7.2 percent. So we will give Medicare recipients even more than the First Lady suggested in 1993.''

After we made that recommendation, my goodness, you would have thought that this was a radical new idea that nobody had ever thought of before, and that we had gone into a cave one weekend, came out of the cave with clubs, and said ''How can we stick it to senior citizens?''

But, Mr. President and members of the Democratic Party, facts are stubborn things. This proposal is more generous for senior citizens than even the President's proposal in 1993.

And what did the press say about it? Well, there was a silence. There was a conspiracy of silence for some time. In an article in Roll Call this morning, Morton Kondracke talks about how a new study shows that 89 percent of journalists in Washington voted for Bill Clinton in 1992 and only 6 percent voted for George Bush.

I really do not care who they voted for. I care about how they report the news. Unfortunately, during the Medicare debate, the way they reported the news for a good portion of the time was one-sided and shameful.

There are notable exceptions, and I have got to say one of the most notable exceptions has been the Washington Post, long considered to be an enemy of conservatives, the Washington Post told it straight when they talked about the President's demagoguery and shameful behavior on Medicare.

The Post started with an editorial talking about medagoguery, talking about how the Democrats and the President were more interested in scaring senior citizens and allowing Medicare to go bankrupt than they were in helping senior citizens.

Later they wrote an editorial talking about what they called the real default when this Government was close to defaulting. They said the real default was the President and the Democrats' refusal to help senior citizens. In fact, the terminology was they said, ''The President and the Democrats,'' quoting the Washington Post, ''have shamelessly demagogued on the Medicare issue to scare senior citizens, because that is where they think the votes are.''

Another editorialist, Robert Samuelson, for the Washington Post, wrote later in straightforward terms that ''The President,'' and I am quoting Robert Samuelson, I would not say this on the floor myself, but Robert Samuelson said, ''The President lied on Medicare to win votes from senior citizens when the President knew that Social Security was going bankrupt.''

Matthew Miller, a former employee of President Clinton, wrote a front page article for the very liberal New Republic, and the headline was ''Why the Democrats' Demagoguery on Medicare Is Worse Than You Thought.''

And Miller's quote was, ''The President has taken the low road on Medicare in ways that only the media could call standing tall.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The Chair would remind the gentleman from Florida that he is not to use any personally derogatory terms in relation to the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, are they permissible if they are not my terms?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules of the House do not allow the gentleman to quote from anyone, from any source, that may give some derogatory term to the President which would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Needless to say, many people have been concerned with the behavior of elected officials on this issue. Why do I bring it up? Why do I not just leave this issue alone? It is not a good issue, right?

Well, let me tell you something. I have got two parents that are about to go on Medicare. I have got a 93-year-old grandmother who is on Medicare right now. The fact of the matter is that the President of the United States had his own Medicare trustees come before him and tell him that Medicare was going bankrupt.

Unfortunately, the news got worse. This past fall they were aware of the fact that Medicare was going bankrupt even quicker than the April 1995 report stated. In fact, instead of Medicare going bankrupt in 7 years, the new reports that the White House got was that Medicare is going bankrupt in 5 years. And the CBO just came out with a new report that says it is even worse than we ever imagined. Medicare is going down the drain quickly, and something better be done about it fast.

I think it is time for us to put the demagoguery behind us. It is time to make a difference, and it is time to save Medicare for my grandmother and for my parents. I personally, if telling the truth costs me my seat, I really do not care.

The President came before this Chamber and talked about the era of big Government being over. I do not know how many of you saw the State of the Union Address, but he came before us and talked about the era of big Government being over. He said Government should not be involved in everything. Of course, 2 days ago he thought gas prices were getting too high, so he decided I am going to kind of interfere in the economy and sell off some oil reserves and we will try to cut gas prices that way, instead of course cutting the 4.56-cent per gallon tax he increased on us.

The next day the Washington Post ran an article, ''Clinton Acts to Halt Drop in Beef Prices.''

Well, apparently the President and his administration thought that beef prices were becoming too low for consumers, that they could actually afford to buy beef more, so they decided that they were going to do what they could to increase beef prices. And the Post says, ''One day after intervening to hold down gasoline prices he said were getting too high, President Clinton yesterday announced steps to help cattle producers rally from prices they say are too low.

Clinton's action left White House aides laboring to explain the apparent contradiction of a President who says he supports free markets, but who is also launching initiatives aimed at fine-tuning prices in different industries on consecutive days.

Ladies and gentlemen, either you believe that Government is too big, that it spends too much money, and that the era of big Government is over, or you do not. We need consistency from our leaders, not only at the White House, but also in conference.

Now, we have been hearing Democrats talking for some time also this past week or two about the minimum wage. This is another one of those issues. You do not talk about Medicare, you do not talk about the minimum wage. It is a loser, right? A lot of Democrats think that they have found the Holy Grail. After being intellectually bankrupt for a year or so, now they think they have found the issue, and it is the minimum wage.

Well, facts are stubborn things. In 1992, Gov. Bill Clinton, running for President, was asked if he supported an increase in the minimum wage. The President said, then Governor, said that he opposed an increase in the minimum wage. Governor Clinton said he opposed an increase in the minimum wage. He said it would hurt too many working class Americans, it would cost too much money, and it would cause too much unemployment.

In fact, his chief economist wrote a scathing indictment of those people who would suggest that we would help the working class by raising the minimum wage.

There has been a study by a recent Nobel Prize winning economist who says that it could cost us up to 400,000 jobs, of not only high school students and college students, but also working class Americans that are holding down different jobs, that if we act this way we are going to lose 400,000 jobs.

Unfortunately, with every study showing that, with every single reputable study showing the same thing, that minimum wage increases cost jobs, we still have people advocating it.

It goes back to Medicare. If it costs me my job here to just simply speak the truth and to tell people what the facts are, fine. But facts are stubborn things. We have to tear through the emotionalism, the demagoguery, the politics of it all, and talk about what really matters, and that is figuring out a way to help working class Americans,

and we do that by getting the Government off their backs, by cutting taxes, the way we attempted to cut taxes before the President vetoed them, by balancing the budget the way we attempted to balance the budget for the first time in a generation before the President vetoed those balanced budgets, to try to cut regulations to allow entrepreneurs to expand and grow, and to end welfare as we know it.

□ 1200

The President in 1992, when he was campaigning, said he was going to end welfare as we know it. Well, in his first 2 years here, when he had Democrats controlling both Houses, he refused to bring up a bill on welfare reform. He also, by the way, and I think it is quite ironic that everybody has sort of had this last-minute conversion to raising the minimum wage when they know it is going to cost jobs; it is also ironic that in the 2 years that the Democrats controlled Congress and the White House, they did not try to raise the minimum wage.

Why did they not try to raise the minimum wage? Because it would have caused an increase in unemployment figures. That would have been bad politically. You see, you raise the minimum wage now, there is going to be a lull before those rates go up, which probably will be after the election.

So we have got to ask, how do we help the working class? I have to tell you, I understand it very well. I remember back in the early 1970's my father went to college, worked hard, got a job at Lockheed in Atlanta, worked there for many years, and when Lockheed fell on hard times, he got laid off and was unemployed. And I remember driving around the South with my father over a summer. We were looking for a job, any job, to keep the family going.

But during that time, during that extremely difficult time for my family, and I remember the Christmases, I remember how difficult it was at Christmas, I remember how difficult birthdays were for my parents. Not for the kids, because we really did not know any different, but it was tough for my parents. I never once remember my parents saying, hey, you know, it is all that doctor's fault down the road; or it is that businesswoman's fault down the road that started up her own business. They did not try to incite class warfare, they did not try to blame anybody else or say, oh, it is the CEO's at Lockheed. They recognized that these things happen and it is a difficult economy that we live in.

Unfortunately, the economy continues to get worse and worse. We are in the middle of what many are now calling the Clinton crunch, because the rate of growth in this economy continues to stagger at about 1.2 percent.

Now, you may remember in 1992, then Governor Clinton was talking about how the economy was terrible and how it was the economy, Stupid, and that is why George Bush needed to be voted out. What they are not telling you now is the economy is staggering along at a slower clip today than it was back in 1992. In the last quarter we had 4 percent growth in the economy. When the election was being held in November 1992, the economy was growing at 4 percent, a healthy, healthy clip. Unfortunately, right now it is staggering at about 1 percent. Facts, my friends, are very, very stubborn things.

As I go to town hall meetings I hear middle-class Americans telling me, you guys in Washington are killing us. You have got to get off our backs. You have to cut taxes. It is not people making $100,000, $200,000, that are asking for tax breaks. They are not saying, gee, I need another boat. It is working-class Americans. A lot of single parents coming up to me in town hall meetings and saying I am working two jobs, by the time I pay my taxes, I do not even have money for health care insurance or for day care.

I do not know how many of you saw last night an episode, I believe it was of ''Prime Time Live,'' but they interviewed a family that was falling further and further behind and they broke the bad news to the wife in the family that she was actually losing money holding down a second job because of high taxes, because of child care, because of all the other expenses. And that is something Americans need to know. Facts are stubborn things. We have many people including the President and many in this Chamber, that have raised taxes and that have fought us trying to cut taxes. Women of America, working women of America, if you are in a two-income family, you are averaging about $29,000 a year, on average. The facts clearly show that you are not bringing a cent home for yourself. All of your money is going toward taxes. All of your money. It is shameful.

I figure if God gets 10 percent, I do not think Congress and Bill Clinton should get 28, 29, 30 percent. Just does not make sense. But people still ask themselves, and others last night on the TV show, they are saying, we look at our parents and we see the way our parents lived in the 1950's, when mom would stay home, dad would go out to work, and this is not a sexist thing, you could have it opposite, dad stays home and mom goes out to work, I do not care, but somebody is staying home with the children.

They say, we remember back the way it was in the 1950's and we ask ourselves what is happening to us? Are we failures? Why are both of us working, leaving our children home and working harder and harder every year and falling further and further behind? This is a societal tide.

When I was running for office in 1994, I could not afford to pay the filing fee. I did not have the money. So I went door to door and knocked on doors in neighborhoods because I had to get petitions signed. Nobody was home. Walk through your neighborhoods, they are vacant. They are ghost towns in the middle of the day. The neighborhoods of the 1950's and 1960's and 1970's that we know are gone. They are ghost towns.

When I coached football and taught school, most of the kids I coached and taught went home after school without a parent at home to ask them how their day was, to see if they could help them with their homework, to keep them out of trouble. That is when most of the kids I taught got in trouble, whether it was with drugs, or with sex, or whatever it was, it was after they got home from school, when no parents were there to say, hey, how was your day, what was going on?

It is a societal tide and people ask, why is this happening to us? Unfortunately, it goes back to taxes. Believe it or not, it goes back to taxes. In the 1950's that family was paying about 5 or 6 percent in taxes to Washington, DC, in income taxes. Today, that average American family pays about 26, 27 percent.

So, you see, if they wanted to keep up with their parents in real dollars, in current dollars, they would have to make about six times as much as their parents made in the 1950's.

We have to get Washington off the backs of working-class Americans. We have got to cut taxes, we have to balance the budget to lower interest rates, we have to cut regulations, we have to make a difference. And, unfortunately, the facts have not been getting out.

They will get out, they will get out every day from now until November, because people need to know where we stand on the issues. They need to know where the President stands on the issues. He needs to tell Americans once and for all and then act on his words. Is he for tax cuts? If so, he needs to pass our tax cuts.

He needs to cut taxes not only in gasoline, which we are going to do because he raised taxes on it; we are going to cut taxes for senior citizens that he raised in 1993; we are going to give working-class families a $500 per child tax credit; we are going to cut capital gains to stimulate investment, because let us face it, people do not like saying it these days, but there is a direct correlation between how much a small business makes and how many people they can hire.

We have to do all of these things, and we have to continue to fight. Now is not the time to back down. And it is a fight that all of America is going to have to fight. It is a fight our senior citizens are going to have to get engaged in if they want to save Medicare and if they want to save this country for future generations.

And I have to tell you, I have confidence that they will, because those who are seniors now, like my grandparents and parents, not only made it through the Great Depression in the 1930's and had incredible sacrifices, but also fought through World War II,

fought back the tyranny of Nazi Germany and Hitler, fought back the tyranny of Japan, and made this country and, in fact, made Western civilization safe for democracy.

That is what we have to do in the 21st century. I am firmly committed, and I know my other Republican colleagues and some conservative Democrats are also firmly committed, to making sure that the 21st century, like the 20th eventually, will be remembered as the American century. And to do that we have to turn back to the basic truths our Founding Fathers left us.

You know, James Madison said that the government that governs least governs best. Actually, that was Thomas Jefferson. James Madison, who was really the father of the Constitution, said we have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government but upon the capacity of the individual to govern himself, control himself, and sustain himself according to the Ten Commandments of God.

We have turned away from those basic truths, and that is why we find ourselves $5 trillion in debt in a country that is rapidly going bankrupt and that steals from future generations to pay off current political promises, that misleads senior citizens into believing they are their friends when they are allowing the coffers to run dry in Medicare, that tries to figure out how to cut gas prices in every way but repealing the gas tax that they passed just 2 years ago.

You see, we have to refocus our efforts. We have to reclaim the revolution that we wanted to start in 1994, and we have to retake America, and that is what this fight is about, and it is a fight that we will win.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I want to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's Parks for Tomorrow plan represents an act of plagiarism. Of the 18 proposals contained in the President's plan, not a single one represents a new idea or concept. Rather, these are responses by the administration to acts of Congress, bipartisan proposals which have been circulating on Capitol Hill, in some cases for years, and even concepts which the administration has opposed, outright until recently.

However, this is National Parks Week, and the administration wants to look like it is active, even if it has no parks agenda. So it has stolen other persons' ideas. In fact, over the last 3½ years, the Clinton administration has sent a grand total of seven legislative proposals to Capitol Hill for action. Most of these proposals were for minor ministerial duties, such as increasing the development ceilings at a handful of parks, and authorizing the location of memorials to Thomas Paine and World War II on The Mall. Only one of these proposals previously submitted to Congress is even mentioned in the President's 18-point plan.

In February 1995, the General Accounting Office testified before my subcommittee that the National Park Service was in a crisis. Drastic action was needed now to solve critical funding and other problems facing the agency. According to the Interior Inspector General, the National Park Service hadn't balanced its books in three years. The National Park Service has no way to ensure its existing funds are spent on the highest priority projects, said the GAO. The response from the Clinton administration has been, and is, deafening silence.

Really, it is not too surprising. Secretary Babbitt has inserted more political appointees into the NPS in key slots than any administration in recent memory, more than the last three administrations combined. Most of these persons came from extreme environmental groups, never worked in a park a day in their life and were ill-equipped for their new jobs.

Instead of focusing on the real problems of the agency, the National Park Service has been consumed with a reorganization plan. This is a plan which has cost uncounted millions to develop, and produced literally no benefits to the parks. After unending task forces, meetings and travel, we are left with a plan which merely shifts the organizational blocks on a piece of paper, but provides no new personnel or resources to parks.

Secretary Babbitt himself has shown little interest in addressing park issues, except as they represent a photo-op or press story for himself. In fact, he has largely ignored management of the entire Interior Department, choosing instead to spend tens of thousands of dollars and a good chunk of his time on fishing trips around the country, while bashing Republicans in their districts for attempting to constructively resolve environmental issues.

I would like to examine the proposals in President Clinton's plan on a one-by-one basis.

SECTION I. EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Aircraft overflights: President Clinton says he will address overflight problems at national parks. In 1987, Congress passed Public Law 89–249 directing the President to take action to address any impacts to parks resulting from aircraft overflights. I'm glad the President plans to implement the law, even if it means taking action 6 years after the legislative deadline. As a postscript, 2 weeks ago, the Resources Committee adopted an amendment to the recreation fee bill which provides for economic incentives for the use of quiet aircraft technology over national parks to address aircraft overflight impacts.

Historic preservation: The President promises to do a study of the funding backlog of historic preservation projects in parks. So what? What's he been doing to address this problem the last 3½ years while it's been growing under his watch?

Roads and transportation: Hey. Another study. In 1991, Congress passed the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act, Public Law 102–240, which authorized and funded an identical study. In fact, one of the parks studied then—Yosemite—is now proposed for restudy.

National Park Foundation: Congress authorized the National Park Foundation in 1967 to help raise money for parks. If it can be made more effective, we will support that.

Cooperative agreement authority: Sure let us cooperate, whatever this means.

Five Executive actions which amount to nothing.

SECTION II. NEW LEGISLATION ACTIONS

Wilderness in parks: This new legislative proposal is as much as 24 years old. President Clinton proposes to designate portions of parks as wilderness areas. This is really a meaningless proposal. Land in the major national parks in the West is already managed as if it were designated wilderness. This proposal would change nothing on the ground, and protect nothing that is not already protected. However, since the administration has not consulted with the affected delegations, this proposal is a nonstarter.

Point of Reyes seashore expansion: This is one of the most troublesome proposals of all. Under this proposal, Congress would spend tens of millions of dollars to buy up the viewshed from the existing park. Never mind that Marin County, where the proposal is located, is the wealthiest per-capita county in the country. Never mind that the National Park Service is already $1 to 2 billion in the hole to acquire land at existing parks. Never mind that all the public would get for the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars is a chance to look at the land, there would not even be public access. This is a purely political proposal in a must-win State for President Clinton's re-election. We need better reasons to spend scarce tax dollars.

Reauthorization of the Historic Preservation Fund: The Historic Preservation Fund, authorized in 1966 is scheduled to expire in 1997. It is a pretty good program and should be reauthorized. Changing a date in an existing law from ''1997'' to ''2005'' hardly qualifies as a new legislative proposal.

SECTION III. ACTION PLAN FOR PENDING LEGISLATION

National Park Service 1997 budget: The fact that the administration submitted a 1997 budget for the NPS as required by law is noted.

Fee reform: As part of the 1997 budget, the President suggests Congress should enact recreation fee reform. While he has submitted no specific language with the budget, in fairness he has submitted other legislative fee proposals to the Hill. The budget describes two key provisions of the administration's proposal. First, the administration estimates their proposal would

raise $12 million for parks. Second the administration supports siphoning 20 percent off the top from recreation fees collected for deposit in the Treasury for deficit reduction. The administration proposal is inadequate in scope, and unacceptable in sending user fee revenue to the Treasury.

The administration's recreation fee proposals provides for minor tinkers to existing law, to the benefit of National Park Service visitors only. This is unacceptable to me. We need a complete overhaul of existing law. We need a proposal which addresses the needs of the hundreds of millions of visitors who choose to recreate on other Federal lands not managed by the National Park Service. We need to return all recreation fees to the benefit of visitors. We need to make sure that increases in funding due to recreation fees are not offset through reduced appropriations. Recreation fee legislation reported from the Resources Committee several weeks ago on a bipartisan basis meets all these test. I hope the administration supports my fee legislation, H.R. 2107 when it comes to the floor in the near future. The Interior Inspector General estimated that legislation similar to mine could generate over $200 million per year for parks. This is the type of positive recreation fee legislation we need.

Concession reform: The administration has never submitted a legislative proposal for concession reform. However, the administration has supported legislation which would exclude over 80 percent of existing National Park Service concession contracts from fair and open competition; and which CBO estimates would lose $79 million in existing fees to the Treasury over 5 years. By comparison, H.R. 2028, concession reform legislation which I have introduced, will open not only all 660 National Park Service concession contracts to competition, but over 7,000 other agency concession contracts as well. Further, my legislation would increase deposits to the Treasury by $84 million over 7 years. My bill has already been marked up by the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Lands. Simply put, my legislation raises more funds for our parks and increases competition for these Federal contracts.

National Heritage Area System: The administration has never submitted heritage area legislation to Congress; however, Mr. HEFLEY has introduced this legislation. My subcommittee held a hearing on that bill over a year ago and marked it up last fall. This proposal has been developed in recent years on a bipartisan basis by Congress. Welcome aboard, Mr. President.

Presidio: After a long struggle, the administration is not supporting establishment of the Presidio Trust to manage the developed lands at the Presidio. Last Congress, the administration led the effort to address the issue. Their legislative proposal in the 103d Congress was perpetual management by the National Park Service, which would have cost the taxpayer about $1.2 billion over 15 years. The current proposal, H.R. 1296, developed on a bipartisan basis between myself and Ms. PELOSI, will protect the critical natural lands while saving the taxpayers hundreds of million of dollars. We are glad to have the administration as overdue supporters of this effort.

Sterling forest: This proposal does not even need legislation. The proposal to provide funding for a State park in New York is already authorized under section 6(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. If the administration was really serious about this effort, they would have requested the funds for it in their fiscal year 1997 budget request.

Old Faithful Protection Act: Protecting the irreplaceable geothermal resources of this world class park is a high congressional priority. However, according to exhaustive study conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey, this legislation is unnecessary. The State of Montana has already passed legislation modifying State water law to protect the park. The States of Wyoming and Idaho remain adamantly opposed to making their State water laws subject to Federal control, as proposed in this bill, just as they have for the last several years.

Minor boundary adjustment: I agree we need flexibility to administratively make minor park boundary adjustments at parks. I introduced legislation to accomplish just that last year. The number of my legislation is H.R. 2067, and I am flattered you are trying to make my legislation part of your plan, Mr. President, but I am ahead of you again and I welcome your signature when the bill gets to your desk.

Management of museum properties: This bipartisan legislative proposal has been kicking around in Congress for over 4 years, carried alternatively by Republican and Democratic chairmen of the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Lands. In this Congress, it is my bill, and again I ask the President, Where have you been?

Housing: This is another critical topic which Congress has been working on for several years. In the last two sessions, it has passed the Senate twice and the House once. The involvement of the Clinton administration on this effort is illustrative of how they do business. About 2 years ago, Secretary Babbitt announced a new housing initiative for the National Park Service in the Interior Department. He was going to bring in extensive outside expertise and solve this housing crisis. Press releases were issued and the Secretary showed up for a photo-op at Great Smokey Mountains National Park to help build a house being donated to the park. The sum total of that effort after 2 years has been the donation of three new housing units. Today, no one in the Secretary's office is even assigned to this program. It is dead as far as Secretary Babbitt is concerned.

So, Mr. President, you have had your press release and photo-op on your plan. Your plan even made it onto the front page of the Washington Post, above the fold. Now that you have accomplished your political goal, why do you not finally sit down and engage yourself in the work of real reform? The protection of our national parks is too important to use as a political ploy and, Mr. President, you have an obligation to start working for our national parks.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UNITED STATES ROLE IN IRANIAN ARMS TRANSFERS TO CROATIA AND BOSNIA

Ms. GREENE of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–551) on the resolution (H. Res. 416) establishing a select subcommittee of the Committee on International Relations to investigate the United States role in Iranian arms transfers to Croatia and Bosnia, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2974, CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN AND ELDERLY PERSONS INCREASED PUNISHMENT ACT

Ms. GREENE of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–552) on the resolution (H. Res. 421) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2974) to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3120, WITH RESPECT TO WITNESS RETALIATION, WITNESS TAMPERING, AND JURY TAMPERING

Ms. GREENE of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–553) on the resolution (H. Res. 422) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3120) to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1215

ISSUES OF CONCERN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE]