dispersed at the sole direction of the Plaintiffs, is filed by the Plaintiffs to effectuate the threats previously made against Counsel.

THUS DONE AND PASSED on this the 1st day of May, 1995 before the aforesaid witnesses and Notary Public.

LEGAL FEES QUESTIONED IN REMAP CASE

(By Brad Cooper)

BATON ROUGE—Two Lincoln Parish residents who challenged Louisiana's congressional districts demanded their former attorney ask a judge to award fees for fictitious legal work, court documents allege.

That's the allegation Monroe attorneys Paul Hurd levies against Ray Hays and Gary Stokley of Ruston in an affidavit filed in federal court in Shreveport.

Hurd represented Stokley, Hays and two others until December 1994 in the constitutional challenge to Louisiana's congressional districts.

A three-judge federal panel threw out the districts because they were rigged to ensure election of a minority candidate.

Stokley and Hays denied Hurd's charge, saying they are not trying to make a profit from their lawsuit. Stokley called the charges ''upsetting'' and destructive to his reputation.

The state could be responsible for paying the legal fees in the case—possibly more than $4 million by some estimates—if the Legislature approves a new set of congressional boundaries that eliminates a second district with a majority of black voters.

A bill that would do that is a step away from final approval. A Senate committee signed off on a new set of congressional districts Monday and sent them to the full Senate to consider.

The affidavit surfaced at the committee meeting.

''It's all about money,'' said state Sen. Dennis Bagneris, New Orleans. ''According to the affidavit, there has been no motivation based on . . . who is fairly represented. It's all about the bucks.''

Hurd, who is seeking about $728,000 for his work, states in his affidavit that Hays and Stokley wanted him to apply to the court for fees to cover ''fictitious'' paralegal expenses.

He also accuses Hays and Stokley of wanting a slice of the legal fees from the case as well as part of the legal fees from his lawsuit agianst Texas' congressional districts, which were thrown out by a lower court becuse they were racially gerrymandered.

Hurd, who declined comment on Monday, withdrew as counsel after the four Lincoln Parish plaintiffs enlisted the help of a high-powered Washington, D.C., law firm.

The plaintiffs said they hired the firm because it was more experienced in dealing with constitutional issues. Hays said Hurd's accusations are retaliation for the plaintiffs' decision to bring another firm to argue the case before the Supreme Court.

''His feelings are hurt and he got mad,'' Hays said. ''He is angry and popped all that stuff out.''

Filing a false claim with the federal courts could possibly lead to perjury charges if it is verified under oath. Or the applicant could be forced to serve jail time for criminal contempt of court, court officials said.

The judge also could levy a fine if the application is found to be fraudulent, court officials said.

Hays and Stokley were confounded by the allegations. They said Hurd deserves to be paid for the work he did.

''We didn't ask as plaintiffs for any awards, damages or anything like that. This has not been about money,'' said Stokley, a sociology professor at Louisiana Tech University.

''Money has never been an issue with me. If it was I wouldn't have been a teacher,'' Stokley said.

ITEMS IN THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia).

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to speak with my colleagues about the items in the Contract with America and other items that have received legislative approval in this House for which I think there can be bipartisan pride. Many items have come forward to this House and have received almost unanimous Republican support and overwhelming support from the Democratic side of the aisle as well. I think they are worth repeating tonight so that people could put a perspective in this House where we have gone and how far we need to go.

Mr. Speaker, the first item I want to mention would be that we have passed the congressional accountability law. That is a law introduced by Congressman CHRIS SHAYS to make sure that the laws that we in fact have passed that affect everyone else, I am speaking of civil rights laws, the Fair Labor Standards law, OSHA, prior Congresses, bills were passed and Congress, congressional employees were in fact exempt from the benefits of those laws.

□ 2200

Mr. KINGSTON. Before yielding to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], I want to make one final point. None of that money was raised in your district. It all came out of Washington, DC from special interest groups.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friends for yielding, and lest, Mr. Speaker, those viewing on television and in the gallery would misunderstand what we are saying, we do not have any problem with good, honest debate in the American political system. We do not have any problem with honest differences of opinion. But it is more than ironic, indeed I daresay it is hypocritical of those on the left who would repeatedly use the lexicon of special interests and big money and power and extremism applying to members of the new majority and yet as my colleague from California has outlined, actually take money from outside States and congressional districts, take Washington money and pour it into a certain district.

There is one other further distinction. Because, Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States who have come to view this endeavor quite cynically might honestly ask, well, what is the difference? There is a major difference. When union bosses take union dues and without the permission of union members take those compulsory dues and donate them directly to the Democrat National Committee, and indeed even as we have derided the increase in taxes, even as we have pointed out the Arkansas shuffle from a campaigner-in-chief who spoke of balancing the budget in 5 years only to renege on that promise, from a campaigner-in-chief who spoke of tax breaks for the middle class, only to renege on that promise, from a campaigner-in-chief who talked about ending welfare as we know it, only to renege on that promise, veto those measures in all three instances, now again comes another irony of saying one thing and doing another. The Beck decision, a mechanism my good friend from Pennsylvania, well versed in the law, is aware of, effectively said to end that practice of compulsory, nonvoluntary donations. And yet this President and his Justice Department refuse to enforce that decision.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the American people for their cynicism, but I believe a little background is in order. For the difference is if people can freely give to candidates of their choice, then so be it. But it should be a donation freely made. Not in the realm of compulsory action.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask the gentleman about this Beck decision. Are you telling me that a paper mill worker in my district who is prolife, antigun control, and anti-NAFTA has his money, his dues going to, say, President Clinton's reelection campaign, and he does not have a say-so in it, the union employee does not know his money is being used for those causes, even though they may be things that he does not stand for?

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield further, that is exactly what I am saying. Or the experience I had on one occasion, flying here and some of the folks on the flight, some of the flight attendants involved in their union made clear their displeasure with the incumbent President and members of the liberal minority and said that they called the local chapter of their union to put in their two cents worth and those members of the union were amazed to hear that a portion of their dues were going, even really without their knowledge, to guardians of the old order, guardians of the special interests, folks who would put bureaucracy above people and folks who would trust Washington, DC more than the American people. Those folks were absolutely flabbergasted. That is exactly what I am saying and to my friend from Georgia, I will say something else. It has been noted that Boss Sweeney of the AFL–CIO has asked for what sounds like the Clinton tax hike, an increase in those dues. Even as they bemoan the so-called stagnation in earning power, these bosses are asking for an increase in those dues, ergo a compulsory donation to the guardians of the old order without one whit of personal conviction from many members of unions. Indeed by some estimates almost half the members of unions are conservatives who vote consistently with the new majority. It is one of the ironies of life here in Washington.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. It is interesting the gentleman mentioned that. I had earlier commented about the ads playing in my district, on the 800 number. This has been going on for a year, but it has been interesting because I field calls in my office, being a Californian, here in Washington, DC, we have a 3-hour edge so the folks back home, it is 7 o'clock, it is now 10 o'clock, so when I am working in the office, people will call, I will answer the phone and it is interesting because they said, ''I just saw that ad on television, it's an 800 number, I have to go through shenanigans to get to it.'' I guess they are hooked up to the union switchboard. They take their name and address I guess for future fund-raising efforts. ''But I want you to know I'm outraged to know my dollars are used in this way. I'm a union member, always have been and believe in some of these things, but I also agree with you that we have to get big government under control.''

It was interesting to note when I was home these last 2 weeks, there was a very well-organized protest outside my district office in San Luis Obispo. But it was interesting to note that the people that came were the union organizers. They came from San Francisco, there was one from Los Angeles, one from San Jose. And then the executive secretary of the local union who is the hired bureaucrat and another gentleman were all part of this. Everybody else, the union members, the ones they work for, are hard at work trying to make a living for their family. I agree. They say 40 percent of members are good Republicans, pleased with what we are doing and it is firsthand knowledge, that is what I am hearing. In fact one went on television to tell the world that she was very upset to see her dollars being used in such a way for union ads when she was pleased about what we are doing here in the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Allow me to compliment and put in perspective what these freshman Members of Congress, and we have two with us tonight, have done. And not only the freshmen but the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], a Member of the 103d Congress. In the 102d Congress when I came in, we had a Congress that had been controlled for almost 50 years at that time by one party. We had a situation where in the House bank, Members were writing checks freely. They were not paying the money back. They were laundering money and selling drugs from the post office, which is not a U.S. post office. We are not making these things up. There have been numerous convictions and investigations to prove this to be true. That party from this side that had controlled the House for so long could have reformed it. They did not. Seven of us, became known as the Gang of Seven, started unraveling the twine with a request for an investigation. We finally after 8 months forced an investigation because the people of this country demanded it and we started with the investigation into the House bank, which followed in the post office and made the changes.

Even after all of that became known, we could not make the changes in Congress that needed to be made until this 104th Congress and our majority with our freshman class came on board. And now during the last 18 months for the first time in the history of the country, we have had an audit, an audit that has disclosed discrepancies in the past in the House. We have had numerous changes with the Contract With America that was offered. This House has passed most every aspect of that, certainly with the majority in Congress, and has sent it on, most of it has been sent to the President who has vetoed tax reform, tax relief for people in this country. They have vetoed welfare reform and other areas that the freshmen of this group have put through. There answer to the American people has been not to join and do what the American people want, not to pass the reforms the American people have demanded and that this freshman class and this Republican majority Congress has given. It has been to try to go back to the dirty politics side, try to run ads with millions of dollars against freshman Congressmen and try to win back control.

What will they be winning back control to do? To return back to the same situation we had before, where house bank scandals and house post office scandals were common.

I commend their class for the work you have done. Those of us that fought in the 102d Congress and later when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] came in the 103d Congress and fought, are being joined by you, and I think the people will make the same decision. In my first race, I won by about 3,000 votes. They immediately gerrymandered my district and put 30,000 votes against me by taking 15,000 from one party out and putting 15,000 new in. And although the President, President Clinton, carried by district, I won in a hard campaign by 55 percent. Last year all the liberal organizations joined, the Democratic women's organization of Emily's List that you are going to find and those contributions do not have to be reported. They can be bundled and slip under the law in a method that allows hundreds of thousands of dollars to go to campaigns unreported. And we won 61 to 39 percent.

What I am saying is the people out there are living and listening to what is happening and the things you are doing and I think they will, with knowledge of what is going on, return you to office in order that reform may continue in this body, that you are carrying out and have been working on. I want to commend you for the work you have done.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I will ask the gentleman from Georgia to yield so I can respond to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes.

HAYWORTH. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his membership and his actions as part of the Gang of Seven, and I point out now there is a gang of 73 and a new majority, and the gentleman from North Carolina is quite right. For in the midst of this talk of reform comes one legitimate question that the gentleman from North Carolina touched on, Mr. Speaker.

If this newfound embracing of reform by the liberals in this House were so genuine, where was it during their long years of domination of this institution, their complicity with the forces of big government and the forces that would always use the same tired equation, the answer of tax-and-spend, tax-and-spend, tax-and-spend. Where was that commitment? And make no mistake. If we retreat, Mr. Speaker, one can imagine a new liberal majority coming to this institutions, having learned its lesson in what through misleading claims and the politics of fear and the complicity of many liberals in the journalistic endeavors might wish to take place here, they would turn on this institution and that notion of reform in a heartbeat. Their notion of reform would be as the actions taken by ancient Rome against the Carthaginians. They would move metaphorically to lace the soil with lime to ensure that the full honest flour of reform would never take root again in this Chamber for the foreseeable future, and to return to an iron grip with rules completely out of proportion, a majority that would border on tyranny. In short, the same type of tyrannical majority we saw in this institution at the tail end of those 40 years of one-party domination.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. If the gentleman would yield, if you watch, you talk about the reform, how there would be no reform, let me tell you, if you look at these ads, negative ads, there is no hope. Everything is negative, negative, negative in the attack I am taking. Bad balanced budget, bad welfare reform, bad tax relief, bad this and that. There is no hope in these ads. And because there is nothing, let us fact it, their ideas are bankrupt after 40 years. There is no hope in their ideas. And so what do they do? All they have left is to just condemn and to attack. And it would be something if they could offer alternatives to the situations at hand today for the problems that need to be solved across this Nation, but it is all the same.

□ 2215

Their answer is usually more, bigger, more dollars here from Washington, DC.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let us talk about some of these basically Republican solutions, but they are anti-Washington

bureaucrat solutions, some of the things that I think that we have been trying to work for: more choice in medicare, a balance in environmental policy, more local control in education, more State flexibility in poverty and welfare programs.

Thinking of the Medicare policy, here we have in April last year, a Clinton trustee saying Medicare is going bankrupt and in two years, it will be out of money. Well, they missed that by 11 months. In February for the first time in the history, Medicare ran out of money. So we went in there, said okay, people want traditional Medicare, we understand that. But if our seniors want options, like physician service plans, and if they want to join a managed care plan or take an individual medical savings account, let us give them those options, and by offering the options we can reduce the growth from 11 percent each year in Medicare to 4 percent and head away from the insolvency and the bankruptcy. We can save, protect and preserve Medicare and increase spending per recipient from $4,800 to $7,100 at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, a key component of that, as you two know, is cracking down on fraud and abuse. I have with me a Derma-Gran bandage, which a friend of mine in business has sent to me. He said this bandage actually cost 94 cents to produce. It is sold to health care providers for $6. And Medicare, on this 94-cent $6 purchase, gets $36.44 with it.

Now, your mother is paying for that and your father is paying for that, and it is going at the price of their health care, a diagnosis or something down the road. My friend's math on it, he just pointed out to me, that does not sound like that much of a problem, does it? But the fact is potentially, listen to this. Potentially 20,000 nursing home patients each day use this. That would mean this is costing American taxpayers at that $36 rate $21 million per month or, $262 million in nothing but waste and almost fraud but certainly abuse in Medicare. And this is what we were trying to resolve, and this is what the President vetoed, cracking down on these.

Again, we are just giving seniors choices and protections that we need for the program.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield, I think it is important again to articulate something, because it is lost in the politics of hyperbole, in the grand political theater of the propaganda on the Nation's radio and television stations right now. And incidentally, I would challenge my former colleagues in television to do their reality checks that they often reserve for the political campaigns. I would challenge my former colleagues in television news around the country to apply the truth ads to these cynical, manipulative, untrue announcements and maintain the vigilance now that they reserve for the election campaign.

But the gentleman from Georgia brings up an interesting point. I do not know anyone, despite the extreme rhetoric of those outrageous claims made on television and radio, I do not know anyone in the new majority who would for a moment wish that his parents would have inadequate health care, desire for his grandparents inadequate health care, purposely move to starve children and deprive them of the basics of life, nor doom America to drinking dirty water and breathing impure air. The claims are outrageous, and my colleague from Georgia correctly points out the challenge is met.

The challenge is presented by the waste, fraud, and abuse in the current vacuum in a Washington-based, one-size-fits-all system that is devoid of the very compassion it claims to give to people, for it denies the most essential element of our freedom: The opportunity to choose. When my parents turn 65 next year, when that happens, there will be no federally provided shopper to accompany them out of their homes and to decree what department store they will visit, what clothing they will buy, what car they will drive. And yet in the current health care system, in the one-size-fits-all anachronistic plan of the 1960's, which we hope to update, improve, transform and, yes, even save, a vacuum exists. A massive bureaucracy exists that invites the very waste, fraud and abuse that the gentleman spoke of.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. It is interesting that the gentleman mentions the waste, fraud, and abuse, but I think one of the things, particularly in the ads from the big labor unions, the statements they make is we are cutting Medicare. My mom is on Medicare, and she was concerned about this, that her daughter was going to be doing something that she was in need of. And I just want to tell people that that is the worst thing to say, to scare our senior citizens. And I know some of them actually, people went into with their propaganda into nursing homes to scare our older and elderly that are in nursing homes and convalescent homes across the Nation.

I just want to set the record straight. We actually increased Medicare spending from $4,800 per beneficiary starting now to $7,100 in 7 years. Now, I am just an old fourth-grade school teacher that did a lot of old math without calculators. But if we subtract that, we get a difference, and that difference has a big plus sign in front of it. Very, very hard to get that point across, especially to some of the reporters today. I guess they were brought up on new math.

But we are increasing Medicare spending over the next 7 years by $2,300 per beneficiary, and that is with more and more seniors coming into the system. So you can tell we are spending a lot more. And that is one of the falsehoods in the ads that is hitting and attacking some of the freshmen, myself included, today on television.

Another interesting point was I know in the ads, and we heard it all, we hear it from the other side of the aisle, that we are just taking care of our rich friends with tax relief. Well, you know, I have been through this litany. What am I doing here for the rich? A $500 per child tax credit that would benefit 29 million families; a capital gains tax credit that will create 6.1 million jobs; relief from the marriage penalty that would allow 23 million taxpayers to receive $8 billion in tax relief; an adoption credit that would have allowed parents to claim a $5,000 annual tax credit for up to five years in order to help with their child adoption expenses; or how about an elderly care deduction that would allow 1 million taxpayers a $1,000 deduction for the care of a parent or family member?

Mr. Speaker, now maybe for some of those union bosses that live high on the hog here in Washington, DC, that do not understand what the working families back in each of our districts have to face, this is what I voted for and what we proposed is for working families across this nation, and I do not know about any rich people.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentlewoman had mentioned also about some of the putting common sense into some of the environmental laws. One of the things that happened in California that we know of, Riverdale, California, the endangered kangaroo rat. Now, you know, my view is I do not want to lose a species. I am committed to the Endangered Species Act. Riverdale, CA had kangaroo rat, and the EPA would not let them cut fire breaks in the residential area because it would endanger the habitat of the kangaroo rat. So what happened? A fire came and it destroyed 30 homes.

But in addition to that, it also destroyed 25,000 acres of kangaroo rat habitat. So we have got lose-lose policy for both the private property owner and the kangaroo rat. We see this kind of impracticality over and over again. In fact, I think it was in Arizona, may have been New Mexico, where the Boy Scout was lost last year in a wilderness area.

They discovered him I think 48 hours later, and the Park Service would not let a helicopter land there because it was a motorized vehicle. And under the Wilderness Act, you cannot have any sort of motorized vehicle in the park area. So here is this kid 14 years old, 12 years old, I am not sure of the age, and he is hungry, he is starving, he has been sleeping on rocks, and the helicopter comes and it won't rescue him. You know, it is just out of balance.

The other thing is, the decision to dig fire breaks in Riverdale, California, or to rescue a 14-year-old in a western State does not need to be made out of Washington by a Washington bureaucrat. I think that the Park Service people and the local county commissioners

and the residents can probably figure it out, keep it in Federal guidelines. They can solve their own problem without Washington bureaucrats.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Well, if the gentleman would yield, I think a lot of the bureaucrats that work here in Washington, DC have never been to our districts. Unless they read National Geographic, they have never come to the middle kingdom of California to see the Monterey Bay Sanctuary or the Channel Island Sanctuary. So what do they do? They do regulations that one size fits all, and it does not fit our particular needs at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, every one of us wants clean water, a better environment. After all, we are going to leave this place and I hope to leave it in a better way for my children and my grandchildren than I found it. But it is interesting, another area that when we are dealing with the environment is to look at the Superfund. And the folks back home say, hey, my tax dollars are going and where are the Superfund sites being cleaned up? And what do we find out? We are spending it on bureaucrats in Washington, DC, who are attorneys and using those dollars to litigate, litigate, litigate. In the meantime, the sites remain dirty. And we want to cut through that so we can take those precious tax dollars, put them into the sites, clean them up and get on with the business of the day at hand.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentlewoman would yield, indeed the current Superfund legislation, in stark contrast to the genuine reforms the new majority would propagate, which we advocate, the current Superfund legislation could well be renamed the special interest and lawyer subsidy act with an incidental tip of the cap to the environment to camouflage its true purpose. I mean that is a long title, but that is in essence what has transpired here. Come to think of it, may not be entirely grammatically correct. I would bow to my friend who taught the fourth grade so capably for many years in that regard.

But regardless of the fractured syntax, it does not take away from the validity of the observation of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall on another occasion just prior to our recent recess when we returned home to the districts, where I came to this floor along with the gentleman from Georgia, a gentleman from Maryland, a gentleman from Michigan. No, we do not agree on every jot and tittle of what should transpire with meaningful reform to conservation and environmental legislation, and yet there were some common themes. One just rearticulated by the gentleman from Georgia dealing with the notion of local control and State control now being perhaps the most capable way to address many of these problems.

Indeed, I do not believe anyone would argue of the necessity of the action taken in the early 1970's in the Nixon administration to create an Environmental Protection Agency. The question now becomes, however, with 50 States with their own departments of environmental qualities, in other words, 50 State-run EPA's, in effect, a legitimate question can be asked, should everything be centered in Washington? Indeed, the gentlewoman from California referred to one of the main problems, and let me pause here so no one will misunderstand. I do not discredit the millions of hard-working people who are in the employ of the Federal Government. I realize many of them work hard to do the jobs they are given. But sometimes those jobs are ill defined, or worse, the dynamics or the situation into which these employees are thrust leads to impracticalities, such as the notion of being deskbound instead of in the field looking at problems.

On an occasion which we were discussing Indian housing, and there are more native Americans living on reservations in the Sixth District of Arizona than anywhere else in the continental United States, one of my constituents offered the story. There was a body of water on the reservation land in that district that the people had come to call Twelve Mile Lake.

□ 2230

Well, there was some contentious debate with an EPA administrator, I believe from San Francisco so the story goes, according to my constituent. And during many telephone conversations, the EPA official in San Francisco behind a desk was adamant, certainly there must be significant wetlands protection for that body of water known as Twelve Mile Lake. The tribal administration, my friend who recounted the story, said, sir, you don't understand, it is not a significant body of water, it is a tiny body of water. It is akin to a mud puddle. Oh, certainly you exaggerate, said the EPA official. There must be these safeguards.

Well, miracle of miracles, the U.S. official, the San Francisco bureaucrat, left that beautiful city by the bay and traveled to the reservation land, and the tribal officials took him to what in essence was a mud puddle. My constituent said, evoking images of Madison Avenue, it made for a Kodak moment to see the expression of stupefaction that crossed the bureaucrat's face. He said something to the effect of, you're right, it is a mud puddle. Why do you call it Twelve Mile Lake? And the tribal official said, well, you see, sir, that's what we've been trying to tell you. The reason this particular small body of water is called Twelve Mile Lake is not because of its dimensions but because, you see, it is 12 miles from the center of town to this particular body of water.

And I think the story speaks volumes, and I daresay a disturbing tendency would be the overzealousness to abandon the context of what is reasonable to have almost the unbelievable advocacy of saying that mud puddle should be equated with a navigable water and should be a wetland that is protected. And that is the next course of action that has been taken on many different fronts. What should always undergird our mission in this Congress is a standard test of the law of Western civilization. What is reasonable? What would a reasonable person do?

Mr. KINGSTON. Our friend Frank Luntz uses this illustration. Do you know that the State of Indiana does not participate in daylight savings time? They do not spring forward and fall backward.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If you would yield for a second, let me also say the great State of Arizona does not subscribe to savings time either.

Mr. KINGSTON. Did you know that Indiana did not? I did not know that of Arizona. Did you know that?

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Yes, I did.

Mr. KINGSTON. You two are exceptionally brilliant. Four hundred thirty-five Members, I can almost promise you that 90 percent of us do not know that. But don't you think that is relevant to the people in Arizona and Indiana, that they do not spring forward and fall backward on their time? And don't you think that would be relevant for a business doing commerce in either of those two States, or a visitor or a government?

And isn't it ironic that I can vote, as can any other Member of Congress on things affecting the people of Arizona and Indiana, and not even know such a fundamental thing about their culture? And yet we do it routinely, just like you talked about with the Twelve Mile Lake.

The bureaucrat in Washington can set the rule, having no idea that the lake is not 12 miles wide, simply that, and not knowing that it is just simply 12 miles from town. But they are experts on everything, and they are from the government and they are here to help and they are going to tell you how to run your town and your State.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. It was interesting, I have just been appointed to the Speaker's Environmental Task Force. I am serving on the steering committee. And during the recess, I naturally organized a task force for my two countries of my district and invited, as a jumping off period, a first meeting, some 28 people from different agencies and local groups that are active within the environment. And when you start thinking about this, this is vast. We can have a lot of great discussions, and I am looking forward to our monthly meetings.

But it was interesting at that first meeting, an attorney who makes his living on litigation said, I hate to say this because I make my living this way, but I deal every day trying to make sense of the regulations from Washington, DC. And because some of these laws were written some 20, 25 years ago, technology is advanced,

science knows so much more, and we need to look at science, we need to look at the technology today and reform and change some of these laws. Not throw them out, but let us change what can fit 1996 for a better way, a better environment.

It was interesting, one of the Federal agencies' representatives said, you know, in my job I have a standard, and I have the State official from the agency following me right behind, and we are doing the same work. In other words, repetition. The taxpayer is not getting good use of people sharing resources.

Another gentleman said from one of the other Federal agencies, you know, I would do anything to be able to have a local advisory group to give me input as to what they feel about situations that affect what I am doing here. So it was interesting, in that short 1-hour beginning meeting of a task force, I was able to learn and get from other people that have to deal in this area every day, their feelings of what we have talked about in this new Congress with this new attitude.

We want to give incentives to people, not penalize them so if they find an endangered species on their property, they are worried about it and they do not want to tell anybody. I want them to be able to tell a government official about it, so that they can get an incentive and figure out how they are going to continue having the endangered species on their property and still have property rights to see that they can utilize that land.

So it is interesting. We have a long way to go. It will be an exciting time to be part of the environmental task force so that we can come together and discuss the policy for the 21st century.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now, one of the things I hear, and you mentioned earlier on the Superfund, is that Superfund is 15 years old. We have spent $25 billion on it and yet we have only cleaned up 12 percent of the national priority polluted sites.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would you yield just a second? I want you to repeat the amount of money spent on this over 12 years, over 15 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. Over 15 years we have spent $25 billion on environmental cleanup and only cleaned up 12 percent of the sites.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. And may I add, if the gentleman would yield, I want to add this statistic. The Justice Department spent over 800,000 man-hours just on Superfund litigation between 1990 and 1992. That is a lot of hours.

Mr. KINGSTON. I understand that translates to about 43 cents on the dollar going to the cost of litigation. Now, it does not matter where you are on the environmental debate, we all should come together and say this is broken and we need to fix it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And if the gentleman would yield, numerous examples from the great Grand Canyon State of Arizona, one in particular from a couple of years ago, bears out what I talked about in an abbreviated fashion this morning in responding to my good friend from Georgia on this floor, and what we have talked about tonight, and indeed what is one of the basic tenets of this new practical, realistic, common sense majority, and that is one size does not fit all.

Phoenix is not the same as Philadelphia, nor is Flagstaff the same as Fargo, ND. And, indeed, something that transpired 2 years ago in the desert City of Tucson, Arizona, offers a stirring example.

There was a violent windstorm in the desert. Those wind storms blow up great dust devils, great amounts of dust in the air. Visibility is poor. There was a car crash on Interstate 10, one of those long 20-car tangos, if you will. But also, even as that was transpiring on the interstate, moving through Tucson, Arizona, technical data collection, equipment provided by the Federal Government to monitor the Clean Air Act, showed that at the same time Tucson was technically in violation of the provisions of the Clean Air Act.

Now, the particulates in the air on that day did not come from the cars involved in the accident on the interstate, it came from the particulates in the air. When you live in a desert and a windstorm blows up, there will be more particulates in the air; ergo, Tucson is not the same a Tacoma. Different places, different areas of this Nation, different climatic conditions offer different challenges.

And, yes, while there are some technologies that are common, certainly the circumstances of those respective areas should be taken into account, not for Washington standards but for local standards that are realistic, reasonable and move to protect the environment.

Mr. KINGSTON. And with the Federal presence, guidance, and oversight, but not necessarily Washington bureaucratic micromanagement.

Now, I think probably the biggest failure of the Washington bureaucracy to manage a problem is local poverty control. You know, the folks on welfare in Savannah, GA, have to do what the bureaucrats tell them to do in Washington, and it is the same bureaucrats telling your folks in California what to do, and the people in California in Mrs. SEASTRAND's district have to do what the folks in Arizona in your district do, and you have one Washington bureaucracy command controlling poverty. As a result, since 1964 we have spent $5 trillion on poverty. The poverty rate then was 14 percent, and the poverty rate now is 14 percent. It has not worked. We need local control and flexibility.

You know what? I cannot solve Mrs. SEASTRAND's poverty problem, and I cannot solve Mr. HAYWORTH's, and maybe I cannot solve mine. But you know what? I can do a heck of a lot better job on mine than I can on yours. Just give me the tools and I think I can do it.

That is one reason why you want State block grants. Cut out the poverty brokers and put the control in the hands of the local people.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. If the gentleman would yield. I had a firsthand experience in what you are saying. I served in the State assembly in California. And so often the folks back here in Washington, DC, in this House, would vote a particular bill, legislation, change the law, and then it would come down to us and they would hold the hammer over our head. If you do not follow these rules the way we want you to do it, we are going to hold back on transportation funds or welfare funds or whatever.

And we knew that we could do it a better way; that we here in California perhaps did not match what you needed to do for your folks in Savannah, GA, or the people in Arizona. And that was day in, day out that we were constantly told if we did not adhere to the new mandates from the Federal Government they would hold back something from us.

So many times I would vote no to just protest, and then most of the folks, though, would vote yes and we would receive another mandate from the Federal Government that many times did not make sense to us at the State level.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And if the gentlewoman would yield, it is worth noting that one of the genuine reforms and one of the few times in which the gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in the big white house was willing to work with us was on this notion of unfunded mandates, where Washington bureaucrats decreed to local government officials you will do it this way.

The frustration of that system has led the mayor of Winslow, AZ, to coin a new phrase. He calls it the idiocracy. The idiocracy which would mandate an action being taken without taking into account the realistic, common sense, reasonable notions of the good people who live right there in the area and also want to redress the problem but on their own terms, reflecting their own priorities, with no less of a commitment to solving that problem. That is what we must remember.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. If the gentleman would yield. I know our time is coming to a close, but I would just say that all of Americans across this Nation I think have to be reminded that so many of them voted for a change in 1994 and that change has begun, but it is not going to be completed in such a short time. We have to chip away at so much that has been built after 40 years and we have to keep driving for that change.

You know, I am pleased, being from California, that we have seen, in passing legislation off this floor regarding immigration reform, we talked about lowering taxes, and we talked about earlier the line item veto and returning government decisions to state and

local levels and to continue our push for a balanced budget. But we have to continue to do that. And I just would say that what we have seen happen here, there are forces that do not like what we have accomplished.

□ 2245

They are going to try their very best to more or less take some of us out in this next election so that they can take back that old status quo of big bureaucratic Washington-controlled government. I just am going to fight it, as I know you gentlemen will, too.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would close with an observation by one of my constituents in the Navajo Nation, having spent Sunday in Window Rock, Arizona. A lady told the story of a young homemaker in a Navajo household cutting off a substantial portion of a hand. Kids asked her why. She said, I do not know; mom did it. So she went to great-grandma and she said, why did you cut off a major part of your hand. She said, well, it used to be a smaller pot and so I had to cut that off to make it fit in the pot, an example of a tradition for tradition's sake that defied common sense and needed to be changed, in much the same way we need to make changes here. Not because Washington said so, but because technology and the people living in those areas are willing to make the changes of their own volition. History does not occur in a vacuum and history is on the side of freedom.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me conclude with this. Last week a teacher in Darien, Georgia told me that in an 8-hour day she spends two to three hours filling our paperwork, about 50 percent of it is for the Federal Government. That is 10 to 15 hours a week that is not spent teaching Johnny how to read, write, and do arithmetic. She can teach her children better than the bureaucrats who are making her fill out the paperwork in Washington.

What we are asking with that and all these other examples, let the local people do what they know how to do best and let the Washington bureaucrats stop the micromanagement, return freedom to the people and increase personal responsibility along the way.

I thank Mrs. SEASTRAND of California and Mr. HAYWORTH of Arizona for being with me tonight.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLUTE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, on April 17.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WATT of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

(Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania (at his own request), for 5 minutes, today.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. NORTON.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. RICHARDSON, in two instances.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. STOKES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLUTE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, in two instances.

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. EWING.

Mr. TORKILDSEN, in two instances.

Mr. KING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MARTINI.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. LATOURETTE.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. KING in two instances.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. TIAHRT.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. MASCARA.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. ORTON.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. WARD.

Mr. OBEY.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following title:

On March 20, 1996:

H.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to grant the consent of the Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois.

On March 28, 1996:

H.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to two bills of the 104th Congress.

H.R. 2969. An act to eliminate the Board of Tea Experts by repealing the Tea Importation Act of 1897.

On March 29, 1996:

H.R. 3136. An act to provide for enactment of the Senior Citizen's Right to Work Act of 1996, the Line-Item Veto Act, and the Small Business Growth and Fairness Act of 1996, and to provide for a permanent increase in the public debt limit.

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

On April 3, 1996:

H.R. 2854. An act to modify the operation of certain agricultural programs.

On April 5, 1996:

H.R. 1833. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

H.R. 1561. An act to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for U.S. foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 17, 1996, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2378. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on automated information systems of DOD, pursuant to Public Law 104–106, section 366(c)(1) (110 Stat. 276); to the Committee on National Security.

2379. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting three reports pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, the report are as follows: ''Improving the Combat Edge Through Outsourcing,'' in response to section 357; ''Policy Regarding Performance of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair,'' in response to section 311(c); and ''Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workload,'' in response to section 311(i); to the Committee on National Security.