

That was in the Contract With America in 1994 that the Republicans, before they were elected to Congress, signed on to. It is an important part of this final package, and it is something that will benefit a whole lot of families in this country, and I am glad that we were able to retain it in there.

We have started down a road on which we have a long ways to go before we reach completion in this battle, and one of the things that I hope to be a part of, as we continue that fight, is simplification of the Tax Code.

□ 1830

One thing that we have done, if nothing else, we have, hopefully, at least started to lower the revenues and made Government smaller, the values that we believe in. But we still have an inordinately complex Tax Code which is in desperate need for simplification. And we have not done anything in this bill that in any way lessens the complexity in the tax bill.

So I hope that as we continue down the road that one of the priorities for this Congress, as we come back here in September, is to continue to bring additional tax relief, but also to come up with a Tax Code that makes sense to the American people who have to comply with that Tax Code. I am looking forward to being a part of that process.

Again, I want to thank my many colleagues who supported this bill today because it is an important first step and it is a critical step for the future of this country.

#### GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, earlier this week the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], a good friend and distinguished Member of the Congress, on the floor of this body, charged that the ongoing Federal grand jury investigation of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, was a political prosecution and was brought because the chairman was trying to do his job. My colleague from Tennessee further accused the Attorney General of politicizing our system of justice.

I would like to examine those remarks for a few minutes to determine whether there is any foundation in these remarks. As the senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have tried to follow the activities of the Department of Justice as carefully as I can, and I am trying to find where the Justice Department is politicized or whether it prefers, as has been alleged, to investigate and prosecute Republicans or in particular the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the gentleman from Indiana Mr. BURTON.

The first thing I would bring to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives is that this Justice Department has prosecuted numerous Democratic Members, including Messrs. Rostenkowski, Reynolds, Bustamante, and Fauntroy.

And so, I am not sure whether it is fair or not to characterize the Department of Justice's conduct as politicized in the sense that the administration has acted in disregard of its legal obligation when the record to date is that the Attorney General has repeatedly exercised her discretion with very due diligence and has appointed repeatedly independent counsels to investigate prima facie allegations against this administration, its Cabinet officials, and others.

Now what kind of job the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is doing is not in my province this evening. But we are well aware of the objections that the campaign finances and investigation, that the chairman of that committee is conducting has had some problems. I refer particularly to the fact that the general counsel of the committee, who submitted his resignation earlier this month, has indicated that his resignation was based on the fact that he was unable to implement the standards of professional conduct he was accustomed to at the U.S. attorney's office.

In any case, it is not important how well or poorly the chairman may be doing his job. Right now I am concerned about the allegations being raised in his defense, which challenge the integrity of the Department of Justice in this instance. And I would suggest that it is a leap of faith to believe that the coincidence of the chairman's investigation followed by a subpoena of his records mean that the subpoena is a consequence of his investigation.

I do not know the scope of the grand jury that it is alleged concerns itself with his conduct, nor may I be privileged to know the scope. And I would refer the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Tennessee to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, rule 6(e), which quite carefully says no attorney for the Government can disclose what the grand jury is doing. It is at page 36 of the 1997 edition of the Federal criminal code and rules.

For the same reason, I do not know what evidence, if any, prompted any subpoena the grand jury may issue of the grand jury matters are secret in order to protect the person under investigation. For that reason, the Department of Justice may not comment on the scope of its investigation, nor may it publicly justify the legitimacy of the subpoena or its scope.

But the chairman has a remedy, or his counsel. They may challenge the scope and appropriateness of the subpoena.

I would close by pointing out that the gentleman can file a motion to quash or modify the subpoena and indeed he can challenge the entire grand

jury proceeding in the Federal district court in which these grand jury proceedings is brought.

#### WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this has been quite a day. Sometimes in the heat of debate the clarity of what has been done has become more confused and a little less evident. So I think it is important today to clarify for the American people and for those who have worked so hard to drive the economic engine of this Nation to clarify for them that this legislation, this tax bill, this tax bill that was truly a creature of a bipartisan effort led by a President who never shies away from the Democratic principles that helped to elect him orchestrated.

It is a time, as well, to be able to applaud those who sat at the negotiating table and to recognize those of us who were soldiers on this floor who said that we would maintain the battle line to ensure that dignity would be given to those citizens who worked every day making \$25,000 a year, \$30,000 a year, \$50,000 a year, and \$75,000 a year.

It is important, however, that those of us who advocated that position, those Democratic principles for working men and women not be labeled as not understanding that it is business that adds to the economic engine, it is business which we foster under the capitalistic system that those around the world applaud and admire and try to emulate and imitate.

So it is important in this discussion to say a few things. One, it is valuable to acknowledge, as my colleagues have heard over and over again, the tax credit that will be given to families no matter what their income if it falls under, for example, \$75,000. So a \$20,000-a-year family making \$8,000 maybe the spouse and \$14,000 the other spouse, \$22,000 they can get the tax credit for their children. The children of the working poor and working families are no less valuable than those making thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars. I am gratified for that.

We stayed on the battle line for that issue and it is very, very important. Then I would like to mention that I voted against the Republican welfare reform bill. Oh, not because I was not the advocate of all of those who want to raise themselves up, all the constituents in any district whose homes did not look as attractive as someone else, when I went to their homes and they were on welfare and they were dependent on public assistance. They said, "I really want a job. I want to get out of this." But I was not going to vote for a bill that did not give child care, give job training.

And yet, now we have a tax bill that gives \$3 billion to cities. We bypassed