

When I go back home, what they tell me is, "We would like to duplicate our efforts and triplicate our efforts but we do not have the resources." We will have a forum on November 1st in my home city of Worcester to try to bring people together to try to find ways to promote some of what works. I hope we can bring that message back here to Washington and get the necessary resources and backing.

I thank all my colleagues for joining in this special order tonight.

CAMPAIGN FUND-RAISING INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I think before moving into the general topic I am getting into tonight, I want to express my support for many of the education initiatives, although I think sometimes we get it backwards and think Washington is the fount; unless something is done out of Washington, it will not be done.

I know that it was under a Republican President that Head Start was created, and Ed Ziegler of Yale University worked with then President Nixon because he felt there were some gaps. We ought to look to Washington to fill gaps, not to be the end-all, be-all of education.

Sometimes I think while the motives are correct on the other side, that is, that we need to help our children, and all of us who are parents of young children, older children, are very concerned about education and it is not a partisan type of thing, but we do have some substantive disagreements over whether it should come out of Washington and be controlled out of Washington or whether it should start with the parents and back home.

I am joined tonight by my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH]. I know he wanted to make some opening comments, too.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, likewise, I thank those who preceded us this evening in this Chamber for discussing the issue of education. I think the gentleman from Indiana makes a very salient point when he distinguishes part of the difference of how best to deal with schools, how best to deal with this precious notion of educating our children and what is at stake in the future.

I was pleased to hear many of our friends on the other side talk about local initiatives but this, I believe, is the key. That is that initiatives can develop at home rather than be Washington-based, with a Washington community then trying to send those notions down to the schools, if you will. Things can happen at home on the front lines with volunteerism, with innovative teaching, with people taking time in their respective communities

to adopt a school. But my colleague from Indiana is quite right when he mentions that there are ways for government to fill in the blanks.

I would take this time, Mr. Speaker, to inform my colleagues on the other side, as I have through many inter-office letters, of a couple of pieces of legislation that I think are vitally important, both of which are drawn on a rich history of bipartisan cooperation. The first I would commend to everyone in terms of attention is the Education Land Grant Act of 1997, a bill I developed for those rural school districts that live adjacent to federally controlled land.

It is based on what happened in the Sixth District of Arizona in the 104th Congress, where the small town of Alpine, Arizona did not really have any resources to build a new school. Its tax base had been eviscerated because the folks there were not really allowed to ranch or to harvest timber any longer because of some court orders. So they came to me and said, "Do you think we could get a conveyance of 30 acres of Forest Service land, so that we could save what scarce resources we have on books and bricks and mortar and teachers and students and building a new school?" I was pleased that during the 104th Congress we passed a conveyance of land of 30 acres to the Alpine School District.

I got to thinking, based on our history, is there something else we could do. I looked back to the Morrill Act of the 1800s during the Lincoln administration where through land grant opportunities, Federal land was given back to the States for the creation of institutions of higher learning. Out of that grew the notion of the Education Land Grant Act where we can go and convey acres, up to 30 acres at a time to those school districts adjacent to Federal lands, so that they can save their precious resources for school construction and for improving the quality of instruction within those schools.

I would commend that to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. And also a bipartisan bill I coauthored and cosponsored with my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS]. We do not agree on a lot, but one thing that we think is important has to do with mathematics rather than philosophy. It is the notion of raising the ceiling for private bonding authority for local school districts working with banks and financial houses that are private.

□ 2045

Right now Congress has a ceiling of \$10 million there. When we checked, we have seen that banks and other financial houses say we can raise that level to \$25 million with no problem whatsoever and that can help school districts across the country as well.

One other note on the Education Land Grant Act, or as some have come to calling it, with an acronym, HELGA, the Hayworth Education Land

Grant Act, we should stipulate, Mr. Speaker, that the lands we are talking about are not Park Service lands nor wildlife refuges. Those areas would not be available for conveyance to local school districts. But so much other land is federally controlled from coast to coast, and specifically in the American West, that there is a variety of land that could be available that is not Park Service land nor wildlife refuges that could make a real difference for many different school districts.

So I am pleased to join my friend from Indiana, and based on what we heard in the previous hour, in offering other approaches to education, which we believe may be more practical and certainly can have profound effects for all congressional districts, for all school districts from coast to coast.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in joining my friend from Indiana if we were to neglect the reason we are primarily here tonight, and it is something as basic as education and, indeed, one of the first things we learn, and that is the notion of what is right and what is wrong. And, sadly, recent events in Washington force us, really compel us to come to this floor to discuss inaccuracies, discrepancies and what, sadly, may in fact be widespread breaking of laws.

I yield to my colleague from Indiana, because I know in his role on the committee overseeing this, he has had firsthand experience on this legislative day.

Mr. SOUDER. And it is important to note, because people may get confused sometimes in these special orders when we, some of us in particular, have been trying to point out some of these problems that have developed in basic justice in this country and abuse of the political process, it does not mean we are not doing lots of other things. I also serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. It was my first choice. For 4 years in the House and for 4½ years as a Senate staffer, my first focus was children and family issues. I was Republican staff director of the Children-Family Committee; worked on many of these issues, and worked on them with Senator COATS in the Senate.

I have a deeply held conviction of the importance of education in the system, and I get tired of hearing we do not care about public schools. My kids have gone through public schools, I went through public schools, my wife went through public schools, and that is an important issue to us. But I am also on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and we have also seen a perversion of our political process.

I wanted to, first, on the eve of an important day, because tomorrow the House investigation begins on the abuses in the political process, and particularly the campaign process, I would like to sketch a little background. I know the hearings that we held today, where we gave our opening statements,

will probably be aired later tonight if not later this week, and then tomorrow we have our first witnesses in the House investigation, but I wanted to put a little bit of context into what we are doing and how this developed.

I want to start with a little bit different spin. A man named Dick Morris, who has become relatively infamous around the United States, has written a book. While it may not be the most interesting book that has ever been written, and quite frankly is a little bit self-serving, as many of these type of books are, nevertheless gives us some very interesting insights as to how the political process can become corrupted.

Let me give my colleague a brief book synopsis that really outlines how we got to what has been happening since we came into Congress. And that was, basically, in 1994, after the election that brought the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] here, brought me here, the President was in deep trouble. Much like happened in Arkansas when he was defeated after one term as Governor, he realized he needed to change his strategy, and he brought Dick Morris back.

One thing Dick Morris suggested, and he writes about it, and he writes about it proudly, was they needed to have a permanent campaign. An interesting thing happens when are going to have a permanent campaign. It means one has to have a permanent fundraising operation. And early money is hard to raise, so one has to go to some places that may or may not be quite as up front and a little different, plus there is the need for huge quantities of this money.

They wanted to run ads in the district of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] from day one, pounding him, from the time he got elected until his reelection came up. They wanted ads running while we were in this government shutdown debate trying to spin to the American public. Quite frankly, our side sat back and waited until the election.

In this process, a man named Harold Ickes, Jr., it is clear in Morris' book, and some is not as clear in the book, Ickes and Morris fought when they were in New York City growing up. Because Harold Ickes is most liberal he has been committed to the liberal cause. Dick Morris is committed to the latest poll. It is not that he does not have some convictions of his own, but his convictions are a little movable and he is willing to try to win elections first.

Harold Ickes did not like that and he found himself getting cut out of the process from the White House. It is documented in other places too, but Morris more or less ignores him in the first part of the book. Then an amazing thing happens. Harold Ickes, whose memos, quite frankly, have been very important in this, because he had some with the President's initials on them and Mrs. Clinton's initials on them, Harold Ickes was suddenly brought in

and Morris delineates why: Through praise. He praises him for his fund-raising efforts and how much money he has been able to bring in.

And Ickes got access in the decision-making process of the White House by being the point person with the outside in how the money came into the system. This is documented by the memos he left the White House with.

So Morris takes over and takes it in a polling direction. So we get things like welfare reform, that Ickes did not like, and the liberal Democrats did not like. Ickes gets back into the process through fund-raising.

Interestingly, also, the Vice President of the United States is praised repeatedly in this book for his wonderful efforts in fundraising.

Now, in the book there is no indications there was illegal fund-raising, but that gives us the ideas of the pressures in the system that were occurring that lead to the dramatic fund-raising abuses. And that has not really been laid out exactly why did this happen and what was different and why were there such massive amounts of money. It was because they decided to do a permanent campaign.

But some of this actually started earlier. In the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, from the time we took over and we started to investigate, we heard there was this problem in the Travel Office. And we started looking at the Travel Office and we wondered, well, why is this person walking around the White House without a security clearance? Why is this person walking around? Why are the Thomasons involved in such a little thing? Because it did not seem that many dollars. And even though they owned the travel agency, why were they involved in this?

And as it evolved, we discovered they were trying to get the travel budget elsewhere; that there was this person over here who was a girlfriend or boyfriend of this person and there was a Clinton distant cousin over here. And we started to see the pattern we are now seeing in full bloom a couple years later. So as we were investigating the Travel Office, we started to check on where did these security clearances come from.

The next thing we know we turn up the FBI files case, because we start saying how did they get these clearances. Hey, some of these names, they do not have any business having. These people are Republicans. They have not been in this administration. John Towers is dead, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If my colleague from Indiana would yield for just a second, if I am fully cognizant of the reports and our recent history, we are not talking about a few files. We are not talking about a dozen files. Could the gentleman from Indiana provide for the record how many files are we talking about?

Mr. SOUDER. We honestly do not know. We know there were at least 200,

then 400. It appears there were at least 800. Chuck Colson went to prison after the Nixon administration for showing one.

We documented that interns had them, that multiple people had them. We know they were out there. What has not been documented yet is whether they have been abused. But merely having people's secret files, with any allegations, raw allegations, unproven allegations are in these files.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Indeed, to draw the proper analogy, and I thank my colleague from Indiana for yielding, but it would seem to me these FBI files contain very personal information. And it would be akin to someone, a pickpocket, having hundreds of wallets that he had purloined from different folks. Now, maybe the pickpocket never used the credit cards in the wallet, maybe the pickpocket never took the currency out of the wallet to spend, but yet that wallet, something very close to someone, personal possessions, were taken away and in the possession of someone else who could have used that information, that currency, if you will, in this information age, in a very disparaging way.

Sadly, again, it seems that was another example of some folks in the executive branch running roughshod over constitutional rights and, indeed, our traditions of law in this country.

Mr. SOUDER. And to take the gentleman's analogy further, in addition to, in effect, pickpocketing people's billfolds and private things that were official and on record, this is not a matter of FBI files where they just have whether an individual has been picked up for a parking ticket or where they went to college. These are when an individual applies for a secure government job and they go try to find out what anybody says about them.

So there are raw unedited transcripts of if somebody says I saw him at dinner somewhere and he was having an affair. I saw him at a gay bar one time. I heard that he beats his kids. These things are in those files and individuals do not even know they are in their files, and yet we have kids, we had all sorts of people walking around with these.

The question comes, were they potential blackmail files for people who were holdover, or for people who they had to do business with outside, or for, quite frankly, staff members who used to work in the administration and came over. We do not know, and that is still unanswered.

But as we moved through this, we turned up Craig Livingstone, and he was in charge of White House security and the files, along with Anthony Marceca, who had been kicked out of different campaigns for multiple questions, had had various problems in their lives. The question was who hired these people? Craig Livingstone would not say who hired him. The attorneys would not say who hired him. They said maybe Vince Foster did, which

was always the convenient answer. It was always the dead guy when we tried to get an answer.

But then we found out they had a data bank. And from the files investigation we turned up they had this data bank. And as we looked at the data bank, they had these piles of documents with little codes on them. And we found out that the codes were amounts of money that the people gave, and they had a code so they could know at the White House how much money these people gave. And that was the codes for coffees and Lincoln bedroom. And that is how we evolved into the coffees and the Lincoln bedroom question.

So this has been an unfolding process as we go through this, and we are now seeing the last phase of this, which is the foreign money, in what appears to be at least on the surface. And we are trying to get the evidence, and that is the purpose of these hearings, of were we penetrated by foreign governments? Was national security compromised? Did they make land deals or other government decisions based on who was at the Lincoln bedroom; based on who was at a coffee? Because we have seen this pattern.

And I want to relate two other things that make us extra suspicious. The American people are generous people, and they will give people the benefit of the doubt, but we have seen a repetitive pattern of stonewalling through all these investigations. And every one we get into, there is this excuse as to why they cannot give us the information of why this person has fled overseas. Sixty witnesses pleading the Fifth Amendment. Twenty-five so far have fled overseas. They always have an excuse.

I also happen to have, for a variety of reasons, chaired two investigations of the INS. I, quite frankly, and bluntly, was reluctant, because the chairman was not here at that point. Mr. Zeff, who had led much of this, decided to run for governor of New Hampshire, and I wound up chairing the subcommittee.

But I was reluctant, because I was afraid that in investigating these things would be perceived as anti-Hispanic. But at some point the truth just stares us in the face. We saw the piles of documents that civil servants, many of them Democrats, were bringing in bundles of tests, citizenship tests filled out in the same pencil, in the same handwriting; there are people coming in and saying we had eight boxes of applications that never had a background check; and we watched and heard these people say that the deadline was the voter registration deadline.

The deadline was not to try to get people in. We wanted legal aliens to become citizens. And out of the 1.1 million who came in, at least a million were completely legitimate. But it appears that up to 100,000 were not. We had rapists. We had all sorts of people brought in because of the pressure to

get the voters registered for an election, which ties in with Morris' whole scenario.

So we already have the public acknowledgment that the INS has fired people and cleaned up their process, and are working hard to do this, but the INS clearly violated the law.

Now, interestingly, Mr. Zeff and, then full committee chairman, Mr. Clinger, were pursuing another category. In this other category was the White House communications agency. I wound up at that hearing as well and chaired part of the hearing, and found it, quite frankly, one of the more boring hearings I have been to. I confess that not everything we do here is interesting, even when we pretend it is interesting.

We heard GAO tell us that the White House Communications Office had major reporting problems; that it was funded under the Department of Defense, and the Department of Defense was accountable, but the political people at the White House, because usually they had a fairly low to mid level defense person over there, was being pressured by White House high ranking political people. And we, in particular, were looking at a major waste of a huge broadcast system they had purchased with a high percentage of their budget that then they could not get on one plane so they were not using it.

Also came out charges of a variety of different things that they were looking at.

□ 2100

One the charges of this office that we said could easily be abused, that GAO said could be abused, that we were holding a hearing on, one of their charges was to videotape key events at the White House.

As of last night, the media started to ask questions, because we turned in fraud potential in this office a year and a half ago, and it is clear in the process not only has this committee, full committee, been requesting tapes and they only turned up yesterday edited, but these tapes, we had a hearing where we were investigating this agency and they did not come up. And then when the tapes come up, it is, "Sorry, the audio is missing."

Some people did not seem to have read Watergate. And that is, when there is a missing 14½ minute gap in Rosemary Woods' transcript at a very key point, people jump to logical conclusions. And when the tapes come back without the audio in the part where the allegations have been that there was fund-raising, we have doubts.

One of the things I went to this chairman of this subcommittee today to follow up on is, I think we need immediate hearings in this subcommittee that is already investigated, on top of the hearings from Chairman Burton that are starting, and say, "Okay, who filmed the stuff, the stuff that was played on C-Span the other night that was clearly edited? Where is the full

tape? Did you doctor these tapes? What happened to the audio of these tapes? Who did this? Who authorized you to do this?"

This is shocking, that they went through and did this and abused a Defense Department agency, which we had already been warning about, that they had potential fraud in the way that they were setting it up.

As the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] knows, I am on the same committee with the gentleman that is looking into this issue, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, and was there for the opening statements today.

My colleague raised some serious points about this issue of the tapes. I just want to bring a little levity here because, quite frankly, there are parts of this thing that I find incredibly humorous. Let me just kind of walk through it.

The tapes the gentleman has been referring to are videotapes of the so-called coffees that the White House conducted, where they invited in these individuals, most of them, coincidentally, major donors to the Democrat party and of the White House and of the President, but maintained, and had maintained for months now, that these were not fund-raisers, "Look, these are reasonable and legitimate, and we are having nice discussions, but they were not fund-raisers."

What I find humorous about it is a couple of different things that reveal how we got the revelation of these tapes. For example, when the White House, first in response to our committee's subpoena, searched for the names of the individuals we knew had attended those coffees, according to press reports, and I am quoting here from George Lardner, Junior's Washington Post story the day before yesterday, they searched for those individuals' names, the White House database came up empty.

As a matter of fact, they could not find anything on those individuals in the White House database. So they said, what we really should do is search under the name "coffees." And, in fact, they did come up with what they call, I think it is a total of 44 hits, under the name "coffees," and that is how we led to the discovery of these tapes. They only bothered to wait from March, when we subpoenaed this information, until, we are in October, are we not? until October to decide, well, let us look under "coffees."

But the fascinating thing is that in Mr. Lardner's story, he goes beyond that and he says, guess what? Somebody had the bright idea of searching under "coffees" to look under "DNC." What is "DNC"? Democratic National Committee. And to look under "fund-raiser."

Now, I do not know why they would look under "DNC" or "fund-raiser," because, as we all know and as the American people have already come to believe in their heart and soul, these

were not DNC fund-raisers. And yet the curious thing is, when they did search that same White House computer database under "DNC" or "DNC fundraiser," they did not get 44 hits, they got 150 hits.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, people who put that in there never would have acknowledged it in their own computer system.

Mr. SHADEGG. After all, the White House spin machine has been running around the clock to spin this thing as coffees, get-togethers.

What did my colleague say the other night? What is the coffee shop, prominent coffee shop?

Mr. SOUDER. Starbuck's.

Mr. SHADEGG. This is Starbuck's on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. SOUDER. Only a lot more expensive.

Mr. SHADEGG. Only a lot more expensive. And the fascinating thing is, well, all 44 coffees also happened to be hit under the same computer system for DNC fund-raisers.

Now, let me see, the White House spin machine has been saying these were not fund-raisers, "We were not using public property for fund-raisers." But when they searched DNC fund-raisers, the same 44 turned up. And we know that. Now, what is the difference between 44 and 150? There are 106 others out there that we do not know anything about. I find it absolutely fascinating and tremendously humorous.

But there is one more point in all of this that I want to bring out. When this came out, I happened to be in Arizona en route back to Washington when I first heard this story of the tapes released: "White House releases tapes of White House coffees," not fund-raisers, even though the White House itself in their own computer called them DNC fund-raisers. But when the tapes came out, the national news reporter I heard on this radio story said, "But they do not show any breaking of the law; they actually back up the President's story."

I kind of listened to that for a minute. Then I got here, and I happened to see the tapes the other night. There are fascinating things in the tapes; for example, the missing gap of time. Rosemary Woods surfaces again, and there is, you know, a human gap. Now it just so happens that the gap appears on the one tape where we see none other than John Huang. It is kind of, huh, I wonder how that happened.

Mr. SOUDER. Coincidence. We are jumping to conclusions.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mere coincidence. We are leaping to conclusions. "These were clearly not fund-raisers." They will call them fund-raisers in their database, but that was a goof.

Mr. SOUDER. They had to have some way to distinguish it from other coffees.

Mr. SHADEGG. Of course.

But one last point I want to make on this that is also humorous is that while the news spin was that these were, in

fact, clearly not fund-raisers, and indeed nothing in the tape shows the President saying, "give me the money," that is true, it is not there, what is there is the understanding of the people who attended.

The understanding of the people who attended is quite clearly shown on a tape for which they accidentally released the audio. And you know what it is? It is this gentleman in the audience saying, "Hey, I got the checks. I got the checks."

As a matter of fact, the White House spin is, "Well, these were not fund-raisers because the DNC official in the room turned the checks down." Now, I mean, I am certain this is one lost soul who happened to make it to these coffees and had the mistaken notion that he should be offering up these five checks. Clearly, he was a mistaken soul.

The fact that there was a DNC official who said, "Wait until later; wait until later," I am certain these were not fund-raisers. Thank goodness the White House has come forward.

The last point I want to make: Because the White House has been so incredibly forthcoming, I am certain that within minutes of when we discover there are over 150 events, take away the 44, 106 events, the White House will be forthcoming. They will give us all the tapes of those events, computer records, all the lists of people identified; they had never stalled or delayed in any way of providing information; they have never stonewalled or failed to respond to a subpoena until we threatened contempt. I am certain that within minutes the President himself is going to run down here and say, "Here is everything."

As a matter of fact, in this morning's paper, the President said, "Well, they have the evidence." The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], pointed out they do not have the evidence. They, in fact, stonewalled. But I am sure it is just a glitch.

Mr. SOUDER. The key thing is, as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] knows, he is an attorney, what we need to do is check out the statute of limitations on a lot of these things.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman would yield again, I understand. Now they will surface the day after the statute of limitations. How foolish of me.

Mr. SOUDER. What a pattern.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER]. And I am very pleased that we are joined by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], because he has distinguished himself in the legal profession as he distinguishes his work here in this body.

I would simply offer one different take on one aspect, because I know my colleague is laughing to keep from crying, because none of this should bring us joy.

It is one thing to have political differences with folks and to have philo-

sophical discussions. In a free society, we champion that. The problem now is a pattern, as my colleague said tongue in cheek, that is really not coincidence, that seems to be a habitual pattern of lawbreaking.

I thought it was very important when he mentioned the videotapes and how they had obviously been edited and when my colleague mentioned the lone, soundless tape.

Let me read today from the Omaha World Herald on this point. Quoting now the Omaha World Herald, "The lone, soundless tape in Clinton's collection is one of the potentially more important videotapes made. It shows DNC fundraiser John Huang introducing the President at a coffee on June 18, 1996. A Johns Hopkins University professor has testified that Huang said, 'Elections cost money, lots and lots of money. And I am sure that every person in this room will want to support the re-election of President Clinton.'"

Mr. SOUDER. This is the part that is missing.

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is the audio that is missing, according to the testimony of a professor from Johns Hopkins University.

What is also fascinating, and my colleagues have distinguished themselves, I believe, in these special orders where they have helped to inform the American people, but I want to call on my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], for some free legal advice here in the people's House, and it has to do with some other things we have heard now dealing with these issues, because there are some at the White House, some attorneys there, who tell us that if a law is an old law, it should not count any longer.

I refer specifically to the Pindleton Act. Let me ask my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], has he ever seen a situation where a cogent, logical defense is, a law is old, therefore, it should not be observed?

Mr. SHADEGG. Well, certainly I have not. Indeed, perhaps the first laws enacted in the world are laws against murder, therefore the oldest, certainly laws we ought to respect before any other. The notion that an old law is due less deference than a new one is, on its face, absurd. Actually, the existence of a law for a long period of time establishes that it truly embodies the consensus of the society.

Clearly, these are searched-for excuses by the White House to try to get out from under what they have done.

A fascinating parallel is the line, "Everybody else does it." Another one is, "Well, we certainly thought we were complying with the law."

I love that one with regard to the issue of phone calls by the President himself from the White House, because if my colleagues recall the sequence of events, his first story on phone calls from the White House was, "I don't recall making any." And then his second story some several weeks later was, "Well, I know that at the time we did

this, whatever it is we did, we believed we were complying with the law."

Now, spare me, and maybe my colleagues can help with this. I have problem with the logic that says, "I do not remember doing it, but if I did it, I remember that I thought I was complying with the law." That one is tough for me.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And even more astounding, as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] will acknowledge, even more astounding was the explanation that we heard from the Vice President of the United States, who stood before a gathering of the press and said that he was proud of his actions but, from that day forward, he would not repeat them.

And he developed for that press conference one of the most infamous phrases that I believe has been hoisted upon the American people, because the Vice President of the United States, the man who, if circumstance and tragedy struck, would be elevated to this Nation's highest office, the Vice President of the United States said, "There is no controlling legal authority that pertains to my conduct."

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, and those who join us through the miracle of television, coast to coast and around the world, ponder those words, because words mean something.

For the Vice President of the United States to presume and to protest that there is no controlling legal authority can only lead us to conclude, sadly, that the Vice President of the United States believes himself to be above the law, believes his conduct, which is and has been and is suspected of being illegal in this regard, somehow should result in no sanction, somehow should result in no punishment, but instead should be blithely dismissed as just one of those things, because as my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], to paraphrase so many who work in the fourth estate here in Washington in the news rooms here so eager to explain things, so eager to change the agenda for our Nation, as they try to say, "Everybody does it."

□ 2115

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on the record tonight with my colleagues here to protest that notion; to say most certainly, not everyone does it. Indeed, when we came to this Chamber, when we started to help change the way Washington works, one of the first things we were taught was that these offices are government offices provided by the taxpayers, belonging to the taxpayers and our constituents; they are not to be used in any way, shape, fashion or form, for fund-raising.

This is an elemental lesson in the education of a public servant in this role in the people's House, in the other Chamber, and dare I say at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. This is one of the first things we are told and we are taught, and sadly, there are

some who have ignored the lesson, some who would presume that they are above the law because they claim there is no controlling legal authority. How tragic, how shameful that utterance truly is.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, clearly the Vice President of the United States first was warned by the legal counsel in a memo that has been circulated all over the country in newspapers. He was a Member of this body in the House and knew that we could not do it. Then he was a Member of the other body, the Senate, and told that he could not do it. He has no excuse. We are tired of hearing these kinds of excuses.

The gentleman read earlier from the Omaha World Herald, and in Hotline today, now admittedly, these are audio only; I do not have any video, and also, I only have highlights from some of these editorials. But if I was at the White House, I would not complain about me editing. They are not in a real strong position here.

But I want to show the reaction around the country and express my disappointment with, quite frankly, a lot of members in the other party for not agreeing to speak up. As my colleagues will see if they watch C-SPAN and the upcoming opening statements of the members of this committee, there were a lot of excuses and a lot of dancing around about how everybody does it, which, A, is not true; how we ought to be investigating Congress, which we have no jurisdiction over, we are an oversight committee on the White House and the executive branch. Our duty is to look into misconduct. That is what our committee's charge is to do and we are going to do that.

Back in the days of the Grant administration when they looked into the Credit Mobilier scandal, they did not say well, Philmore did it; well, so-and-so did it before. They looked at the scandal that was in front of them.

Back in the days of the Teapot Dome, the excuses were not, oh, other people did it. They looked into the scandal of Teapot Dome. Quite frankly, in Watergate, some, including myself, initially felt they were picking on Nixon, but we had the courage to say as it unfolded, what he did was wrong, what the Vice President did was wrong, and that we did not say, look, because Lyndon Johnson bugged Barry Goldwater's room and because Lyndon Johnson covered up, therefore, Nixon should not be kicked out of office just because Johnson did it.

First off, we have not established that other people did what Clinton did. Particularly we are looking at all these scandals put together in one administration. But it is no defense, and when is the other party going to start to step forward?

I want to read these newspapers and show that newspapers around the country have come to this conclusion. Where are the members of the other party?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to make the point, and I thank my colleague from Indiana for yielding, because he makes the point that I can recall many of the arguments as I was coming through school, as my colleague from Indiana was, in the wake of the Watergate scandal. And I do wish that many on the other side of the aisle would heed the words of the late Democratic Senator from North Carolina, Sam J. Ervin, who said in response to those types of protestations, well, does that make it right?

Are we to ignore it in this situation because it may have gone on before? That is the type of selective analysis that is akin to saying that if a traffic cop pulls me over and I try to say, "Well, everyone else is speeding," is the traffic cop simply supposed to say "Well, you are right, so I will let you go on your merry way." No, of course not.

By definition, it is going to be selective, but how I wish that others would speak up and remember those words of Senator Ervin: Just because it happened before and perhaps was not prosecuted or investigated, does that dismiss the current problem? Of course it does not.

Again, it brings us no joy to do this, but it is a sad tale of woe that goes to the very fabric of our constitutional republic, and to ignore these problems, these discrepancies, these misdeeds would be to do our country a grave disservice.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I know this will take a couple of minutes, but I want to show how overwhelming public reaction has been around the country.

New Mexico, Albuquerque Journal: "The administration could save itself considerable trouble and criticism if only it learned to be candid."

Georgia, Augusta Chronicle: "It's time for Congress to start drawing up articles of impeachment against Reno. She is open to charges to both conflict of interest and incompetence. It's time to get rid of the worst Attorney General in the Nation's history."

Alabama, Birmingham News: "Apparently, Ms. Reno believes she must have photographs of illegal transactions taking place before she can proceed with a special investigation. Perhaps the videotapes of the coffees and other fund-raising functions at the White House will give her what she's looking for."

New York, Buffalo News: "President Clinton can insist that no money changed hands and no policies changed at all when he schmoozed with donors in White House receptions caught on videotape. But the reality is that the public is entitled to suspect the worst."

West Virginia, Charleston Post and Courier: "Clearly the White House is not cooperating fully with Ms. Reno's probe. That puts her in an impossible bind. The sooner Ms. Reno hands off this investigation to an independent

counsel, the better it will be for her and for the reputation of the Justice Department, which is sinking fast."

Ohio, Cleveland Plain Dealer: "If the failure to reveal these tapes to the congressional investigative committees isn't obstruction of justice, it's far from the 'full cooperation' the President and his men keep claiming."

Texas, Corpus Christi Caller-Times: "The President's team is either spectacularly inept or willfully obstructionist."

Michigan, Detroit Free Press: "Janet Reno is part of the problem, not part of the solution."

Indiana, my hometown, Fort Wayne Journal Gazette, another Democratic paper, which many of these have been: "You hear no claims of executive privilege this time. No excuses about controlling legal authority. No accusations that the Republicans did it, too."

New York, Long Island Newsday: "The tapes made Reno look clueless in denying once again the need for an independent counsel."

New Hampshire, Manchester Union Leader: "Of course only the Clintonoids know whether these tapes, under subpoena for six months, were tampered with, altered or edited. Only the Clintonoids know whether these are all of the tapes or whether there were others of a more incriminating nature that have since disappeared. And so it goes in the Clinton kleptocracy."

New York Times, New York: "Justice has been conducted in a slipshod investigation."

We already heard from Nebraska and the Omaha World Herald.

Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Inquirer: "Janet Reno needs to get her head out of the sand, tune in to the conflict-of-interest problem, and hand these allegations over to a preeminent lawyer free of political pressure."

Oregon, Portland Press Herald: "Only an independent special prosecutor can bring the credibility needed to determine whether the President and Vice President of the United States violated the law."

Missouri, St. Louis Post Dispatch: "Ms. Reno should seek a special prosecutor for the Clinton-Gore telephone solicitations and ask the prosecutor to investigate the other White House fund-raising investigations as well."

Now, once again, these are not Republican conservative papers.

Minnesota, St. Paul Pioneer Press: "No more than Richard Nixon could 'circle the wagons' during Watergate can a modern White House keep 'losing' documentation of its actions and hold onto its credibility."

California, San Diego Union Tribune: "The Justice Department's investigation of possible White House campaign finance violations has lost all credibility."

California, San Francisco Chronicle: "The long-sought videotapes may show nothing incriminating, but the Clinton administration's history of stonewall-

ing, delay and obfuscation only add to the public perception that an independent counsel is needed to finally untangle the mess and find the truth."

California Stockton Record: "President Nixon had to resort to the infamous Saturday Night Massacre to get the Justice Department to his political bidding, and it ultimately failed. Reno's Justice Department is just rolling over and playing dead."

Washington Post: "The attitude of this White House toward the truth whenever it is in trouble is the same. Don't tell it, or tell only as much of it as you absolutely must, or as helps."

Washington Times: "There has been so much obstructionism in document and evidence production that only someone as naive as Attorney General Janet Reno could believe that it hasn't been intentional."

Kansas, Wichita Eagle: "Many Americans and most Republican lawmakers doubt whether Ms. Reno, a Clinton appointee, has conducted a thorough and honest investigation. And who can blame them?"

North Carolina, Winston-Salem Journal: "The lesson the White House keeps failing to learn is that any attempt at a cover-up usually makes matters worse."

This is overwhelming, from nearly every part of the country, and this is just a sampling, of liberal press for the most part, some conservatives, saying this is outrageous.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I commend the gentleman from Indiana for bringing that information forward. I must say as I stood here I was shocked to listen to that. I had no idea that the editorials across the country and the editorial page editors were that unanimous.

I do want to point out the significance of this particular point the gentleman is raising right now. In any free society, we can only survive if people, largely voluntarily, choose to comply with the law. That is, in a democracy, the success or failure of that democracy is dependent upon respect for the law and respect for the government that creates that law.

It seems to me that it is absolutely patently clear that Janet Reno is not only not doing her job and covering up and rolling over and playing dead, but most importantly, in not doing her job, in covering up, in rolling over and playing dead, in, for example, ruling as recently as this weekend that the Justice Department for the 18th time was going to refuse to open an investigation or authorize a special prosecutor for the President because he had done nothing wrong; moments, literally moments before the White House released these tapes, her conduct, I would suggest, is eating away at the most fundamental aspect of what our society depends upon, and that is faith and credit by the American people in the integrity of this government.

If she continues to cover up for him and to not be forthcoming and to not

acknowledge the flagrant conflict of interest she has, and to refuse to recognize the evidence that is staring her in the face, she is helping to destroy the faith that the American people need to have in this government if we are to survive as a Nation.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about a couple of actual cases and refer to something else as people look at the opening statements today, and I want people to remember all of these editorials around the country and the universal outrage, and then watch the kind of creative excuses that people come up with here in Washington to defend why they are not speaking out. I believe that eventually we will have more and more Members on the other side, like there were Republicans, say, "I cannot defend this any more. This is too humiliating. This is undermining the core of our system."

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for joining us here tonight, and the American people.

What my friend from Indiana has pointed out from newspapers, both liberal and conservative, is tantamount to a litany of shame. What is even more compelling and even more difficult are some reports we hear that perhaps White House attorneys met with the Attorney General on Wednesday night, perhaps those people even had knowledge of those tapes and they did not share that knowledge with the Attorney General. Very, very disturbing and serious questions need to be answered.

I would simply point out to those who would wrap themselves in that rather infamous excuse of no controlling legal authority that yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a controlling legal authority. It is called the Constitution of the United States, which gives this body and the other body in the legislative branch oversight ability to check on allegations and to deal with these growing concerns, and it is the role of the people's House and the other body here in the Capitol to exercise that oversight, because our constitutional Republic and those who live in it can demand nothing less.

□ 2130

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I had a series of pictures, but I want to use this to illustrate another point. This is a picture of the Vice President with Jorge Cabrera. I want to go through this case to illustrate that the things that we are going to hear tomorrow in our first House hearing are not isolated. There are so many that the Senate has already done, that we have pending, it is overwhelming.

I want to go through this case to illustrate several points. The Vice President has been a good student of President Clinton's in more ways than one in fundraising. He attended a fundraiser in Florida for 60 wealthy contributors. One of the attendees was

Jorge Cabrera, a drug trafficker with links to a Colombian cartel, and Dr. Joseph Douze, a fugitive who once blew up a bridge. The host for the evening was Jerome "Jerry" Berlin. He was indicted in 1990 and later acquitted on Federal conspiracy charges of bribing public officials. One of the politicians allegedly targeted in that charge was 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 I was the only honest person in the room. To be fair, a Gore spokeswoman pointed out that the Vice President was disappointed to learn that his picture had been taken with a longtime drug dealer. This is my favorite quote so far of the whole investigation. "He never wants to be associated with people who break the law." That probably makes for real interesting cabinet meetings.

Some of the same donors at the fundraiser later received personal greetings from President Clinton and the First Lady. Only days later the Cali-connected Cabrera was sipping eggnog at the White House at a Christmas party. Cabrera, who gave \$20,000 to the DNC, was later sentenced to 19 years in prison for helping to import 6,000 pounds of Colombian cocaine. He was indicted, mind you, when he was going to all of these fundraisers.

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

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 reception. An invitation to the White House Christmas party was also sent to Dr. Douze, who the government had confiscated his passport, another branch of the government had taken his passport, yet this man was at the Christmas party, and they restricted his travel after his arrest on 11 counts of Federal mail fraud and conspiracy. The Federal judge denied his 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. He has not returned from Haiti since. How does this happen? They let it.

Rule number one is follow the current law. The moral equivalency crowd is saying everybody does it. No, not everybody does. Everybody does not take pictures with drug dealers who have already been convicted or fugitives or swindlers. This happens when cash and

contributions guide, and as I said at the beginning, when your driving force is you have to have money to hold your power, and your goal is to get power in Washington, and then you start chasing the almighty dollar, pretty soon you make mistakes like this.

What we are going to see in the hearing, in the opening statements today, as one Member of Congress said, we are applying guilt by showing fuzzy pictures, because this makes the Vice President look seedy and this Cali cartel person look seedy.

Do Members know what? If I call up Vice President GORE and say, will you give me a fresh color picture of you posing with that member of the Cali Colombian cartel, I do not think he is going to give it to me. The only way I can get a picture is to get it out of a newspaper.

I did not deliberately make this picture fuzzy, just like we do not make the pictures at our committee fuzzy. But the White House does not want to give us pictures of them posing with John Huang. They do not even want to have videotapes with audio on them being with John Huang. They do not want to give us pictures with John Chung. They do not want to give us pictures with the swindler who bilked new Americans coming into our country in one of the biggest credit card scams.

So the picture tends to be a little fuzzy. But Members know what? Part of the problem here is not that we are making them look like violators of the law, they are. If you pose with drug dealers, there is not a whole lot you can do to clean up the picture, because you are posing with a drug dealer. It is particularly disappointing that in the background checks of this administration, that they have been so sloppy in doing that.

I hope that Members will watch as we go through the hearing process and as we try to bring some of these points out. This is very difficult. I realize a lot of people think it is partisan, but our democracy is at stake. If money can buy this much influence across the board, if agencies can be corrupted, if our national security can be at risk, that is what we are trying to find out. If we do not find it, the President will get off free. If we do not find it, the Vice President will be fine.

But our job as Members of the United States Congress is to look into what appears to be repeated across-the-board types of that, and we need the White House to start cooperating and the Attorney General to start cooperating.

I agreed to lend the last few minutes of this special order time to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG]. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], too, for his great efforts, not only tonight but at other times, because there is another matter pending right now in conference committee on national testing, and earlier tonight the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] and I

were talking about education, as well as some of the Democratic Members. I thought that might be a fitting way to close here, too.

EDUCATION AND NATIONAL TESTING IN AMERICA

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. This is in fact a very important topic and a very timely topic. Indeed, the gentleman was just talking about how the campaign fundraising scandals are sadly partisan. This is one on which I would hope we could be mutually bipartisan. In fact, on the floor of this House within the last few weeks we voted, 290-plus Members voted to oppose national Federal school testing as proposed by President Clinton, a national test.

The Senate went a different route, and the Senate has proposed that we should allow national testing, but rather than allow the Federal Department of Education to write that test, they would be comfortable with letting what they claim is an independent body write the test.

In point of fact, when we last discussed this issue on the floor, my colleague from Indiana pointed out quite accurately that that so-called independent body would not in fact be independent, but would consist of people appointed by the President, be totally administration-dominated, and not be independent.

I have a passion about this issue, because I think it is one where many Americans, mainstream middle-class Americans, do not understand why some of us would be so vehemently opposed to testing; why we would stake out such a tough fight on this issue; why, indeed, we believe that if the provision in our bill that says there should be no national testing gets stripped, we are willing to fight, and fight, quite frankly to the death to put it back in.

But let me explain that. I am holding a series of columns which I want to mention tonight. This one, "National Exams Provide Few Benefits for Students," is written by Mark F. Bernstein. I do not know Mr. Bernstein, but he lays the first premise of this fight. He says, point blank, in a very bright and elucidating article, what is tested will be taught. Think of that. What is tested will be taught. That is the first plank in this argument.

The President has not come forward and said, I want to have a national curriculum or national standards. The reality is that if we have a national test written by the Federal Government in the Federal Department of Education, what is in that test will be taught to my daughter, Courtney, and to my son, Stephen, in Phoenix, AZ.

So once we get to that point, we have to say to ourselves, wow, the content of that test then becomes vitally important, because Courtney's teacher will want Courtney to know what is going to be on that test and she will teach it. And Stephen's teacher will want Stephen to know what they are going to

test, and that teacher will teach Stephen the information in that test. So what is tested will be taught.

Why should we be concerned about that? Well, many people say these are controversial topics, and some of these articles we have here tonight talk about the fact that when the Federal Government, for example, proposed history standards, those history standards were not what you and I would think about history. They painted a grim and gloomy view of America, of American and western civilization, ignoring many of our heroes and accomplishments and emphasizing our failings.

When the Federal Government proposed English and language art standards, they were so bad and considered such a muddle that the Clinton Department of Education threw them out. So the President came in and said, well, we will not test history, because that is subjective, and we will not test English and language, we will test math and science. Who can object to a uniform standard? How can my Arizonans oppose that?

The sad truth is as Lynne Cheney detailed in an article in the Wall Street Journal on September 29, there are national experts who believe that we should never teach children simple mathematics skills. Indeed, the expert is a man by the name of Steven Leinwand. He sits on President Clinton's committee to do this.

He says, it is downright dangerous to teach children mathematics skills. He wants to test my child on a national test so I can compare my children's performance to those of the children in New Jersey, but he says we should not teach them basic math skills. This is a battle which is going forward soon.

Lynne Cheney wrote another article, "The Latest Education Disaster, Whole Math." That is the kind of math where you do not teach children math skills such as addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Marianne Jennings wrote an article, "MTV Math Doesn't Add Up," pointing out how bad this is.

National testing is a potential disaster for the Nation because it would set one standard driven by the Federal Department of Education, and it is a standard that I think we ought to all be concerned about. I trust the people in Arizona, the Arizona education department, and the experts at my children's school board to make the right decisions about what we need to learn. National testing is scary and dangerous.

I urge America to listen up to this debate, and to join us in opposing the President, who may have a well-intended idea but an idea which would be disastrous.

FOOD SAFETY AND FAST-TRACK AUTHORITY FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

LET US GET ON WITH REAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and the country tonight. I could not help but overhear my colleagues who are talking about campaign finance, and the evilness they see about that. But I think it is time for us to stop talking about it and really get on with it.

We have a number of pieces of campaign finance legislation. I think we all know what the problems are with campaign finance, and we should really go at it and bring those bills to the House floor and actually address it. I think maybe this country and the integrity of this body could be better served in that manner and method.

I find it ironic that they would get up and rail about campaign finance, while it was the majority party here that caught a plane about 4 o'clock in the afternoon and takes corporate jets to go up to New York to raise funds. I think that is the soft money that causes problems in campaigns, and we have some bills like McCain-Feingold and the Shays-Meehan bill here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I wish we could get at it. We all know what the problem is. Let us cut the rhetoric and get on with the business of campaign finance. Unfortunately, that does not appear to be what is going to happen with majority party in control here in this Congress.

What I do want to talk about is something that is coming forward, something that should be discussed openly, and I hope that the American public joins with me. That is on food safety.

I sit on the Committee on Commerce, the Subcommittee on Health and Environment. We have been devoting some time there to the outbreak of E. coli and other problems throughout this country of our food supply. There is no greater security that a family can provide or the providers of that family provide for young people but to make sure that the food they serve each night is safe for their family's security.

Unfortunately, what we have seen here in the last few years in the U.S. Congress and across this Nation is that the food coming into this country, we have more and more imports of food coming into this country, and the safety of that food has been very questionable, to say the least.

What brings this issue to a head is recently the President came about 3 weeks ago to the Democratic Caucus and presented his legislation to outline his fast-track authority. Fast-track authority, of course, is to allow the President and his negotiators to enter into trade agreements. The trade agreements would then come before the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, and we do not have the opportunity to change, amend, or alter those trade agreements.

In those trade agreements, when we take a look, we can see many difficulties have developed in recent years. This new fast-track authority that the President is requesting is to actually increase our trade with the Caribbean nations and South American countries.

While that is admirable and something we would all like to do, we must ask ourselves, why are we increasing trade at this point in time when our economy is doing so well, and what is the rush to enter into another trade agreement, especially when we take a look at it, and the trade deficit in this country is so high, and every year it continues to go up?

Every President, be it Democrat or Republican, has come to the White House and has said, we are going to cut down on this trade deficit. Well, it has never happened. We have had fast-track legislation for the past five Presidents. That includes President Clinton, President Bush, President Reagan, President Carter, President Ford, and the trade deficit continues to spiral out of control.

Our economy is doing so well, but yet we seem to be in this hurry to fast-track into another trade agreement. We must ask ourselves, why are we doing this? Why are we doing this? What is the rush to enter into another trade agreement? What is the rush to enter into another trade deficit that continues to go up?

When I came to Congress in 1993, January 1993, the issue then was the budget deficit. We have basically erased that budget deficit, but the other deficit, the trade deficit, continues to go up.

□ 2145

Our economy is growing, more jobs ever in this country, yet our trade deficit continues to spiral out of control.

So what is the rush to give the President more authority, authority to actually enter into more trade agreements which would actually lower our standards here in the United States, especially when we deal with food safety?

Mr. Speaker, that is where I would like to direct my comments here tonight. What is the rush to lower our standards, especially when it comes to food safety?

When I say lowering standards, understand the safety and security of our Nation's food supply has recently been in the news because of the contamination at the Hudson plant in Nebraska. And recently we had Beef America we have seen splash across our screens about E. coli.

If we take the Hudson plant situation in Nebraska, over 20 million pounds of beef was recalled by the company when it was determined that some of the meat was contaminated with the deadly E. coli virus. In response, Secretary of Agriculture Glickman wants more authority to inspect and take action against meat and poultry factories. I think that is probably a step in the right direction.