed him in repeatedly, and at a radio address, and into the White House with the Chinese businessmen. So they did not heed their National Security Council's warning.

And so at some point we have to say, how are we going to pass additional laws to regulate people who will not follow the laws, who allow drug dealers in, who allow people in who blow up bridges, who have their passports revoked, who have been warned by the National Security Council that the guy is a risk?

What they are doing is, they are going ka'chung, ka'chung, so to speak, because they want the money, they want the cash register to ring with the dollars, because that was the primary goal, not the integrity of the political process of the United States.

They abused people like Johnny Chung. His statement when he says he thought that was what you have to do, this is not a statement on Johnny Chung as much as it is a statement on the White House: "I see the White House as like a subway. You have to put in coins to open the gates."

So people who did not understand our system were led by this administration

to think that the way it works in America is, they have to put the coins in, or you do not get any action. And that is a disappointing demonstration to people from all these different countries about how this works.

I am so disappointed in this administration, that they would let the world think that the way we do business with the President of the United States is giving him illegal campaign contributions.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And, regretfully, that is something that has been echoed, again in the New York Times: "Oil man says he got access by giving the Democrats money." And in this story he testifies, "I think next time I will give \$600,000," and stated, really, that the way to get into the White House was money and said that was the only reason he was there, was money.

I want to yield in a second to the gentleman from Kansas, who is certainly a good friend and a great Congressman, but my office has called me back up, and I have to offer an apology, because I had said no Democrat had stood up and questioned the fundraising. And my office notified me that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has; and, of course, he is a trailblazer.

I have to remind the gentleman from Arizona, he owes the gentleman from Ohio a steak dinner, because he said he would give a steak dinner to the first Democrat that actually stood up and questioned it. The gentleman from Ohio, of course, the trailblazer, did that.

Something that the gentleman from Indiana and I have not touched on yet, something that we are going to be working on in the coming months, has been the abuse by the Democratic National Committee and the AFL-CIO to launder money.

According to press reports and according to three Teamsters officials who have been indicted now and who are talking to the U.S. Justice Department, the AFL-CIO and the DNC have been acting improperly.

There is another part of this scandal that, of course, the Attorney General would like to ignore but simply cannot. The Washington Post, on Friday, September 19, 1997, wrote, "U.S. says Carey aides used DNC and AFL-CIO. Consultants plead guilty to funneling money to 10 Teamsters presidents' reelection campaign." And in the heart of the article it says, "Both the DNC and the Clinton-Gore Reelection Committee agreed to seek contributions to the Carey campaign in exchange for Teamsters' donations to the Democratic National Committee." And, of course, according to the Washington Post, that is what happened. That is what the United States is telling us now.

□ 1100

And, of course, it is blatantly illegal to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], who has had some experience dealing with some of the parties involved.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] for yielding.

I want to remind the Speaker that this Congress, through the Department of Labor, actually spent \$20 million to oversee this election, and we were spending our taxpayers' dollars to try to ensure that there was a fair election in the Teamsters Union. And what happened is that we had an unfair election and that the president of the Teamsters Union had to step down, now is in very serious trouble.

Many people wonder, where do the unions get all this money that is available? It comes to them through compulsory union dues, it comes from all types of dues from working men and women that are struggling to make ends meet. And up to 80 percent of the money in their union dues does go for contract negotiations, it does not go for grievance procedures. Eighty percent of the money, or approximately in some cases 89 percent of the money, goes to the international headquarters here in Washington, DC, where they push their own political agenda, where they push their own political candidates, where they attempt to launder money, in this case, in order to get their agenda forward, with no regard to what the workers have in mind as far as what they think is best for America.

Well, this is a typical laundering campaign, where the AFL-CIO was funneling money into the Teamsters, the DNC was funneling money into the Teamsters, with hopes of later on getting it reimbursed from the Teamsters back to the Democratic National Committee.

But it is not just at the Federal level. It is not just at the White House. We have had experience of it happening right in Kansas, in the heart of America in the Bible Belt.

The Wichita Eagle reported about how the Kansas State Democrat Party, which is limited by law to receive only \$25,000 in Federal funds coming from the Federal party to the State party, managed to get \$315,000 by funneling it through or laundering it through local Democratic candidates and county State parties.

A candidate would get a check for \$500; and a phone call would say, "We would appreciate if you would send \$400 right back to the State party." A county, the Democrat party, would get a check for \$5,000, limited by statute again, and it will come back to the party. And they used that money to run ads against Senators and against Members of Congress who were running for election.

I think it is really interesting that the defense is kind of the same in each instance, whether it is the White House or whether it is the Vice President or whether it is the State party. First of all they say, "Well, I did not do it." Then later on, as more of the details come out, they say, "I didn't not do it. But, well, maybe I did do it, but it wasn't wrong."



Then the third line of defense was, "Well, yes, maybe it was wrong. But I will never do it again." And then the fourth line of defense is, "Well, it is not my fault. We had to win, you see. We had to do anything, at any cost, regardless of the law."

Well, we must, No. 1, uphold the law here in America. Because if there is no justice in Washington, DC, there is no justice in Wichita, KS, or in Florida, or Indiana, or anywhere in the United States. We must uphold the law of the United States of America in the States.

The campaign financing must start with the individuals. Rule No. 1, as was stated earlier by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER]: Follow the law. If we are ever going to find where we are going, we have got to find a place to start from. And that is the current law today, we must follow the law.

I guess the Democrat Party in the State of Kansas, the Teamsters, and the national party in the White House are tired of breaking old laws, so they want campaign reform so they get a brandnew set of laws to break.

I want to say in closing, we cannot write enough laws. We have proved that. We have laws upon laws, statute books upon statute books. People have to do the right thing. It is up to the American people to ferret out those who will misalign what they say and what they do and mistreat the taxpayers and the people of America by not doing the right thing. So voters need to find candidates that will do the right thing and support them so we can change America.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] for his insights. And he is right, we have got to abide by the laws that we have already passed.

I have said for some time that for the Democrats and the President to talk about how they want new laws to be passed on campaign finance reform would be a lot like the driver of Princess Diana coming back from the dead and holding a press conference and demanding that the speed limit be lowered in the tunnels of Paris or that the alcohol level be lowered in Paris for DUI.

Abide by the laws that are on the books and nobody is going to get hurt. Regretfully, though, this is just another way that they can change the subject. And my colleague is right, it is shameful, a lot of the bobbing and weaving. I know the White House, the Vice President particularly said, "I did not break the law. I did not do anything wrong. And I promise I will never do it again."

It just does not make sense. The American people are being underestimated. They are smarter. When we see the scandals that are occurring, when we see the National Security Council, when we see money laundering with the AFL-CIO and the Teamsters, when we see the Energy Department being improperly used, the CIA, the NSC, the

White House, the Vice President's office, it is time for us to do something.

I agree with the New York Times and I agree with editorial writers across the country, Janet Reno has no choice but to step up to the plate and hire an independent counsel, not a partisan Democrat, not a partisan Republican, but somebody that is independent that can look into this and look into the type of abuses, again, that the New York Times even wrote about this morning that the Democrats use State parties to bypass limits; that \$32 million were sent to the local level, paid for by ads aiding Bill Clinton, possibly very, very illegal.

Somebody must look into this. We cannot allow the integrity of the American system to continue to be questioned like this. Let us get somebody independent in that can look at the law and apply the law equally to both sides. If that happens, America is the winner, not just Republicans or Democrats.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PEASE]. The Chair will remind all Members that they are to refrain from references to individual Members of the other body.

#### ELIMINATE MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to my colleagues today about a project that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] and I have started in the last few weeks. I want to thank each of my colleagues who have joined us in cosponsoring our legislation to eliminate the marriage penalty tax in our Tax Code.

I first started focusing on this when I received a letter from a constituent of mine, Sharon Mallory, who lives in Straughn, IN. Sharon wrote to me about how she and her boyfriend wanted to get married, went to the accountant, and found out that she would have to give up her \$900 tax refund and start paying \$2,800 if they got married. Sharon closed her letter of last February saying, "We hope some day the government will allow us to get married by not penalizing us. It broke our hearts when we found out we can't afford it."

And it broke my heart to think that Sharon and those like her that want to get married and start families in this country are not able to because our Tax Code penalizes them simply because they are married.

I have started a project on my website, and I wanted to share the results of this with my colleagues. People, when they want to communicate with me about the marriage penalty, have started leaving me e-mails at my

site, [www.House.gov/McIntosh](http://www.House.gov/McIntosh), where we have got a special page on the marriage penalty and what it means to people. So, if I may, let me show my colleagues the map of the United States and some of the dozens of responses that we have gotten.

My colleagues, these are just a few of the communities around the United States where people have written me these e-mails explaining to me what the marriage penalty has meant to them. Let me share with my colleagues a few of them.

Wayne Shelly, who lives in Dayton, OH, wrote this:

Penalizing for marriage flies in the face of common sense. This is a classic example of Government policy not supporting that which it wishes to promote. In our particular situation, my girlfriend and I would incur an annual net penalty of \$2,000 or approximately \$167 a month. Though not huge, this was enough to pay our monthly phone, cable, water, and home insurance bills. Therefore, the net effect to us is that, if we remain unmarried, the United States Government will pay these four bills for us.

He might have gone on to say, conversely, if we do get married, instead of paying those bills, we are going to have to dig into our pockets and pay the Government that money.

A second message was from William Dixon of Osgood, IN.

I was a single parent paying child support. I remarried in 1990. Because of my change of status, I owed a tax bill that I could not pay. I am still trying to pay these taxes and penalties.

Terri Wyncoop of Springfield, VA, wrote to me:

I knew it was more than enough because I had never owed before I was married. However, when I married I owed every year. We could owe anything from \$500 to \$1,000. We both claimed zero, and took out an additional \$25 weekly out of both of our checks and still owed. Unfortunately, our marriage failed because of financial reasons.

Does it not just break the hearts of my colleagues to know that there are American citizens like Terri Wyncoop of Springfield, VA, who attribute the breakdown of their family to the fact that this government penalized them for when they were married?

I can just picture the desperate straits of those two young people who want their marriage to succeed deciding, "Well, let us take more out of our paychecks in order not to pay taxes at the end of the year," and to find themselves still penalized and hit with that terrible burden.

Now, those financial crises often-times come in at a time when young people are trying to make a new life together. And people say to me, how can that make a difference? Well, I want to share with my colleagues a few statistics of what has happened in this country since 1969 when we started penalizing marriages in our Tax Code.

The National Fatherhood Initiative reports that since the marriage penalty was created for the average American, the probability that a marriage taking place today will end in divorce or permanent separation is calculated to be