

bipartisan bill. It is not about Democrats or Republicans. I recognize the fact that we cannot get a bill to the President without Republican support. That is why I went out and worked with the Republicans to get a bill that we could agree on, a bipartisan bill. But it has to limit how much money is spent. Otherwise, it is not real reform. I am delighted to have had this opportunity to speak out about my bipartisan bill and the really sorry state of affairs that we are faced with here on Reform Week, day 3, I guess. We are going to leave tomorrow, I guess, not doing anything in terms of any of the reforms that were advertised, including campaign finance reform.

Mr. FARR of California. I think history will show as we end this debate here that the Democratic caucus with bipartisan support in the past has passed campaign reform out of this House, in the 103d Congress, the 102d Congress, the 101st Congress, and the 100th Congress and in every one of those instances, that action has been thwarted by Republican actions either in the Senate or a veto by a Republican President. It is obvious that the campaign reform that we are talking about that the American public wants and has supported these number of years is about to be thwarted by actions in this House as well. It is a tragedy. It is a tragedy that Reform Week has diminished into this kind of strained effort to not have effective campaign reform. I thank the gentleman for coming down tonight and being in the well and sharing his thoughts with me as one of the leaders in campaign reform in America.

Mr. MEEHAN. I compliment the gentleman for having this hour on campaign finance reform.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all speakers that it is inappropriate to characterize possible action or inaction in the other body.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3820, CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. SOLOMON (during consideration of the Special Order of the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-685) on the resolution (H. Res. 481) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3820) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of Federal election campaigns, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3734, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

Mr. GOSS (during consideration of the Special Order of the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-686) on the resolution (H. Res. 482) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3734) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### MORE ON REFORM WEEK

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and wanted to say first of all a couple of things about the, and I am not going to call it a debate, my friends from the other side of the aisle who would yield 1 minute and then go off on a tirade. I do not think that is quite a debate, but then again I am not from their districts.

But I want to point out one thing, Mr. Speaker. The Clinton administration came to office, and they have been in office for 3½ years. They enjoyed 2 years of majority rule in the Senate and in the House. During that period of time, campaign finance reform was not passed. I have heard that PHIL GRAMM was the problem.

Who controlled the Senate during that period of time? Obviously the Democrats did. If they are going to bring in partisan politics, then it certainly stands to reason it should have passed under their watch the first 2 years.

I know this, Mr. Speaker, because I worked with TILLIE FOWLER and PETER TORKILDSEN on a campaign finance bill that we introduced as a freshman class.

□ 2215

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman from Georgia would suspend, the Chair would remind all those assembled that it is inappropriate to discuss individual Members of the other body or action or inaction they may have taken with regard to legislation.

Mr. KINGSTON. I understand that, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that point.

Let the record be clear that the Senate and the House were controlled by Democrats for the 2-year period of time. The House Republicans have been working on campaign finance reform on a bipartisan basis for some time now, and one of the issues that we are trying to get bipartisan support on but

we cannot is the issue of soft money and the practice of unions and big union PACs to participate in elections and not even to have to report that money even though it is spent on behalf of a candidate. They can come into a district and spend under the label of soft money, an independent expenditure of money on ads, money directed toward the incumbent Republican, almost unlimited, and there is no check on that.

True campaign finance reform would account for all political money, not just the reportable money, and I hope that we do get some Democrats who are willing to stand up to the big union bosses. I know that they are raising \$35 million on behalf of Democrat candidates right now and Democrats are somewhat very reluctant to take on such a cash cow, but it would be great if they would.

Just to give Members some idea, AFL-CIO in 1994 spent \$804,000 on Democrat congressional candidates, 99 percent of their contributions. The American Federation of Teachers spent \$1,053,000; 99.3 percent of their total contributions went to Democrats. The American Trial Lawyers Association spent 94 percent of their campaign contributions on Democrat candidates, \$1,759,000. The Human Rights folks spent 96.5 percent of their money on Democrats. That is \$470,000. The Community Action Program spent 96 percent of their money on Democrats, \$42,000. The International Longshoreman's, \$300,000, which was 96 percent going to Democrats. The IUE, this is some other union, I am not sure which, \$204,000, 100 percent going to Democrats. The International Union of Bricklayers, \$143,000 going to Democrat candidates, 98.9 percent of their entire budget of contributions. The National Education Association, \$1,968,000; 99 percent of it going to Democrats. And one more, the UAW union PAC, \$1,914,000, 99 percent going to Democrat candidates. I would say if you want true campaign finance reform, this has to be included in the formula.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts wanted some time, and let me yield to him.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was just going to make the point that the bipartisan bill, which I have been working on with CHRIS SHAYS and with LINDA SMITH, would in fact limit, in fact the first provision is to abolish PAC money. The second fall-back provision because of constitutional problems is to limit PAC's to \$1,000 per primary, \$1,000 for general. And there are 21 Democrats on that particular bill so I think the characterization of Democrats is inaccurate.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming the time just a minute with the intent of yielding back to you for further explanation, does your bill also limit or eliminate independent expenditures, such as those that have been targeted

by the AFL-CIO to the tune of \$35 million?

Mr. MEEHAN. The U.S. Supreme Court has just recently ruled that one cannot limit the independent expenditures in these races. But what we do is require more accurate recordkeeping so that we know where the money is coming from and where it is going.

One of the difficulties with campaign finance reform is the U.S. Supreme Court decisions which make it impossible to limit independent contributions.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time for a minute, I understand that and I think that is a good point. Let me ask the gentleman this, though, in terms of individual union members who are not necessarily buying the big labor union Democrat embrace, should they not have the right to know where their dues are going? For example, here is a union, the Democrat-Republican Independent Voter Education Committee. I am not sure which union this is, maybe the gentleman can tell me. But just the name, Democrat-Republican Independent Voter Education Committee would lead me as a rank and file union member to think that my money was going everywhere when in fact \$2,131,000 went to Democrats which represented 97.8 percent of the entire expenditures. Clearly that is a Democrat PAC. It would be fair to tell the people who have to contribute where their money is going.

So my question is, do you support that worker contributor's right to know clause, which we have been working very hard with in our campaign finance reform to try to get in there?

Mr. FARR. May I respond?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield.

Mr. FARR. I think that every worker has a right to know where their contribution is going. I do not think that your provision is the one that I support because it does not apply equally to corporate as well. A PAC contribution is a PAC contribution. It is a check-off system, whether you work for a corporation or whether you work for a union.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming the time for a second, I agree with you absolutely. PAC contributors, people who work for banks or insurance companies or manufacturers, they should know also because clearly some of those PAC's are lopsided, also.

Now, none of them are as lopsided as the labor union PAC's, but I mean, for example, even NRA and tobacco PAC's, the tobacco PAC's gave more to Democrat candidates in 1994 than they did to Republicans. NRA is on like maybe a 60-40 split. I do not have the number with me but I did look at it. I truly believe anybody who contributes to a PAC needs to know to the dollar where that money went. So I am in complete agreement with you on that.

Mr. MEEHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. MEEHAN. I just ask the question, why do you think big tobacco de-

ecided to stop contributing more to Democrats and retool their efforts contributing to Republicans after NEWT GINGRICH and the Republicans took over?

Mr. KINGSTON. That is a good question. Reclaiming the time, this is the way I understand it as a student of campaign finance reform. In 1972, when PAC's started because of the large, individual contributor, the gentleman may remember the man, he was in the life insurance business, gave over \$1 million to Richard Nixon's campaign, and one of the reactions were to have PAC's and PAC's were originally supposed to be a campaign finance tool, a way to get around the influence of a guy who can write a million-dollar check. And so what happened is that PAC's, people thought back in the early 1970's, would be ideological, and the gentleman knows there are some that are truly ideological. For example, a lot of the women's group PAC's they will give to a pro-choice candidate who has no chance of winning, whereas a lot of the pro-life groups hold back and want to make sure that they are winning.

Let me even take that back. I would say the abortion PAC's are more ideological. The business PAC's are absolute pragmatists. They do not truly have an ideological philosophy except their own special interest. So what they do, and the gentleman knows well, they contribute to the majority, and a lot of those tobacco contributions that have come in have come in because they best against the freshmen who knocked out incumbents, and the first thing that happens, as the gentleman is well aware of, is PAC's that bet on the wrong horse try to make amends early on in the game and that was part of the thing that was going on.

Had you guys kept the majority, there is no doubt the money would have stayed with you on that.

I agree, let us fix it. Let us have more worker right to know, contributor right to know, and let us get into it. There is plenty of room here for finance reform.

Another thing that I am interested in, and I believe the gentleman is too, is making sure that the money comes from the district. I think 75 percent of the money ought to come from somebody's individual district. But we are willing to settle on 50 percent plus \$1. But that is more to your side than our side.

Mr. FARR. The difficulty with your plan is you have no limits. If you are concerned about PAC contributions influencing, whether they be labor PAC's or business PAC's or whatever the ideological framework of a PAC may be, you put no limits on them, none, absolutely none. We put limits, we say all right, candidate, if you are going to run with a limit on yourself, then you cannot take more than one-kind of your money, \$200,000 maximum from a PAC and no PAC can give you more

than, in a 2-year cycle, \$6,000. That is what you are missing. You are missing this sort of idea of putting any kind of limits on an individual.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I agree with that and I know you are supporting the one-third limitation. I would support that.

In my race generally I am well under that. Let me give the gentleman some live true-to-life examples, Members of your party. I will share this list with you. I am not going to tell their names at this point. This one here is one of your leadership, \$77,000 from PAC's, \$281,000 from individuals. Seventy percent PAC contributions. Here is another one, 80 percent from PAC's, \$229,000, \$63,000 from individuals, or 16 percent.

Going through your list, here is one who is in your leadership, \$753,000 from PACs or 78 percent and \$167,000 from individuals, or 17 percent.

The list goes on and on. I could tell the gentleman, as a conservative Republican, I would love to limit this because I think it would help my party a lot more than it would help your Members.

If you want to be partisan about it, and I am not trying to be, I know the gentleman and I are both trying to clean up the system.

Let me yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARR. In response to your question, if I knew you were going to bring your list, I would have brought my list. I think there is probably a list of similar sorts with your leadership as well. The point of the fact is this is not about what has occurred in the past because we are trying to clean that up. We are trying to put some limits on it. You cannot put limits on a bill that, frankly, the Committee on Rules has just reported to the floor. Your leadership's bill does not reform campaign finance.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, there are a lot of things that are not in that bill. My freshman class bill that we introduced in January 1993 reached a lot further. The gentleman's freshman class bill when he first came here or the bills that the gentleman worked on reached further, also. I think that what we are trying to do is get this done, maybe plank by plank.

There is a big debate when it comes to campaign finance reform: Do you have a big bill that is a delicately stacked thing that you know winner-take-all, and if it goes down, you get nothing, or do you do piece-by-piece and does it take years to accomplish?

Before I was in Congress, I was in the State legislature. Just about every year we had a campaign finance bill. We always had to add to it, we always had to tighten it up, and I would say over a 10-year period of time, there have been dramatic changes in the Georgia campaign finance laws. So I have seen it both ways where you try a big, comprehensive bill, then it falls flat, then I have seen the smaller bills. I am not going to tell the gentleman

one is better than the other, but we have got to get, as you know, a lot of folks on the other side to pass it.

We have got to get the President to sign it. We have got to get 218 votes here. We always want it to be bipartisan.

□ 2300

And I overheard you say earlier tonight one of the big problems is everybody is an expert, because the way he or she won his or her race, they believe is the absolute for everybody.

Mr. FARR of California. I, like you, served in a State legislature for 13 years and was very active in campaign finance reform in the State of California. It is a very complex system. You have 6,000 local governments in the State besides the 58 counties and the State legislature, and you are dealing with an awful lot of campaign filings and technical process.

Unfortunately, you cannot reform campaign financing piecemeal because it has so many different versions. It has amounts of money that people can give, whether they can give them to a candidate, whether they can give them to a party, whether they can give them to a PAC, whether they can give them to a national party.

So just the individual giving money, how much, how often, whether each of those organizations, a PAC, how much money they can give, what they have to report, in California you still have what we call corporate contributions to campaigns. You can give either an in-kind contribution. You may be a corporation that has a lot of telephones and, therefore, on election night you can give your office for people to come down and make calls. Under Federal laws you cannot do that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I want to say normal PAC's cannot do it, but union PAC's can do it. And union PAC's provide manpower, whereas banks or a Chamber of Commerce, they cannot. In terms of the lopsidedness, in terms of a big union PAC, it is incredible.

I also want to throw out something that I consider campaign finance reform. Many Members around here do not, on both sides of the aisle, mostly on your side, which has to do with Federal Government agencies lobbying.

I served with you on the Committee on Agriculture last session and this session moved over to the Committee on Appropriations. I can tell you, Mr. FARR, anybody who thinks Federal Government agencies do not lobby has never served on the Committee on Appropriations because that is all they seem to do.

They come up to our office, they have money for conferences, they have money to fax themselves around their offices and so forth. I believe a key portion and one of the stumbling blocks in balancing the budget is the fact we have agencies who are feeding out of the taxpayers' trough and they do not want to have finance reform that would stop them from lobbying.

Maybe this is more in the lobbying category, but, see, I would still consider it under that general topic of cleaning up the House.

Mr. FARR of California. Well, I think we have to address lobbying reform separately from campaign reform. Lobbying reform is essentially people who make their living there in Washington, whether it be on the public payroll or the private payroll, trying to convince Members of Congress that their opinion is the right one.

I frankly believe that lobbying is good. I do not think that lobbying is bad, because these are complex decisions that we have to make, and, as the gentleman knows, we need to have all the information that we possibly can, both sides, pro and con, and, fortunately, people are supposed to be independent after getting all that knowledge.

We know the decisions are complex. A lot of it deals with minutia and the only way we can get a grasp on it is listen to people who have vested interest in it. That does not mean because they come see you that they have our vote.

I think if we are to address campaign and lobbying reform, we have to do it, but we have to do it in such a way that it does not cut off getting good information to make a tough decision.

Mr. KINGSTON. I agree with the gentleman, and I agree it certainly can be done. Having again served in the State legislature, I would say that the State agencies also lobby, some more than others. For example social service agencies I think lobby a lot more than something like the natural resources or the fish and wildlife agencies in the State of Georgia. And that kind of model, where we do see two different agencies, one that is very aggressive, one that is passive but there with good information, but you as the legislator had to initiate the conversation as opposed to fax machines and working networks and conferences, and so forth, and bringing people into town and so forth like that. I just think that that should be part of the process.

I would love to have campaign finance reform and lobbying reform, because I think they are twin sisters. I think it should be one bill. Now, I have learned, there again going back to piecemeal, you have to take what you can get passed. So there has to be a practical side to it.

Mr. FARR of California. Under your scenario of piecemeal, the campaign reform would be piecemeal and lobbying reform would be piecemeal, but as you know, under each of those tents there is a tremendous amount of technical law that has to be developed.

My point of it is that you are not going to get campaign reform. You may get technical adjustments along the way; for example, the issue you brought up about requiring people who contribute, PAC's who annually have to go through the process of committing that, that is I think a technical adjustment. That is not campaign reform.

Campaign reform is really the whole comprehensive effort of trying to control how money comes in and how it is spent. I do not think we will do that unless we put limits on what people can do. Otherwise it is just a feeding frenzy of getting money from wherever you can get it and trying to influence the outcome.

Mr. KINGSTON. There again I think it is important that people at least have a requirement that at least 50 percent of the money come from their own district, because you can be elected from one district and then gallivant around the globe, going to Hollywood, going up to New York, meeting with big labor bosses in Washington and then going back home and your opponent has raised 100 grand on local contributions, you have raised \$800,000 with the Washington big money types, and you can spend and annihilate your opponent. You can make yourself look conservative, a liberal, a moderate; you can target women, you can target minorities, or white middle class, people with blue suits, people with red hair, anything you want with that kind of money, and that is what lopsides this thing in favor of incumbents. We need to level the playing field more.

Mr. FARR of California. May I share with you the concerns I have by limiting 50 percent of your contributions just to your district? And I can probably do that and I am sure if I looked at it, I do, but it is not something I really support.

When I first ran, I ran against a very wealthy individual and when I was interested in running for office, I did what I think everybody does, you sit down and say where do I start. And what do you start with? You start with your friends and your relatives and you write everybody you ever knew, everybody you went to school with. I happened to serve in the Peace Corps so I went and wrote all my Peace Corps colleagues.

I wrote my relatives around the country and said, hey, I am running for public office and you know I am better than anybody because I have grown up and worked with you, will you help me with your initial contributions? And I think that is where everybody every candidate starts.

What disarms them is if they cannot do that and only the person who has a lot of money, a person of wealth, and by the way we limit the person—

Mr. KINGSTON. Hold on 1 minute. I want to reclaim the time and I want to admonish you. Have you ever read Robert Mitchum, who wrote "Alaska"? Have you ever read any of his books? He always starts at the very beginning, and I am interested.

But I do have something else to talk about, and so I want to say if you can quickly get to the point, I would appreciate it, so that I can talk about this other issue.

I do also want you to acknowledge the fact you guys did not yield us any time, and I do want you to remember that.

Mr. FARR of California. I appreciate your allowing me to dialog with you.

Mr. KINGSTON. I had to slap myself on the back since you are not volunteering to do it.

Mr. FARR of California. I appreciate your allowing us to have this colloquy. Without people talking, sometimes it is kind of lonely in this chamber. But my point is limiting raising that money in your district will put the advantage on a wealthy person versus a person who really has the passion to run for office, and I think we should be very careful before we do that because you do not put any limits on what a wealthy person can spend. Our bill does. It says you cannot contribute more than \$50,000 of your own money.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, now, the bill that I have cosponsored with the gentleman from Tennessee, ZACH WAMP, which is a bipartisan bill, does put individual limits on there. We do not want anybody or any organization to have undue influence.

Taking your situation and saying you have to take money where you can get it. The other problem is, though, if there is going to be influence, and if influence and money are related, should that not be district driven rather than outside interest driven?

Mr. FARR of California. I think that is for the voters to decide in your district, frankly. If they do not like where your money is coming from, you have to publicize it. It is a public record, and the newspapers pick it up the moment it is of public record. And we see that because our campaign reports, everybody in this House had to file them, and I think they become public record any day now, and you will see the stories all next week about where contributions are coming from. That gives the voters in the District an ability to decide whether they like what they are seeing or not.

I am not sure that is so broken that it needs that kind of fixing, because I think that if you do not put limits on what the individual can contribute, the advantage all goes to the wealthy, and I do not think that is fair.

I do not want to take any more of the gentleman's time. I really appreciate this colloquy with you tonight.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, listen, I appreciate what you guys are doing, and I know you appreciate what we are doing. I think that what we will do, as we do have these genuine disagreements on just different portions or sections of campaign finance reform, as long as we can identify those that we do agree with and keep the ball moving, then we will continue haggling over some of the other parts.

And, again, that might take a while, but I believe Democrats and Republicans all realize on an issue like this we have to have each other, we have to work forward if we want it to move down the road.

Mr. FARR of California. We have a bill on the floor, as the Committee on Rules just indicated, and I hope we can

gain your support. Thank you very much.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. FARR.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk a little bit in regards to tax relief and economic issues and jobs. I got a call last night from a gentleman, a father from Pennsylvania, had two kids, and I could tell he was a lot like my middle-class friends back home, struggling to make the ends meet. And he just left a message, "Please keep us in mind; keep working."

I think about this man. I think about the women I see that are my wife's friends, who are around the neighborhood raising those 3-year-olds, those 5-year-olds. I drive the carpool every Monday when school is in, and when I am driving the carpool, quite often I get out and I talk to people. Mostly it is women. There are a few other dads, but, fortunately, one of the good benefits about this job is we do have some odd hours during the day and we are a little more flexible when we are home.

I see these families struggling. They save a little money, but at the end of the month instead of going down to Florida for the weekend, they have to spend it on a new dryer, or they have a car payment, or the house mortgage is payable. And they can manage it, but then they want to do something else to the house, a little modification, or they have to put in a new stove or oven, or something like that, and there is no money at the end of the month.

We passed a \$500-per-child tax credit. If you had two kids, this gentleman, this family in Pennsylvania, that would have been \$1,000 more that they could have. Is that a tax cut for the rich? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. What that thousand dollars would have meant for this middle-class man is that he and his wife could have bought a few more pairs of tennis shoes, a few more clothes, or maybe they could have gone to another ball game this summer and seen the Philadelphia Phillies do something. It just would have been a good thing for them.

That was vetoed. We are going to keep working on that, Mr. Speaker, because that \$500-per-child middle-class tax cut is important.

Another thing that we have passed is an increased deduction for the home-office tax. In this day and age, with two-income families and high-technology, men and women have an opportunity to work at home. I think of Liz Simpson. She is a neighbor of mine, a friend of mine, an underwriter with an insurance company, and she was able to hook up by modem to her business and stay at home with their little boy, John, and their other child so that she could spend a little more time but also continue earning a living there at home. It gave her a lot of flexibility, and I am glad we increased this home-office tax deduction.

We also had a thousand dollar elder deduction so that if your elderly mom or dad, because of medical or economic

necessity, has to move in with you, you can deduct up to \$1,000, again, helping that sandwich generation, you know the ones who have dependent children and dependent parents. And they are getting squeezed one more time.

We need to do things like this for the American middle class.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, of course we have to balance that budget. We are paying \$20 billion each month interest on the national debt, and that money could be going to education, could be going to health care, could be going to crime prevention.

□ 2315

All it is doing is paying the bondholders on the national debt. If we balance the budget, we can bring down interest rates, which would bring down the cost of home mortgages and automobile payments. It would stimulate the economy.

On small business entrepreneurs, do my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, that one-third of the small businesses in America are owned by women? If they could get money cheaper, borrow money at lower interest rates, then these female entrepreneurs could create more jobs, expand their businesses, create more opportunities and in turn earn more and be able to spend more leisure time at home, which is very important to the American family these days.

In terms of other family issues, we have got to increase security back home. A friend of mine called me. Obviously, I am not going to mention her name, but this woman was in her house. It was about 10:00 in the morning, mid-morning, washing her 3-year-old. The door bell rang. She goes to the door bell. She sees somebody through the curtain and does not open the door and goes back to the bathroom where she is bathing the baby. The guy kicks in the door, comes in and rapes her. Does not hurt the child, fortunately.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that this rapist only was sentenced for 3 years. They caught him but he was sentenced for 3 years. I never would have known about the story except she called me because she was notified that he was getting out. They have a law in Georgia that you notify the victims when somebody on probation is coming. That just makes your stomach cringe, Mr. Speaker. This thug, this deadbeat who kicks down the door on a housewife at home and then only gets 3 years, that is why we need truth in sentencing. Mr. Speaker, it says, if you are sentenced for 10 years, 15 years, then you serve 10 years or 15 years. You serve your full sentence.

I want to say this, that when folks are in prison, they ought to have work requirements and they ought to have education requirements. They ought to be out there busting bricks. Hard work, 40 hours a week. Education, 20 hours a week. That adds up to 60 hours. And do you know what, Mr. Speaker? That is what my middle-class friends are working anyhow. The people who are paying

the taxes, they are not doing it on 40 hours a week anymore. They are running around doing all kinds of things. Sixty hours a week for a prisoner, that is nothing.

Another case, heart breaker, a man calls me at home. His daughter, 12 years old, was spending the night at a friend's house and was raped by the friend's older brother who was 19 years old. He called me, Mr. Speaker, because it had been 3 or 4 weeks and the police had yet to pick up the rapist.

When the daughter was raped, they took her to the hospital. They got the fluid samples and all the necessary identifications for this horrible experience. Yet it was 3 weeks. The reason why it was 3 weeks, I talked to the authorities about this, is that the police were so afraid of messing the case up because of all the loopholes that we now have in our court system that allows trial lawyers to bend and manipulate the system to get rapists, 19-year-old rapists who rape 12-year-olds, get them off because a police officer did not dot an I or cross a T, or the arrest papers.

So in the meanwhile, while the police are out very carefully, meticulously building up a case on this, guess what? The 19-year-old is still driving by the house every day. The little 12-year-old who is now in trauma, who is now in therapy, she still sees this guy out walking the streets.

We have an absurd court system right now, Mr. Speaker. We have got to get common sense back in it. We have got to say common sense is that we want to give everybody a fair trial, but it has got to be one that is governed by common sense, not by technicalities and loopholes.

Justice should not be determined by money and whoever is the cleverest. It should be determined by what is right. So in this Congress, we have worked hard to crack down on criminal thugs and in lawsuits.

Another problem, Mr. Speaker, that is adding to the stress of the middle class has to do with the fact that drugs are just going crazy on our streets. Earlier tonight the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] had a chart that showed how drug usage has been going up in the last 3 or 4 years. One of the reasons is because we had cut funding on drug awareness programs.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in a lot of schools in my district, the First District of Georgia. I have spoken to the DARE classes, drug education for eighth graders and seventh graders and sixth graders and fifth graders, telling them what illegal drugs are all about, what the consequences are about.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the average age right now nationwide for trying marijuana is 13 years old? That is the bad news. The good news is, if we can keep a child drug-free until he or she is 19 years old, then, Mr. Speaker, they have a 95-percent chance of being drug-free the rest of their life. So what we have got to do as families, as edu-

cators and as government officials and as a society is keep our kids drug-free until they are 19. If we can do that, they are 95-percent home free, and that is one of the things we have got to do.

I believe drug education is extremely important for the youth of today.

Now, in terms of the pushers, we have got to be very tough on sentencing for pushers. Let us get them off the street. Let us protect our families again.

Health care is one more security issue that we have got to deal with as a society. We right now are trying to pass a bill that gets portability on health care. Very important for people who have job lock because of some situation that they can switch from job to job. My wife, Libby, her college roommate, a young lady named Kathy Haggard, was working for a bank when she discovered that she had cancer. And God rest her, she lost the battle. But during the period that she was fighting it, she went into remission for a short period of time. She was engaged. She, I think, was living in Atlanta and her fiance was living in Birmingham.

They, Mr. Speaker, could not get married because Kathy could not quit working for her bank in Atlanta because, if she did, she could not get insurance through her fiance's insurer in Birmingham. So this young lady sadly lost the battle to cancer. She went to her grave without ever being able to marry, which is, as you know, probably one of the most wonderful things that anybody can experience.

And if we had portability on health care, people like that would be helped by it, Mr. Speaker. That is something very important.

Medical savings accounts. Something that I am very big on, and I know you have worked hard on it. Medical savings accounts would allow middle-class people to take health care with a high deduction and with that deduction it would be funded through a special account, kind of an escrow account. And out of that escrow, middle-class people would pay for their kids stitches, for pediatric shots, for their glasses, the small things.

And at the end of the year, the middle-class families would get the money out of the account and get to keep it. They could use it for a college education account, if they wanted to, or they could put it in their pocket. They could spend it for Christmas money. This is a tool that middle-class families need all over America, Mr. Speaker. It is something that we are working on, and we have got to keep working for.

The breast cancer situation. Breast cancer now gets, I believe, it was a couple years ago the statistic was one out of every nine women. Now it is even higher than that. And we have increased funding on breast cancer research in this Congress. We have also expanded Medicare coverage to include breast cancer. It is something that we have to do to make sure that our moth-

ers and our sisters are well protected, because so much of it, if detected early, we could prevent.

Our colleagues, JOHN MYERS and BARBARA VUCANOVICH, have been great champions on this because of personal family situations. JOHN MYERS brought to the Committee on Agriculture, the ag subcommittee that oversees FDA, this plastic looking device. It was a circle about this big. And he put a grain of salt on the committee table and he put this on it and he said, find the salt with your hands. And you could feel the spec.

This was a device that would not substitute for a medical exam, but it is something that in their own houses women could use for just kind of a home breast cancer analysis. And, Mr. Speaker, the FDA fought us on that. They did not want to approve the device.

I believe that American women would know that a home analysis is no substitute for a doctor's analysis. But give them the tool. Because not only could the tool detect it, but it would raise the interest level, raise the awareness level. And you and I know, as men, when we are over 40, we have to start testing for prostate cancer and so forth. Preventative medicine has got to be part of the health care planning. I truly support the efforts to increase awareness of health in the school systems and so forth, because if we can get our kids exercising and eating right early, we will have less problems down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to just close with this. Another thing we can do for the middle class is to have good education systems. We have increased student loans from \$24 to \$36 billion in this Congress in our budget. That is going to expand the availability of a college education for many middle-class kids. I think that that would be good. But to the classrooms back home, Mr. Speaker, we want to get the bureaucracy out.

A school teacher in Darien, GA, told me at a town meeting recently that she spends 2 to 3 hours a day each day on paperwork. That is 10 hours a week that she cannot spend teaching children in her own class reading, writing, and arithmetic.

We want to take the bureaucracy in Washington out of the American classroom and let the parents and the teachers teach their own children. And we believe that that local control will help us compete in the world market.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that we are working on and have worked on and have accomplished in this Congress. We need to keep the commitment for the American family and for the American middle class.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of personal business.