for the Port of New Orleans, the Downtown Development District and the United Way. He was also president of the Metropolitan Area Committee, Kingsley House, Touro Synagogue and the Jewish Federation of Greater New Orleans. Donnie also served on the board of directors for the New Orleans Symphony.

His passion was for the city of New Orleans. Though a decided underdog, he ran two very competitive campaigns for mayor falling just short each time. After his attempts for mayor, Donnie returned to his law practice and pursued strengthening black-Jewish relations.

He was extremely interested in the subject because as Tulane Law School Dean John Kramer said, ''he felt the bridges ought to be there. He felt the strong minority communities were the Jewish and the black communities, and the last thing that should happen was that they should be turned against each other. He never gave up.''

He and his wife Susan raised two talented children, Michelle and Arthur, and always had time for me and my family whenever we visited New Orleans. And when my career took me to the House of Representatives, he hosted receptions in his home, introducing me to his friends.

My most vivid memory of Donnie comes from that leadership institute in the summer of 1958. On one of the first days of the program, we took some time off to play softball. When Donnie came to the plate for the first time, he laid down a perfect bunt and raced to first base. As he reached the bag, he stumbled, landed hard and suffered a concussion. Near the end of the 2-week institute, we played softball again. Donnie now recovered from a serious injury, came back up to bat. On the first pitch, he laid down a bunt identical to the one on the play when he had been hurt, and beat the throw to first. Donnie was not intimidated by adversity. He never backed off from a challenge and he lived his life at full speed.

Donnie Mintz touched the lives of many people. His city, his State and his Nation are better because of him. He will be missed.

IN MEMORY OF DONALD MINTZ

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, my home city of New Orleans lost a great leader and a good man on Sunday when my friend Donald Mintz died in his sleep. Donald was a civic activist who worked unceasingly to improve living conditions in his city and a national Jewish lay leader who strove mightily to help those of different races and faiths understand and work better with each other.

In New Orleans, Donald had been chairman of the Dock Board, the Downtown Development District and the United Way, and president of the metropolitan Area Committee, Kingsley House, Touro Synagogue and the Jewish Federation of Greater New Orleans, and had served on the board of numerous other civic organizations as well—always with an energy, a flair, a seriousness and a wisdom which helped each organization reach unprecedented achievements. He loved New Orleans, and he sacrificed greatly to serve her.

All of us who knew him, and the all very, very many whose lives were bettered by his efforts, have been enriched by his life and are sorry for his passing.

□ 1745

THE QUINN FAMILY: ANOTHER TRAGEDY CAUSED BY ICWA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, last week I came to this floor to announce my hopes that some minor changes can be made to the Indian Child Welfare Act so that it will no longer have the chilling effect it does on adoptions in this Nation and so that it serves the interests of children first.

Last week I told of the heart wrenching story of the Rost family from my own district in Columbus, OH, and their still unresolved battle to adopt the twin girls they have had for almost 3 years now. The girls, unbeknownst to the Rosts, turned out to be 1/32 Pomo Indian due to blood from a great-great-great-grandparent. The twins and their adoptive parents still fear the day that the courts rule the twins be returned to a dysfunctional abusive environment due to a twisted, inaccurate, yet far too common application of the Indian Child Welfare Act.

Today I want to share with you another of the countless horror stories I have heard from all over our country. This case took place in the State of Washington, where the Quinn family spent 3½ years fighting for custody of their son, Loren.

This couple had worked with a 14-year-old biological mother for 7 months prior to the birth of a baby boy. They were even present to celebrate the birth mother's 15th birthday. The prospective parents attended the birth of the little boy at the invitation of the birth mother and and later took him into their home, honoring her wishes. There they loved and nurtured him.

Weeks later, they got the horrible message, the worst fear of all adoptive parents, that nightmare that becomes a reality, that the birth mother had changed her mind and wanted the child back.

Although she had voluntarily relinquished custody of her child, even chosen this couple, she attempted to reverse her decision under the Indian Child Welfare Act by retroactively enrolling with the Cherokee Nation.

It took 3½ years to finally reach a conclusion in the courts, 3½ years of horror, sleepless nights and worry of the unknown for this family who wanted nothing more than to provide a secure and happy home for the little boy they loved so much.

Mr. Speaker, night feedings, diapers, pediatricians, bottles and baths, birthday parties, first steps, bedtime stories, bedtime prayers, colic, car seats, first words and lullabies, on and on and on, these are the joys of a family. But for 3½ years the normal joy was somewhat subdued, because for 3½ years the future of this family was unknown.

He would have been removed from the only home and family he ever knew, and, Mr. Speaker, many courts have ruled this way. They misinterpret the intent of ICWA, take these children and send them to strange places. Now, we must ask ourselves, is this what is in the best interest of the children involved? Is this what ICWA was intended to do?

Mr. Speaker, not only the legislative history but common sense dictates that the answer is no. Very simple, minor reforms to the Indian Child Welfare Act would clarify these ambiguities. Membership in the tribe would be effective from the date of admission and could not be applied retroactively as in the case of the Rosts and the Quinns and countless others.

Mr. Speaker, ICWA was intended to stop State court abuses of native American children in involuntary placements. It was needed and well intended at the time. But it was not intended to interrupt voluntary adoption proceedings. As it is currently written, ICWA is a factor in every single adoption in this country because it is hard to say, and almost impossible to determine what child may or may not, through some remote part of its heritage, be some part Native American. And who can prepare for a law being applied retroactively, no matter how diligent and careful?

The simple and minor changes to ICWA will preserve the intent of the act, ensuring the culture and heritage of Native Americans, and at the same time protect the rights of birth parents, adoptive parents, and, above all, the children.

Mr. Speaker, I can almost guarantee that every Member in this body has at least one case of a judicial abuse of ICWA in their districts. I urge my colleagues to support these changes. Congress created these ambiguities, with all the best intentions, in 1978. It is time for Congress to correct them and stop the heartbreak.

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

[Mr. MARKEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FIRST LADY'S FINGERPRINTS ON BILLING RECORDS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Newsweek magazine reported this week that the FBI had discovered Mrs. Hillary Rodham Clinton's fingerprints on billing records from the Rose law firm discovered at the White House in January. These billing records have been under subpoena and could not be found for over 2 years. Nobody knew where they were. And yet, just recently, they were found in President Clinton and Mrs. Clinton's personal residence at the White House by Mrs. Clinton's secretary.

Independent counsel Kenneth Starr is investigating to determine if anyone obstructed justice by hiding the subpoenaed records. The billing records supply important information about Mrs. Clinton's work for Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan and the Castle Grande real estate projects. Arkansas Governor Jim Guy Tucker, who at the time this was taking place was the Lieutenant Governor under President Clinton, is on trial right now in Arkansas for fraud because he defaulted on loans over $1 million related to Castle Grande.

Now, Mrs. Clinton was the billing partner at the Rose Law Firm for the Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan account. However, she stated in a sworn statement to the Resolution Trust Corporation that she did very little work for Madison Guaranty and could not recall the Castle Grande project.

Yet, these mysterious billing records, that could not be found for over 2 years that were just found, tell a different story. They show that she had 14 meetings and conversations with Madison executives about Castle Grande and she drafted a comprehensive option agreement for this project.

Regarding the fingerprints, White House lawyers told reporters that Mrs. Clinton reviewed the billing records during the campaign in 1992. Now, this sounds strange, because if she reviewed them in 1992, she should have remembered that she had done extensive work on this project and on this comprehensive option agreement for the project.

Anyhow, they said that the fingerprints on the telephone records can remain intact on paper and other materials for years, so her fingerprints on the billing records do not necessarily mean that she saw the records recently.

Now, this is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because when Vincent Foster died, you remember Vincent Foster, the assistant counsel to the President at the White House, when Vincent Foster died, a suicide note was found in his briefcase. At least that is what they called it. Despite the fact that it had been torn into 28 pieces, you have to tear it to get 28 pieces 14 of 15 times, there was not one single fingerprint on any one of those pieces. Investigators and various Clinton administration officials said at the time that it was not unusual, because fingerprints do not attach themselves easily to paper.

Now, here we have the President's wife, the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, her fingerprints are all over these telephone records that nobody could find for 2 years and were found in their residence, while they were under subpoena, incidentally, and they are saying that it is not unusual for the fingerprints to be attached to paper, and that she probably attached them to those documents in 1992 during the Presidential campaign.

Now, you cannot have it both ways. Either it can be attached to paper, you can get fingerprints on paper, or you cannot. Her fingerprints were on the documents, but the fingerprints were not on Vince Foster's alleged suicide note.

Adding to the mystery, the first two times that the White House counsel at the time, Bernie Nussbaum, search Vincent Foster's briefcase, he did not find any torn up note. The note was found 6 days later when another White House aide searched the briefcase for a third time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has to be one way or the other. If fingerprints attach themselves easily to paper and stay there for years, there is no explanation for why Vincent Foster's note had no fingerprints on them, especially since it had been torn into 28 pieces. And if fingerprints do not attach themselves easily to paper and if they wear off quickly, then Mrs. Clinton must have handled the billing records more recently than her aides are saying, which was 4 years ago, in 1992.

Mr. Speaker, this is something else that I hope we get to the bottom of. Those records were subpoenaed over 2 years ago. They should have been given to the independent counsel. They are not. They were found in the White House Presidential residence. They had the First Lady's fingerprints all over them.

There is something very mysterious about this. It should be explained fully to the American people. They were subpoenaed. They may have been an obstruction of justice, keeping those records from the independent counsel. If that is the case, somebody should be held accountable for it.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1996]

FIRST LADY'S PRINTS ON DOCUMENT, MAGAZINE SAYS

(By Susan Schmidt)

Hillary Rodham Clinton's fingerprints have been identified on the legal billing records that were discovered in the White House In January, according to a published report.

The records, sought for more than two years by Whitewater special investigators and the subject of several subpoenas, consist of a 116-page computer printout detailing work Clinton and other lawyers at the Rose Law Firm did during the 1980s for the now-failed Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan.

The independent counsel's office asked for the fingerprint analysis in an attempt to determine where the records were, why it took so long to find them and whether there are grounds to bring obstruction of justice charges against anyone for failure to produce them.

Newsweek reported in the issue on newsstands today that Clinton's fingerprints are among those the FBI has found on the document. Deputy White House counsel Mark Fabiani said the administration has no independent knowledge of the fingerprint analysis. ''In January we said it was possible Mrs. Clinton handled these records during the 1992 campaign, so this report should not be surprising,'' he said. Clinton said she did not recall whether she looked at the document during the campaign.

Fingerprints can remain intact on some materials, including paper, for years.

The billing records show that most of Clinton's work for Madison was on the Castle Grande project. That real estate project led to indictments, including some of the charges in the ongoing criminal trial in Arkansas of Madison operators James B. and Susan McDougal. The Clintons and McDougals were joint owners of Whitewater, another land venture in the Ozarks. In the billing records, Castle Grande is referred to under the name ''IDC,'' the entity that sold the land to Madison.

During interviews with federal investigators in 1994 and 1995, Clinton was unable to recall most of the work that she did for Madison.

In particular, she said she was unable to recall doing any work on Madison's Castle Grande real estate venture. The Rose billing records were discovered this year by Carolyn Huber, a White House aide who handles personal correspondence for the Clintons, as she unpacked items that had been in the ''book room'' in the White House residence. How the document got to the book room remains a mystery.

David E. Kendall, the Clintons' attorney, and White House special counsel Jane Sherburne, called before the Senate Whitewater committee in January, testified that they realized the document—and the circumstances of its discovery after two years—would be of great interest to independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr and the committee.

Sherburne said she raised the issue of whether Starr would want to check the document for fingerprints and questioned whether they should turn it over to Starr before copying it.

After a discussion, she, Kendall and a lawyer for Huber decided to examine and copy the document and to notify Starr and the Senate committee the following day.

Republicans contended that Sherburne and Kendall had knowingly made it more difficult to obtain fingerprints from the records.

Yesterday, a White House official who refused to be named accused Starr's office of leaking the results of the fingerprint analysis, although the official said he didn't actually know the source of the information.

''It is not surprising that this outrageous leak should come at a time when independent counsel Starr is being criticized for allowing the erosion of public confidence in the fairness of his work because of his continuing partisan affiliations,'' said the official. Clinton aides have recently insisted that Starr's Republican credentials and outside legal work for clients with interests adverse to the government render him unfit to conduct an impartial probe.

[From Newsweek, May 6, 1996]

TELLTALE FINGERPRINTS?

As President Clinton prepared for his videotaped testimony in the trial of his

Whitewater partners James and Susan McDougal, independent counsel Kenneth Starr has received new evidence in his probe of the discovery of Rose Law Firm billing records in the White House last summer. Sources close to the inquiry told Newsweek's Michael Isikoff that FBI experts have identified Mrs. Clinton's fingerprints on the documents. The records, detailing her work for McDougal's Madison thrift, were subpoenaed in 1994 but not turned over until this January.

The documents include computer printouts and photocopied pages made during the '92 campaign. They were removed from the Rose firm in '92 by the late Vince Foster. Mrs. Clinton has said she had ''no idea'' the papers were in the White House. Her lawyer David Kendall later said ''it is possible'' Mrs. Clinton was shown the records in '92, but ''she does not recall.'' Kendall now says the fingerprint discovery is ''not surprising.'' At the least, the findings show Mrs. Clinton reviewed the records in '92, undercutting her claim she couldn't recall many of the mid-'80s meetings they cover. And, says one source, they could be ''critical'' in building a potential obstruction-of-justice case against her. Starr's office declined to comment on the FBI finding, but Newsweek has learned the prosecutor is intensifying his inquiry. In recent weeks, Mrs. Clinton's chief of staff, Maggie Williams, and close friend Susan Thomases have been recalled by a grand jury for further questioning about the records.

MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS, THE EPITOME OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to say a few words about our health care system. The current debate over changing our system seems to have fallen victim to partisan political posturing. That is unfortunate.

Three years ago, along with a dozen of my Democratic colleagues, I cosponsored legislation to create medical savings accounts, most commonly known as MSA's. Today, I am still a Democrat, and I am still a supporter of MSA's.

MSA's are an idea whose goal is to re-introduce the consumers' best interests into the health care market place. Clearly, consumers' needs are not being met. For instance, when was the last time a mammogram sale was advertised?

We see advertisements concerning sales on eye check-ups, eyeglasses, and frames—we even receive mailings on teeth cleanings and annual dental exams. So what is the difference?

Typically, an individual's health care expenses are paid for by their insurance policy, so there is never a thought about finding premium care at low costs. Why? Because people are spending the insurance company's money, not their own.

But when it comes to spending money on eyeglasses or for a dentist—money that typically comes right out of one's own pocketbook—cost, service, and quality suddenly become important. In fact, due to cost effective shopping, spending for those industries was relatively flat during the years health care costs were soaring.

MSA's would encourage the same kind of consumer response for health care. By forcing doctors and hospitals to compete for patients who are concerned about quality and cost, health care spending will slow down. Ultimately, this competition will lead to sales on important services, such as mammograms.

Likewise, MSA's will provide a real incentive to shop around for the best values and alternatives when nonemergency treatment is needed. The incentive? Consumers will keep the money they save.

Critics of MSA's claim that this incentive will lead healthy people to choose MSA's, leaving sick people in a separate, and therefore, more expensive health insurance pool. But while many healthy people will choose to save money, the sick will also choose MSA's because their out-of-pocket costs will be less.

Moreover, during recent health care debates, a rallying cry on both sides of the aisle was choice. MSA's provide that choice for consumers, and that is exactly what MSA's are about.

And what is wrong with giving a break to people who take care of themselves, exercise regularly, watch what they eat and drink, and don't smoke? Don't they deserve something for their efforts?

We as a society are already subsidizing those who abuse drugs and alcohol and are severely overweight. According to one recent study, one out of every four welfare mothers uses illegal drugs or drinks excessively. In addition, it is documented that Medicaid recipients use prescription drugs 2.2 times as much, see their doctors 3.6 times more, and visit the hospital 4.5 times as often as those who have their own insurance.

So I ask again, what is wrong with giving people a break for taking care of themselves?

There are additional reasons that MSA's are good for the consumer. MSA's will reduce administrative overhead as small bills will be settled and paid directly between provider and consumer. They will also increase the record low savings rate of Americans. Lastly, since MSA's provide an incentive to stay healthy, preventive medicine will be encouraged.

These are the reasons I support the MSA concept when I first heard about it, and these are the reasons I support MSA's today.

□ 2000

But there is an additional and very powerful reason why I still support MSAs. They are clearly successful where they are being offered, in spite of Congress' failure to act on the needed changes in the Tax Code.

So I say to my colleagues, as we prepare to reconcile the House and Senate health reform bills, include MSAs in any health insurance reform measure that will come out of Congress this year, because MSAs will cut costs, provide choice, promote healthy lives and save money for the consumers. Is that not what the epitome of reform is?

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hands a Marine ammo pouch. This is the type of a pouch that the Marine Corps infantryman uses to put his M–16 rounds of 5.56 millimeter rounds in for combat operations. This empty Marine ammo pouch represents yet another symbol, really, of the Clinton Defense budget coming apart at the seams.

Pursuant to conversations and briefings that we had with the Marine Corps and other services, when I asked as the chairman of the Procurement Subcommittee on National Security if they had enough ammunition to fight two regional conflicts, which is what we want our Marines and our Army to be able to fight, the Marines said candidly, no, Congressman, we do not. And we said, well, how short are you of ammunition? And they sent over a list of the ammunition that they were short; included in it is $30 million in basic M–16 bullets. That is 96 million bullets that the Marine Corps infantrymen are short, should they have to fight two regional conflicts.

That means if we got into a fight in the Persian Gulf, like the one we had with Saddam Hussein, and then at the same time, we saw the North Koreans moving down the Korean Peninsula and we had to stop them with Marines, with soft bodies, those Marines would not have enough ammunition to do their job and protect themselves because this administration has come up millions of dollars short in ammunition.

Now, last week we had a hearing on safety, aviation safety, after the F–14s crashed. We had three F–14 crashes before the hearing, one right after the hearing. At the same time, we had three of the *Harrier* jump jets, those are vertical takeoff jets, that the Marines use. And the Marine aviation leaders told us that the Clinton administration does not intend to make the safety upgrades to 24 of those Marine *Harrier* jump jets. They further told us that those safety upgrades that they make the aircraft 40 percent safer for the pilot flying it.

Now, when you consider that about 30 percent of our *Harrier* jump jets have crashed, that is a pretty big safety margin and a penny-wise and pound-foolish move for the Clinton administration to make, to cut safety upgrade money out of the budget. But this is a result of these massive defense cuts that the Clinton administration is administering to the men and women who serve in the Armed Services.