

not making cuts. Well, if the growth does not keep up with inflation how in the world are average senior citizens going to get quality care or the same level of services they get now?

Fourth, the GOP claims the Gingrich-Dole Medicare plan offers choices. In fact, they are taking away senior choices. Their plan will co-op senior citizens into managed care plans or HMO's, forcing them to give up their choice of doctors.

And lastly, I wanted to mention, Mr. Speaker, how the Gingrich-Dole plan differs from the Democratic alternatives. In addition to the steep cuts, the Gingrich-Dole plan makes radical structural changes to Medicare. For instance, it calls for steeper cuts to hospitals, compounded with extreme Medicaid cuts, and hospitals will simply close.

Additionally, the Gingrich-Dole plan will allow doctors remaining in the traditional Medicare to charge seniors more in out-of-pocket costs. The protection existing now when you go to the doctor, he cannot charge you more than 15 percent. That is gone. Now they can charge whatever they want.

And, last, concerning the controversial medical accounts, the MSA's, or I call them the wealthy-healthy accounts, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found any plan to incorporate the wealthy-healthy accounts will actually hasten Medicare's insolvency. It will cost the trustees over \$3 billion. That is certainly no way to save Medicare.

WHAT GENDER GAP? LIBERAL MEDIA SPIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], the former Governor of Colorado has been speaking over the weekend to the Perot party. He indicated he supported President Clinton in 1992 but he can no longer support President Clinton because the Democrats and the President are demagoging the issue on Medicare. There are indeed no cuts. In fact, the amount of money that is going to Medicare is going up every year; it is going up almost 7.3 percent.

That being said, Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about the gender gap and how women identify with this as a political issue. Now this gender gap is touted by the National Organization of Women as being in their favor. It is mentioned in the Presidential election that one candidate has a gender gap problem among voters. What does this all really mean?

Well, Concerned Women for America recently hired the Wirthlin Group to conduct a survey, which directly challenges the stereotypical view of the gender gap drawing women to the lib-

eral position on controversial social issues.

Its conducted survey found when asking their party affiliation, it did show 40 percent of the women out of this 1,000 people that they asked, 40 percent of the women identified themselves as Democrat, 29 percent as Republican and 25 percent as Independent. The Democrats appear to have an advantage because the gender gap assumes women voters hold liberal positions on many issues. This assumption would appear to create a risk for candidates who take a conservative position on issues.

In terms of political philosophy, however, 53 percent of all the women surveyed identified themselves as conservative; that is, women who identified themselves as Democrats were also identifying themselves as conservatives. This clearly shows party affiliation does not automatically translate into liberal ideology nor an outright rejection of conservatism.

While the NOW organization is often accepted as the standard position for women voters, this organization actually emphasizes the gender gap by promoting the notion that women's issues such as abortion are the sole determinant for women voters. Well, this is not true. Only 36 percent of the women surveyed have a formidable and favorable impression of NOW which portrays itself as a voice of American women.

The survey also found out that only 1 percent of women listing abortion as their key issue of all the issues. When asked about abortion, 55 percent of women were pro-life, contrasting the views of NOW who are strongly pro-abortion. An even larger majority, 66 percent, favor adoption for tax credit, using tax credits. These findings indeed support a gender gap in favor of conservative voters.

Women identified a decline in family values as the single most important issue. The NOW group proposes a generally liberal position with regard to family views, particularly dealing with homosexual rights and welfare reform. Welfare reform pits 66 percent of women against the views of liberals and the NOW group and in favor of reforms such as family caps.

The Wirthlin study depicts the gender gap as really not a gap at all. Rather, there has been a lack of effective leadership to articulate the conservative position to women. On abortion, adoption, family values, welfare reform, and homosexuality rights women are just frankly conservative and frankly share the Republican view. The media has played a large part in discouraging conservative candidates by concluding conservative social policies alienate women voters. This poll shows just the opposite, and what we have, frankly, Mr. Speaker, is a liberal spin on the issue of the gender gap.

Liberal politicians are already detecting this, though. They realize the conservative positions are the way to go and to promote ideas. Conservatives

during the Reagan era were able to attract millions of registered Democrat voters largely on the strength of Reagan's social conservatism. As conservative leaders, we have the ability to attract these voters, including these so-called women's issues. The gender gap is removed.

Mr. Speaker, the gender gap is a figment of the liberals and the media's imagination. For once the issues are clearly explained by the overwhelming majority of women today of all political persuasions accepting the conservative approach to abortion, adoption, family values, welfare reform, and homosexual rights. Today's women are basically conservative.

WHAT THE GENDER GAP IS ALL ABOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be following the prior gentleman onto the floor, because I want to talk a bit about the gender gap and how I think they still just do not get it.

America's women are engaging in a gender gap because they are very concerned that the Government does not understand what has happened to their families, and American women are very family based. That was the whole purpose of this Stand for Children organization this weekend, where hundreds of thousands of people and organizations came together to say things have changed so drastically for America's families, but the Government does not understand it, the corporations do not understand it, institutions do not understand it. And if we do not suddenly start understanding what this is about, we are looking at real disaster.

Let me just point out a bit why I think things have changed so much. I graduated from high school in 1958. I want to read to you what came from my high school book on home economics about how I should be a good wife.

No. 1, it said: When your husband comes home, have dinner ready. Plan ahead the night before a delicious meal. Men like to be fed right as they come through the door, and they will feel very comforted if they know that they can always count on that.

No. 2, prepare yourself at least 15 minutes before your husband is coming home. Be sure you are refreshed. Touch up your makeup, put a ribbon in your hair, clear away the clutter in the house, get the children cleaned up. Remember, they are little treasures and they must look like little treasures. Minimize all noise. Turn off all machines in the house and be there at the door to greet him and welcome him home from the very, very difficult day he has had at work.

Do not greet him with problems. Do not greet him with complaints. Do not

complain if he is late for dinner. Listen to him. Let him talk first. Make the evening his.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you show me an American home where you can practice this today and I am going to move there. My husband and I have never been able to do this. He has wanted that kind of wife, I have wanted to be that kind of wife. We cannot afford it, nor can anyone else in America today, except the extremely wealthy, because we are in a global economy.

□ 1245

While America's families used to be little islands of tranquillity, what has happened to us today is they are like the Bermuda Triangle. We have a government, we have Members on the other side of the aisle who vote against family medical leave, against helping with child care, against helping with elder care, against, against, against, against trying to increase the amount of deductions for children, on and on and on. Yet they claim they are pro-family. But what they are saying is, your family is your problem, the Government should not do anything about it.

The problem is no one has time to be a family anymore because they are working so hard. The average American family feels like one of those squirrels in a wheel. They run faster and faster every year, their tongue is hanging out, and they never get out of the bottom of the wheel. The Government keeps telling them, greet your husband at the door, make sure his dinner is on the table and the children are clean.

Please. That is what is driving the gender gap.

All the work and family issues continue to get ignored because we have got a higher economic level here who very often does not understand the stress being put on America's families. So when you look at the rest of the Western World, they are way ahead of us. When you look at what people were trying to say here this weekend, they were saying: Government, get a clue; corporations, get a clue; institutions, get a clue.

We must find a way where America's families again can be that little more tranquil island. They will probably never be able to go back to the 1950's. But for heaven's sake, they cannot survive under the tremendous pressures that they are now under where you see single-parent families trying to be both mother, father, provider, and everything else, dual-parent families working at a gazillion jobs running around trying to do everything just to keep the mortgage paid and hardly recognize each other when they finally do get to be in the house at the same time.

America's families today have to keep pictures of the family members pasted by the door so, if people like that come to the door, they know who to let in because they are not around enough. That is what the gender gap is

about. We have not understood it at all in this body. I know. It took me 9 years to get family medical leave passed. It is not nearly enough.

Mr. Speaker, we have got people who want to roll it back tomorrow. We have never been able to get many of the other things done. When we get that done, we will not have a gender gap. Let us get on with it.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE GUIDELINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my colleagues today about an action I took at the end of last week in requesting the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to hold hearings to look into some very troubling transactions that have recently been reported in an article in the Miami Herald.

Mr. Speaker, let me try to set the context for this by reading a bit from a recent publication of the Internal Revenue Service that starts out saying that charities, 501(c)(3) organizations, should be careful that their efforts to educate voters stay within Internal Revenue Service Guidelines. Quoting more particularly: "Organizations exempt from Federal income tax as organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code are prohibited by the terms of their exemption from participating or intervening directly or indirectly in any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office." It elaborates on that saying that they cannot endorse any candidate, make any donations, engage in fundraising, whatever.

What events raise questions under this statement of the law governing these 501(c)(3) organizations? Mr. Speaker, this is a copy of a letter, as we can see, on letterhead titled Senator BOB DOLE, majority leader, which starts out as follows: "Dear friend, I want you to join me in an historic campaign to rein in the Federal Government in order to set free the spirit of the American people." It goes on, somewhat later on this first page: "President Clinton and the liberal big government advocates would like you and all Americans to believe the public is turning against our efforts."

It goes on for two or three pages before one learns that this is a letter paid for and soliciting funds in behalf of the Citizens Against Government Waste, an organization organized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and therefore subject to exactly

the prohibition stated in the Internal Revenue Service advisory earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, this was brought to my attention through an article in the Miami Herald which I would ask to include in the RECORD along with copies of the letters in question that I quoted from. Clearly that kind of letter being submitted in behalf of an individual who is running for President of the United States making the kind of arguments that are very relevant to his campaign for President of the United States but being paid for under the auspices of a tax-exempt 501(c)(3) organization raise some very, very serious questions. They evidently were designed to stimulate support for the Presidential campaign of Senator DOLE and also concluded suggestions that recipients of the letter make contributions to the organizations that paid for the letter.

We are told that the sponsoring organizations, which also included the Heritage Foundation, then turned around and provided the names and addresses of persons who contributed in response to these letters, to the Presidential campaign of Senator DOLE so that presumably they could be used for solicitations by his campaign. The Internal Revenue Code explicitly prohibits 501(c)(3) organizations from engaging in just this kind of political activity directly or indirectly in support of or in opposition to a candidate's campaign.

The Miami Herald article that I refer to also makes it clear that neither the 501(c)(3) organizations' expenditures in preparing and distributing the letters nor the lists of contributors that were then provided by these organizations to the Dole for President campaign have been reported as contributions to the Dole campaign. If the figures are correct, these mailings to some 10 million Americans cost nearly \$1 million. The value of the contributor lists are worth possibly \$40,000 or more. But here was no reporting either under the FEC laws and again no explanation was made as to how this could occur in compliance with the clear prohibitions in the Internal Revenue Code against this kind of campaign activity by 501(c)(3)s.

It raises a whole range of questions which I believe appropriate committees of the House ought to look into regarding the coordination between the Presidential campaigns and these nonprofit organizations who benefited by the mailings, how much they cost, how the lists were developed, whether or not it was all coordinated with the Dole campaign.

I hope my colleagues will take the action as I requested and conduct a thorough investigation of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following materials for the RECORD:

[From the Miami Herald, May 25, 1996]

DOLE CAMPAIGN GETS HELP FROM
NONPROFITS HE AIDED

(By Frank Greve)

WASHINGTON.—Bob Dole, shortly after he announced last year that he was running for