people have earned,'' a reference to months-overdue wages and pensions.

Yeltsin has not appeared in public since he became ill before the July 3 runoff election, but he spoke confidently and without any outward sign of illness.

In a separate address to ethnic Russians in former Soviet republics that are now independent, Yeltsin vowed to provide ''permanent care and support from your homeland.''

UNION MEMBERS DUES USED FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

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

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, I think it is interesting with respect to my good friend and colleague who just spoke that in addressing the question as to why when the Members of his party controlled the House, the Senate and the White House during the 103d Congress, which was 2 years ago, they did not, if this was such an important initiative, undertake to in fact raise the minimum wage at that time. He just dismisses it very quickly and briefly by saying: Well, I am not interested in the past; I am only interested in now. I think that is unfortunate and predictable.

I want to address my comments today to the very hard-working rank and file union members of America whose dues are being used for political purposes and activities that they are probably both not aware of an almost undoubtedly do not agree with. Those are dues that should be put to work for those Members in the negotiation of labor contracts, in getting better working conditions, in getting higher wages, in getting better benefits packages and vacation plans. But they are in fact being used to further the political agenda of their labor bosses who are located not, for example, in Cleveland, OH, which I have the privilege of representing, but in Washington, DC.

What is happening is that through a mandatory payroll deduction scheme, union members dues are being used to fund a defamatory and demagogic attack on Members who have one fundamental problem as far as the unions are concerned. That is, as far as the Washington-based union bosses are concerned, and that is that there is an R next to their name. In other words, what this is really about is partisan politics. It is not about principles and the principles which different people believe in.

Mr. Speaker, let me give an example. There was a poll that was taken of over 1,000 union members about 6 or 8 weeks ago. One of the questions that was asked was, do you believe that the budget of the United States should be balanced and that we should have an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced budget? About 80 percent of the union members responded positively that we should. That is not surprising.

About 80 percent of all Americans believe that we ought to have an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced budget. And yet the AFL–CIO bosses in Washington are opposed to a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. It is funny, I had union reps from Cleveland in my office yesterday. They were talking about the union bylaws. And one of the fellows said very clearly that the bylaws prohibit the union from spending more than it takes in. That is a perfectly reasonable policy which is obviously practiced by American families as well. Yet his leadership in Washington opposes a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, clearly in contravention of what the rank and file members want as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will give another example. The AFL–CIO bosses in Washington are opposed to a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, clearly in contravention of what the rank and file members want as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will give another example. The AFL–CIO bosses in Washington are opposed to a $500 per child tax credit, and that would fall primarily to the benefit of working families, union families. And yet they are opposed to that $500 per child tax credit although in polling the AFL-CIO members, the rank and file members are clearly in favor of it.

So here we have got a very similar situation to what is happening right now in a larger sense in America. That is that what we are trying to do with this Congress is send power out of Washington and back to local communities, because the problem that we have got is this massive centralization, bureaucratic centralization of power in Washington.

So one of the primary efforts besides reducing the size and scope of government as well as reducing the tax burden on the American people of this Congress has been to get more decisionmaking back to the local communities and the conviction that you are going to get better decisionmaking process about government.

The same needs to be done with respect to the unions as well. We need to get that power, the unions need to take that power out of Washington and back to their locals.

UNIONS AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

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

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, I wanted to follow up on the gentleman from Ohio's comments. I think he makes a very, very important point regarding the unbelievably misleading tactics that are being used by the big labor bosses back here in Washington, DC, in what I think is a desperate and transparent attempt to help the Democratic minority in the Congress regain control of this institution. I think it is very telling and very significant because it is a clear indication of just how out of touch they are with average working Americans, the very people that they purport to represent.

Let me cite some basic statistical information at the beginning of my remarks. I think we know that the labor bosses here in Washington are opposed to fundamental reforms, the most significant changes that we have been trying to make back here in Washington over the last year and a half, since the Republican Party became the majority party in both the House of Representative and in the Senate.

These labor bosses, again, I am not talking about rank and file working men and women, but the labor bosses back here in Washington who have become the core constituency of the national Democratic Party and almost the campaign arm of the national Democratic Party. These labor bosses here in Washington are opposed to cutting spending to balance the Federal budget. We all know that we need to put our fiscal house in order. We all know that we need to balance the Federal budget to really preserve the future of our kids and our grandkids and to give them a future with more hope and opportunity than we have enjoyed.

I think it is important to remember the legacy that we do not inherit the world from our parents. We borrow it from our children. We are obligated to create a more promising future for our children and future generations. Yet those labor bosses are opposed to cutting Federal spending to balance the Federal budget, something that would, by virtue of simply bringing Federal revenues and expenditures into line, lower interest rates in this country and produce long-term economic benefits for every single American family and business.

□ 1515

Now, why are they opposed to cutting spending to balance the Federal budget? Well, because the only sector, the only segment, of the union activity that has been growing in recent years is Government employees. In fact, union membership in the public sector has been increasing while union membership in the private sector has been declining over the last several years. So they are opposed to cutting Federal spending to balance the budget because that means that we may have to eliminate a certain number of positions, governmental employee positions, as we go about the process of consolidating and streamlining the Federal Government and eliminating those agencies which are duplicative in nature or which duplicate a function better performed or currently performed by State or local government.

These labor bosses are also opposed to welfare reform. They are opposed to tax cuts for families with children. But what makes their opposition so, I think, significant is that they are opposing the very changes that their own members want.

A recent poll of union members in America indicated that 82 percent of

union members support a balanced budget, 87 percent support welfare reform, and 78 percent support tax cuts for families with children, and those percentages are higher than the general public.

So union members on average support the fundamental reforms we have been trying to enact back here in Washington over the last year at a greater percentage than the rest of the American public.

So why are the labor bosses attacking incumbent Republicans? Why have they targeted incumbent Republicans for defeat as part of a concerted effort by the National Democratic Party to regain control of the House and Senate? Well, it is very simple. They have a vested interest here. They do not want to see government downsized because that would mean the waning or the loss of power and influence for those very same labor union bosses.

So I think it is very important for the average American working men and women to realize that we are doing our utter best back here in Washington to protect their interests and to create a better future for America's families because we are not working for the labor bosses, we are working for those American families, for those working men and women, and they are the people who are the bosses.

So with that, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to stress that point and follow up on the comments made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

U.S.S. ''GARY GORDON''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, Madam Speaker, I guess it is clear for the whole world to see there will not be an hour special order by the Member from Massachusetts followed by my special order. Mr. FRANK told me earlier in the week that he was going to critique my point of personal privilege from this well on June 27, and I said, ''Well good I'll be there to critique your hour with my hour,'' because I said I would keep focused on the truth and I was not going to let go of this crude attempt which we saw again last night late and on the floor this morning and early afternoon to brand anybody who thinks there is something wrong with homosexual behavior as a bigot, as a hater, and, as Mr. CANADY of Florida pointed out, they added about 15 more sleazy words that we could have spent all day long taking peoples' words down to contest.

I would like to tell any people that came to visit us in the gallery today, through the Chair, that I will return to this subject after I do something very positive and upbeat to relate what I was privileged to behold on the Fourth of July, and I would hope that people would reflect on the positives about the United States over this weekend, but spend a little time thinking about this amazing vote that we just had, our last vote today, on the 12th of July, defeating a phony recommit bill with instructions to study homosexual, quote, marriage, unquote, when that study is going ahead anyway. So 30 Republicans, kind of threw—well 29 threw a vote in this direction and joined Mr. GUNDERSON so that they will be able to have begging rights not to have Act Up and other radical homosexual groups try and wreck their town hall meetings with rude demonstrations, and the Democratic vote did not shift that much, 133 for the phony recommit and 118 to back up—or, excuse me, only 65—let me back up; 53 voted against Democrats, that phony motion to recommit, and that jumped up to 65 going the other way and saying that they will go out on a limb for homosexual marriage.

The final vote is, in this Chamber, 118 Democrats in spite of the 2-day debate going with Clinton, that they are not going to sign off on homosexuals getting married civilly, although a few renegade Christian denominations that are splitting in pieces will go ahead and go through a mock marriage ceremony, but 118 Democrats joined Clinton and say no way. The one Independent from Vermont, 65 Democrats and only one Republican, Mr. GUNDERSON, that is 67 people today and 2 voting present, approve of homosexual marriage. There were 23 not voting; that is not unusual for a get-away Friday, although I noticed in the Democratic list here at least 3 Democrats that were participating in the debate right up through recommit and the final passage vote, which was only a 5-minute vote followed immediately thereafter, and they ditched, I will give them the benefit of the doubt, jump in a car and speed off to National Airport or Dulles to get out of town. But it looks very suspicious.

So there is the vote: 23 absent, 2 present, 67 with only one Republican, the sole Independent who usually votes in caucuses on the other side of the aisle, and 65 Democrats saying homosexual marriage is OK. On our side 224 Republicans out of 225 voting, and 118 Democrats, for a total of 342, say no way to homosexual marriage.

So, it looks like my opening remarks in the well June 27, when, as I recall, I said:

Mr. Speaker, I now move out into the evil mind fields of political correctness alone, but I pray and hope not alone on this uncomfortable issue of homosexuality. Well, it looks like I am not alone. Fifteen days later, on the 12th of July, 1996, 342 souls have joined me with varying degrees of commitment to principle and Judeo-Christian ethics.

Now to that positive note: On July 4, I had the honor of being invited by the families of Americans who lost their fighting men in the alleys of Mogadishu on October 3 and 4, 1993, not quite 3 years ago. It was the second ceremony, unprecedented, where a naval ship, a big naval ship, 956 feet of naval cargo ship, was being named after an army sergeant. The first one took place in San Diego where the U.S. Naval Ship *Randall Sugart* was named, with his mother and father and his wife presiding, and that was on May 13—excuse me, Jefferson's birthday, April 13—and then on July 4, the second commissioning of the U.S. Naval Ship *Gary Ivan Gordon*. Both of these army sergeants won the Medal of Honor, fulfilling to the letter of the scripture St. John 15:13, greater love than this no one has that he give his life for his friends. A biblical translation: that they lay down their life for another. They begged to have their helicopter crew get the authority to put them down at the crash site of CWO Michael Durant that ended up saving his life and giving up their own lives. On the night of October 3 the film was so brutal, a videotape on CNN, that they stopped running it by midnight because of people crying and calling in. The film, the videotape, was so brutal. These two Medal of Honor winners, the copilot and I got to meet his widow, Willie Frank, down there at Newport News at the commissioning of the *Gary Gordon*, the two door gunners, Tommy Fields and William David Cleveland. We saw their bodies being hacked apart by the crowds, desecrated, dragged through the streets, objects stuck in their gaping dead mouths. It was a pretty rough scene, the roughest Americans have seen since Vietnam, Korea, World War II, and now we have these 2 beautiful days, Jefferson's birthday and fourth of July, when as long as these ships are at sea and they have invited the families, the skippers of the two ships, they will be crewed by civilians, to come on board at any time.

I saw them invite Gary Gordon's two beautiful children, 8-year-old Ian and 5-year-old Brittany, to come on board any time to see this massive ship sitting next to our newest supercarrier, the U.S.S. *Stennis*, named after a U.S. Senator who was alive when the ship was commissioned, got to see a ship with his name on it when he is alive, the biggest moving object on the planet Earth.

These two big ships sat there, the *Stennis* and the *Gary Gordon*, and Golden Knight or Special Forces paratroopers came in, one from each service with American flags flying off their parachute gear, and landed. There was a small parade of World War II vehicles that went up the ramp onto the *Gary Gordon*, which will be a prepositioned ship with enough armored vehicles, backup vehicles, Humvees, trucks, tankers, supplies, ammunition to support a third of the division.

A full Army brigade will be ready to go at sea anywhere in the world to protect Americans or American interests, and M. Sgt. Gary Gordon's name; I visited his grave last November 5 or November 4, remember as the day Rabin was assassinated, and I stood at his