United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 103d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, May 26, 1994*

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O God, for our homes and our communities, those people and places that are close to our hearts and touch us in our daily lives. We recognize that our families and communities are critical to a healthy national life, to our own freedom, and to the fullness of the joy that is Your wish for us. Teach us to work for understanding and respect, to honor our differences, and to learn to grow in appreciation with one another, so our families and communities will be a haven of blessing and of peace. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 152, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—238

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cardin
Carr
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Wise
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—152

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Billirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clay
Clinger
Coble
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lucas
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Murphy
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—43

Bacchus (FL)
Bereuter
Berman
Blackwell
Brown (CA)
Cantwell
Chapman
Collins (MI)
Cox
Dellums
Dixon
Engel
Fish
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frost
Gejdenson
Grandy
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Herger
Horn
Huffington
Lewis (FL)
Lloyd
McMillan

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Miller (CA)	Smith (NJ)	Whitten
Mollohan	Swift	Williams
Morella	Talent	Wilson
Neal (NC)	Thomas (CA)	Woolsey
Payne (VA)	Tucker	
Slattery	Washington	

□ 1021

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. GRAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1632. An act to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, and Part C of title IV of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to remove gender-specific references.

H.R. 3863. An act to designate the Post Office building located at 401 E. South Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "Medgar Wiley Evers Post Office".

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1631. An act to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, to increase the maximum amount in controversy permitted for cases under the jurisdiction of the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4278. An act to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4278) "An Act to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. DOLE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 965) "An Act to provide for toy safety and for other purposes.".

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 729. An act to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reduce the levels of lead in the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 1030. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the Department of Veterans Affairs program of sexual trauma services for veterans, to improve certain Department of Veterans Affairs programs for women veterans, to extend the period of entitlement to inpatient care for veterans exposed to Agent Orange or ionizing radiation, to establish a hospice care pilot program, to establish a rural health care clinics program, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide per diem payments and construction grants to State homes for adult day health care services, to establish an education debt reduction program, and for other purposes.

S. 1357. An act to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationships of the Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians as distinct federally recognized Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 1406. An act to amend the Plant Variety Protection Act to make such Act consistent with the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants of March 19, 1991, to which the United States is a signatory, and for other purposes.

S. 2145. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to determine which programs of the Department of Agriculture are eligible for State mediation and to certify States to administer mediation for the programs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1928a–1928d, of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. MURKOWSKI, as a member of the Senate delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly Spring Meeting during the second session of the one hundreds third Congress, to be held in Oslo, Norway, May 26–30, 1994.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 26, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of the certificate of election from the Secretary of State, Commonwealth of Kentucky, indicating that, according to the official returns of the Special Election held on May 24, 1994, the Honorable Ron Lewis was elected to the Office of Representative in Congress from the Second Congressional District, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,
DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE RON LEWIS AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect from Kentucky, the Honorable RON LEWIS, please come forward, accompanied by members of the Kentucky delegation?

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky appeared at the bar of the House, and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the House of Representatives.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE RON LEWIS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I have a most pleasant task today, as I, along with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] and the other members of the Kentucky delegation, present to you, Mr. Speaker, the winner of the historic special election in Kentucky, in District 2, last Tuesday, a remarkable young man, RON LEWIS.

Mr. Speaker, this election was more than a special election. It was a very special election.

Twelve days ago, 10 days before the election, only 1 person in 10 in the Second District of Kentucky recognized the name RON LEWIS. None in 10 even expected that he could win. "There is not even a race," they said. The race had been conceded to his opponent. After all, a person of this man's party had never won that seat in the history of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. It had been conceded by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], by the media, the political parties, the political pundits, the general public, by everyone.

Then, Mr. Speaker, with exquisite timing, just 10 days before the election, this man found a theme that ignited a spark in the public's awareness, and in a sensational 10-day campaign the sparks grew and grew until it became a white-hot flame so attractive that last Tuesday this unknown underdog of a few days ago was lifted by those voters into the national spotlight with an astounding 10-point win.

Shakespeare certainly must have had this man in mind when he wrote of the

tide of which taken at its height inevitably leads to victory. RON is the first of his party to ever have been elected to Congress from the Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Kentucky took the oath of office a few minutes ago, he gave his party's delegation in the Congress from Kentucky the highest proportion ever in its history. For the first time in Kentucky's long and storied history the State's delegation will be evenly distributed between the two parties.

Today RON LEWIS' name is on the lips of every Second District Kentuckian. His name is on the lips of all Kentuckians and of most political pundits nationally, especially in this town, even in the White House. The issues he raised and which became instantly so compelling undoubtedly will resound all over America this season. Because they were so persuasive in Kentucky, they will be persuasive most everywhere. The RON LEWIS white-hot flame may become even hotter as the next few months flow by.

□ 1030

On election night, Mr. Speaker, as the hearty and by now euphoric supporters of RON gathered in the headquarters in Elizabethtown to watch became deliciously to them a night when the impossible dream came true, they tell me that the campaign workers' theme song could be heard for miles around, and you can almost hear it today off the walls of this great Chamber, and now even coast to coast. The song was: "Do, Ron, Ron. Do, Ron, Ron."

RON LEWIS is a lifelong Kentuckian. He hails from the same county that gave Abraham Lincoln to the ages. He is a man from middle America.

I think he would want me to mention first off that he is a minister of the gospel, that he is married to a lovely and loving wife, Kay, and they have two wonderful children, Ronald Brent and Allison Faye. We are not allowed to mention galleries in this body, but I am told that perhaps if one could, you would find his lovely wife sitting in the gallery just there.

And, of course, his daughter, Allison, held the Bible as RON was sworn into office this morning.

He holds a master's degree in education. He is a small businessman. He and his wife own and operate a religious bookstore in Kentucky, and this is RON LEWIS' first elective office.

With these qualities, no wonder he found himself in such common cause with so many of his fellow Kentucky citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to introduce and present to the Members now a man you have already met and, I think, already grown to love, the Congressman from Kentucky's Second District, RON LEWIS.

THE FIRST REPUBLICAN TO REPRESENT KENTUCKY'S SECOND DISTRICT BEGINS SERVICE

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my speech, I would like to recognize three men that mean a lot to me, three men that are wonderful and great men of Kentucky: Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, Congressman HAL ROGERS, and Congressman JIM BUNNING.

And I am certainly proud of my family today.

Before I do or say anything further, however, I would like to do something that I feel needs to be done.

I have just signed the discharge petition to force a vote on H.R. 3266, the A to Z spending cut plan. I wanted that to be the first thing that I did as a Member of the House of Representatives.

This legislation will force Congress to do something every family in America has had to do at one time or another, and that is take a look at every single expense and see where there is room for savings. If this Congress adopts H.R. 3266, this Congress will be called into special session with just one topic on the agenda, real reductions in Federal spending.

Mr. Speaker, I was sent here to deliver the message that this Government has grown way too big and spent way too much. That is the message that roared through central and western Kentucky 2 days ago. It is the message that sent me to Washington, the first member of my party ever to represent the Second District in Congress. It is the same message that the people of Oklahoma's Sixth District sent to Washington 2 weeks ago with the election of our colleague, FRANK LUCAS.

But there is more to this message than just cutting spending. The people of Kentucky's Second District sent me here to tell Congress to respect the fact that they work hard for their money, and Congress has an obligation to spend it wisely and to leave as much as possible in the hands of the hard-working American families who earn it.

They sent me here to oppose new taxes, and that I will do. As has been said many times, the problem is not that the taxes are too low, it is that the spending is too high.

In the coming weeks and months I hope to work on the other measures that I talked about in my campaign: Serious crime legislation, a plan to reform welfare, and measures to stop this Nation's war on tobacco that threatens my district's very way of life.

I would say to my colleagues that I have never held elective office. I do not have a network of political connections. But like many of you, I come here as a man who has raised a family, a small businessman, a pastor, at one time a teacher, the very kind of individual, I believe, our Founding Fathers wanted in this, the people's House, one who may never have written laws or regulations but one who has lived under them.

I have big shoes to fill, I know. I, of course, know that better than anyone. Bill Natcher was a great and wonderful man, an honorable man with great character, a great man of work ethic, and no one, I believe, will ever break his record of 18,401 votes in this House.

But with the help of God, I know I will do the best job I can to listen to the views of Kentucky's Second District and to represent those views here in this magnificent place.

I am proud to be here, and I thank my friends and my neighbors for their confidence in sending me here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and may God bless the United States.

THE DEAN OF KENTUCKY'S DELEGATION WELCOMES THE HONORABLE RON LEWIS

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, one of the designations I had never aspired to in my career was to become the dean of the Kentucky delegation because that meant that two revered Kentuckians had to pass before me, Mr. Perkins of Kentucky's Seventh District and, more recently, Mr. Natcher of the Second District. But it has been the will of the Lord that these two gentlemen pass and I become the dean of the delegation.

So as the dean of the delegation, I want to welcome our new colleague, RON LEWIS, from the Second District of Kentucky. I will tell him that among the many wise things he said today, none was wiser than the size of the shoes he had to fill, because we know that Bill Natcher was and remains today a legend in this body.

□ 1040

I would tell my friend from Kentucky, Mr. LEWIS that Bill Natcher always said this, and I think it became the hallmark and the motto of our Kentucky delegation, and I think it is the hallmark and motto that this House should always seek to achieve, and that is that when the interests of the people are at stake, partisanship ceases, party affiliation ceases, differences of philosophy cease to the extent they can, and we try to serve the people.

I think it is on that basis that our delegation, which has never been either Democrat or Republican entirely, has always come together. We have always worked on behalf of Kentuckians, and, by extension, worked on behalf of Americans.

So I welcome my friend from the second district, his daughter, and his family. We wish them much health and happiness in these months ahead. We also pledge to work together for all the people of Kentucky and all the people of the land.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM MAY 26, 1994, TO JUNE 8, 1994, AND FOR A CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM MAY 25, 26, 27, OR 28, 1994, TO JUNE 7, 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The Chair lays before the House a privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) providing for a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate on Wednesday, May 25, 1994, Thursday, May 26, 1994, Friday, May 27, 1994, or Saturday, May 28, 1994, until Tuesday, June 7, 1994, and a conditional adjournment of the House on Thursday, May 26, 1994, until Wednesday, June 8, 1994.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Wednesday, May 25, 1994, Thursday, May 26, 1994, Friday, May 27, 1994, or Saturday, May 28, 1994, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Tuesday, June 7, 1994, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 26, 1994, it stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Wednesday, June 8, 1994, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will take 15 1-minutes on each side.

DEMOCRATIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS WILL WIN OUT IN NOVEMBER

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are crowing about Whitewater, the so-called troubles of health care, and one race in Kentucky. Jerry Falwell does not hesitate to make outrageous claims about the President of the United States to sell a video, and they are predicting great gains in November.

But let us remember that this is May, and that the election is in November, and that come November the President and the Democratic Congress can make the following claims: That the economy is solid and improving; that the deficit is way down; that nine times more jobs per month have been created under this administration than the previous two; that there will be a Democratic crime bill of more cops, more prevention, and more police; that a Democratic President enacted NAFTA and the GATT agreement; that there will be Democratic initiatives on education, welfare reform, reemployment, and, yes, a health care bill.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder the Republicans are talking about side issues.

ARE WHITE HOUSE HELICOPTERS BEING MISUSED?

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last year, within 3 months of taking office, President Clinton issued tighter new guidelines for the use of military aircraft by members of his administration.

"Taxpayers should only be asked to fund necessities, not luxuries, * * *" he said.

Yet, 2 days ago a shiny Marine Corps helicopter from the White House fleet sat on the golf course of a private country club in New Market, MD, to pick up men described as being from the White House staff.

This photo, published yesterday in the Federick News-Post, shows a group identified as White House aides loading their golf clubs onto the Marine Corps helicopter.

Yesterday, I sent a letter to the President asking for an explanation of this event. I do hope this explanation will come quickly, and I do hope it is not another case of this administration's actions not living up to its rhetoric.

WE NEED A CRIME BILL—NOW

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today—and all my constituents—to say loud and clear: We need a crime bill on the President's desk now.

My constituents in the San Diego area are representative of people all across this great Nation. They want safer streets and neighborhoods for themselves and for their children. They want to regain control of their own neighborhoods, and to stop living in fear. They are looking forward to more cops on the streets and more positive and healthy alternatives for their children.

I offered a successful amendment to the crime bill to allow for the funding of graffiti prevention and removal. After the vote, my office was deluged with thanks from people in my community for addressing this serious problem that goes hand in hand with crime, but is seldom addressed by this Congress.

This crime bill will be of major help in our efforts to take back our neighborhoods. I urge the conferees to go to work and send this bill back to us for final approval so that we can take this important step in ensuring a safer future for ourselves and for our children. Let us put the crime bill on the President's desk now.

SIGN DISCHARGE PETITION ON H.R. 3087 TO BRING JOBS TO AMERICA

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, after the Second World War, we had a great industry evolve in the United States. We were building light aircraft all over, and they are all over the world today. Cessna, Beech, Piper, you name it, they are everywhere. Everywhere you go you can see these great airplanes.

Little by little, because of a very active trial attorneys bar, they are no longer there. Where we were doing billions of dollars of business and providing millions of jobs, where we were building 18,000 aircraft a year, we are not building less than 400.

This body has the opportunity to do a historic thing today. We have gone through the other body, we have gone through the Committee on Public Works, but we are being held up in one committee.

This morning I filed Discharge Petition No. 21, and already we have about 50 signers on that. We have 302 cosponsors. That means the majority of us are on this bill. This is a great opportunity before we go home for our break to sign this discharge petition, the 302 of you on this. Once we reach 218, you cannot sign it anymore, the books are closed. I urge you to do it.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the crime bill conferees to adopt key provisions of the Violence Against Women Act in their conference report.

This act authorizes new and expanded programs critical to protecting women.

The conferees must retain the $1.8 billion funding and the title III civil rights remedy for victims of gender-motivated violence contained in the Senate version. This remedy is essential because it recognizes that gender-motivated assaults are bias crimes which violate our belief in equality for all.

The battered immigrant spouse section of the House bill must also be retained. It allows battered immigrant women to self-petition for naturalization, and avoid the dependence on abusers which many endure solely to avoid deportation.

I implore my colleagues to retain the strong provisions of the Violence Against Women Act as a desperately needed first step toward making America a safe place for women, their families, and the Nation.

HEALTH CARE TRIGGERS

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the American people need to learn about a term being tossed around by Democrats in the health care debate. The term is "triggers." And no, I am not talking about Roy Rogers' horse.

Democrats know the American people are fed up with tax increases and they know that small businesses cannot afford employer mandates forcing them to pay for a Government takeover of healthcare.

So they are ducking the issue by using a fancy trick called triggers. It works like this. The Democrats say they will not raise taxes much and they will not make small businesses pay for the new Government health care bureaucracy.

But, if their plan does not work, then there will be automatic triggers that go into effect forcing small businesses to pay for President Clinton's health care plan through employer mandates. And new tax increases may automatically kick in on American families.

When Americans hear the word "trigger" used to describe the Democrats' health care plans, they need to know it is really a gun pointed at their heads. Don't let them pull the trigger.

Let us stop the political games and give folks what they want: Real market based health care reform that keeps families in charge instead of Government bureaucrats in Washington.

□ 1050

CRIME BILL

(Ms. McKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the daughter of a 20-year veteran of the Atlanta police force, I have strong feelings about crime and public safety. Recent polls taken in my district indicate that crime and crime prevention are foremost on the minds of my constituents. Prevention and punishment are a necessary part of any meaningful crime legislation.

I do have problems with the new death penalties. But this crime bill seeks to address many of my concerns through the Racial Justice Act. If the State takes a human life, then it must be done without regard to race.

I welcome certain provisions of the crime bill. The Community Partnership Act and the youth employment services are long overdue. In fact, the prevention provisions offer us a real reason to say yes to this bill.

Congress has crafted a bill of both punishment and prevention. The Clinton administration has tackled this tough issue and when the crime bill goes to the Presidents desk, it will be the first crime bill to get a President's signature in 5 years.

Let us make the crime bill the first priority when we come back from the recess.

FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's foreign policy is damaging our Nation's standing in the world. We are confusing allies, encouraging foes, and dumbfounding average Americans. Where do we stand in Haiti? What is our role in Bosnia? What have we done in Somalia?

Time after time over the past year the President has made threats, promises, and declarations which have been ignored by our adversaries and our allies.

In Somalia, a weak foreign policy and lack of support for our troops led to the slaughter of some of America's best men.

In Bosnia, the Serbs discovered our threats are empty. Repeatedly, they called our bluff. If need be, they made promises only to break them again.

In Haiti, the thugs who have stolen the country thumbed their noses at our warships. When we threatened, they installed an unelected leader. Once again we were helpless because our credibility is gone.

Does anyone wonder why North Korea's leaders ignore our demand to stop making nuclear weapons?

In less than 1 year, the Clinton administration has succeeded in destroying the solid foreign policy America has enjoyed for the last 12. The legacy of the Reagan-Bush years is replaced by indecision and weakness. Our allies are confused and our adversaries are gloating.

Whither thou goest next, President Clinton?

ON CHINA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, China is now dictating to Congress. China said they will not tolerate or accept any conditions from the Congress of the United States at all on their most-favored-nation trade status.

Wow, Congress, how does that tame your dragon hair?

Chinese dictators—any Congress that will allow a bunch of Chinese dictators to set down the law on American trade policy should be impeached. China is now No. 2, right behind Japan, with a $26 billion surplus and telling us how we should vote. Shame, Congress. Shame. Who do you represent, the workers in a Chinese prison camp, or the laid-off workers in cities all over American?

TRIGGERS JUST SMOKE AND MIRRORS

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, by all published accounts, one of the so-called keys to any health care reform compromise are the "triggers."

No, I am not talking about Roy Rogers' horse, or some western gunfight. I am talking about true legislative trickery.

These triggers are the date at which a specific health care reform legislation, probably a Government-run system, would be put into operation should other reforms prove unsuccessful.

The two types of triggers being discussed are equally bad. The hard triggers are bad because they require the automatic institution of any legislation without any congressional approval.

The soft triggers are bad, because this will doom any real reform measures we take now, by forcing us to come back in just a few years and start this process all over again. What a waste!

So what are our choices: abdication of responsibility or failure to act in the public's best interest?

Mr. Speaker, these are not choices that I feel comfortable with.

We need substantial health care reform, today! And our dialog must be about what is right for the American people, not about smoke and mirrors!

HONORING BRAVE AMERICANS WHO HAVE DIED PRESERVING AMERICA'S FREEDOM

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1868 the Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic issued an order setting aside a day "for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who have died in defense of their country."

Unfortunately, in the more than 125 years since that first Memorial Day, the number of graves to decorate has multiplied greatly—each a poignant reminder of loved ones—sons and daughters, mothers and fathers—brave men and women who have given their lives in service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, on this Memorial Day and on the upcoming anniversary of D-Day, we will honor with the deepest gratitude the heroes of Omaha Beach, Da Nang, Dhahran, and all the brave Americans who have died preserving our Nation's freedom. As we honor their memory, let us pledge that their lives and valor shall not be forgotten. Let us also pledge to do our utmost to see that no other generation will need to repeat their sacrifices.

SO THAT'S WHERE IT WENT!

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, media reports this morning tell of the confirmation of the black hole theory in astronomy.

A black hole is described by the New York Times as "a gravitational monster that gobbles up everything around it."

This discovery may solve one of the great political mysteries of our time.

Can it be that a black hole has gobbled up the Clinton foreign policy?

After all, trained observers, using the most sensitive detection instruments have not been able to confirm that such a policy exists, although the administration loudly claims it is there.

Obviously more investigation is needed before this black hole/foreign policy theory is accepted, and I urge astronomers to continue their investigations.

But I must say that I strongly favor this hypothesis, since it is the only logical explanation of why this Nation has not had a foreign policy since this administration took office.

DON'T INVADE HAITI FOR MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 50th anniversary of the Normandy invasion, I can only wonder if the President is planning to commemorate this Memorial Day with another invasion—an invasion of Haiti? We wake this morning to find that the President is sending warships and troops to the Caribbean. The President has deployed two more ships to Haiti, bringing the total to eight United States warships now off Haiti's coast, with an amphibious assault ship carrying 650 Marines on its way for battle exercises. Was anyone at the White House listening when this House said "no" to military intervention and offered an alternative safe haven proposal. We have had positive response to the safe haven plan from countless Americans and from Haitian parliamentarians, Haitians, and Haitian-Americans—people we are trying to help. Memorial Day is a day to remember those who gave their lives. Let us hope the President will not commemorate this day by asking more Americans to needlessly risk their lives in Haiti.

FEDERAL IMMIGRATION POLICIES PLACE HUGE BURDEN ON STATES

(Ms. SCHENK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, a report released yesterday by the Urban Institute confirms what those of us from States such as California, New York, and Texas already know—that our Federal immigration policies are placing an enormous burden on our States.

The Clinton administration has taken an important first step toward helping States and local communities deal with the cost of illegal immigration. For the first time ever, an administration has requested money to reimburse State and local governments for the costs of incarcerating undocumented alien felons. But, the $350 million that has been requested is only a downpayment.

Several weeks ago, this body passed a crime bill making full reimbursement mandatory by 1998. Immigration is a Federal issue and the incarceration of undocumented criminal aliens is a Federal responsibility. The Federal Government should accept its responsibility, so, let us include this in the final version, and let us get the crime bill to the President's desk.

□ 1100

AMERICA NEEDS REASSURANCE THAT CONGRESS LISTENS AND GETS THINGS DONE

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, our day to day business often reminds me of the student who puts off an important assignment until the very last minute.

We have waited until our general aviation industry has been driven to the brink, by frivolous litigation.

We have waited until our communities are driven to the brink by Safe Drinking Water Act regulations.

We have waited until our businesses and cities are driven to the brink by Superfund.

It may be the proverbial last minute, but the last minute does not have to mean too late.

We can pass H.R. 3392 and put some common sense into the Safe Drinking Water Act.

We can approve legislation offered by the gentlemen from Kansas and Utah and revitalize our aviation industry.

And we can and must support a comprehensive reauthorization of Superfund.

Mr. Speaker, we may have to join the students in pulling some all-nighters, but we can also join those who earn good report cards. Let us show America that Congress listens. Let us show America that Congress can get things done.

THE REEMPLOYMENT ACT

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, bad news, good news. The bad news is my district suffers the second worst unemployment in the entire country.

The good news is new projects and programs, with the help of the Federal Government, will create hundreds of jobs and millions of dollars of economic activity in just the next 6 to 9 months.

The bad news is the people who are unemployed may not be the exact fit for the new jobs that are coming into the district.

The good news is the President's Reemployment Act will help provide persons the training they need for the new jobs being created in our increasingly information-driven, computer-operated, consumer-oriented job market.

Let me give you one example.

Two weeks ago the Department of Defense announced that it was locating in my district a new Defense Finance Accounting Service—or DFAS office. This office will create 750 jobs in the

Monterey area. Within hours of the announcement, my office was flooded with phone calls from persons wanting to apply for the jobs at the DFAS. Even now, 2 weeks later, my office is still serving as a clearinghouse for persons wanting information on employment.

The jobs at the DFAS will require special technical skills, skills that, with training assistance from the Reemployment Act, will easily allow people in my community to fill those 750 new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the President's Reemployment Act is exactly the tonic we need to get people back to work. It gives people access to training. It gives them access to jobs. But most of all, it gives them access to the hope of a brighter future.

KEEP OUT OF HAITI

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, Presidents, and this is a bipartisan scandal, like to do sneaky things sometimes when the Congress is out. They like to defy overwhelming votes of the expression of this Chamber and the other body.

We better not go into Haiti and put men and women now in harm's way against the will of both these Chambers for the likes of Aristide.

We had better not do that within a few days of two young widows being awarded posthumously the Medal of Honor for their husbands being killed in the streets of Mogadishu where we had taken away their aerial gunships, the AC-130 Hercules, and denied them armored cars and tanks for rescue recovery.

We better not go into Haiti.

Do Members recall when people were trying to compare themselves to Truman in both parties about fighting heart? Here is one thing where politicians all the way up to the highest office forget to emulate the words of Harry Truman.

Truman in the great David McCollough prize-winning book Truman said this:

"Any man who is dissolute with women is not to be trusted entirely." Here are Truman's exact words out of one of his diary entries: "A man not true to his wife, a man not honorable to his marital relations is usually not honorable in any other relation."

A PLEA FOR ENACTMENT OF THE REEMPLOYMENT ACT

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, of the more than 8½ million workers unemployed this year, over 2 million will be faced with permanent job loss. We need to pass the Reemployment Act this year so that these workers can begin to receive the assistance they need to connect with the good jobs that our economy is creating.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not only workers who would benefit from passage of the Reemployment Act. Businesses would benefit as well. Many businesses creating the good new jobs in our economy are having a tough time finding skilled workers. The REA would help give workers the skills they need to fill these jobs, and would connect the business with the worker.

Business Leaders understand the benefits of the REA. The National Alliance of Business, and I quote: "welcome the chance to support a bill that proposes, for the first time, a national work force investment system responsive to the needs of both employers and employees." The President of the German multinational conglomerate Siemens Corp.—looking to expand its United States manufacturing operations—testified that the REA would give American workers, quote: "the skills that are required by companies such as Siemens."

Mr. Speaker, we need to work with the administration and pass the Reemployment Act. The millions of Americans loosing their jobs this year and the thousands of businesses looking to try and reemploy them demand no less.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S AIDES

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Frederick, MD, News Post ran a photo labeled "mystery visit."

This was a photograph of the Presidential helicopter taken at Holly Hills Country Club where some of President Clinton's aides had gone to play golf.

Officials would not disclose the names of the aides but said the purpose of the golf game was to "scout out the course for President Clinton."

What a ridiculous waste of taxpayers' money. What an arrogant abuse of power. Large helicopters do not fly cheaply.

Surely there is a better use of this helicopter than to shuttle White House staff to golf outings.

Surely White House aides have more important things to do on weekdays than to scout out golf courses.

And why all the secrecy? The answer, of course, is that the White House has been caught in another embarrassing position.

Who were these aides? They should be required to reimburse the Government for the full cost of these helicopter rides.

Further, the White House should not try to cover this up. They should disclose full details and costs of all times that the President's helicopter is being used only by aides.

IN SUPPORT OF THE REEMPLOYMENT ACT

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, there is very encouraging news about our economy and employment everyday, but there is also dislocation and long-term unemployment.

Our current system is not addressing the long-term needs of the unemployed.

We continue to spend billions of dollars on emergency unemployment benefits when we should have a sensible structure in place which emphasizes reemployment.

Imagine the exasperation of the unemployed who must deal with a jumble of unrelated agencies to find the kind of job training and assistance they need.

The Reemployment Act changes this by streamlining the current confusing maze of narrow categorical programs into a comprehensive reemployment system that will connect workers to new jobs and employers to skilled workers.

The plan is market-driven in that job-seekers will work with career counselors to develop individualized reemployment plans based on good labor market information.

Mr. Speaker, we have worked hard to get our economy back on its feet. Let us finish the job by enacting this critical legislation.

ARE YOU GETTING YOUR MONEY'S WORTH, AMERICA?

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week Congress begins considering the annual appropriations bills, which fund the Government's programs.

Before we rush to spend the Nation's money, we should ask ourselves the same question we would ask if we were spending our own: Are we getting our money's worth?

Too often America's answer to this question has been "no."

Democrats would like to try and convince us that America's answer is wrong. Republicans believe America's answer is right and it is the spending that is wrong.

Nowhere is this truer than in the legislative appropriations bill that we vote on today.

The question we should ask is simple: "Are you getting your money's worth, America?"

In the case of this administration and its legislation, the answer is a resounding "no."

This Democrat-controlled House, Senate, and White House keep getting it backward. They insist on spending more and getting less, when in fact America will get more when we spend less.

FOCUS ON PREVENTING YOUTH VIOLENCE

(Mrs. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, last month, the House approved the most sweeping anticrime legislation in its history and we must get this bill signed by the President.

To quote Lieutenant Boykin, a police officer in my district, "violence is an equal opportunity employer that strikes anyone, anywhere, anytime * * *" and this crime bill focuses on that random, senseless violence.

For example, it just makes sense to encourage the adoption of truth-in-sentencing laws.

Otherwise we will have little impact on stopping the revolving door that gives criminals repeated chances to wreak havoc on society and turn safehavens into battlefields.

Of course we need to put criminals behind bars, but we cannot give up on today's 4- and 5-year-olds by simply building prisons for the future.

That is why we must also focus on preventing youth violence.

It is about programs, like an "ounce of prevention," that provide children with the support and opportunities they need to be productive, law-abiding citizens.

MONEY'S WORTH

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, this week we passed a spending bill on the operations of our foreign policy.

The question, of course, is: What foreign policy? Under the Clinton administration, that question is becoming more important.

As we wait for the President to exhibit leadership, our foreign operations budget continues to plod forward. Before we spend the taxpayers' money, should we not rethink where that money is going?

Mr. Speaker, even with the cold war over, America needs research and development in strategic defense, the environment, transportation, and especially medicine. But the Clinton administration is talking about price controls which would scare away venture capital.

The President promised to reinvent Government, but when it comes to foreign aid and domestic spending, we have not reinvented one thing.

As we debated the foreign aid appropriations bill and other appropriations bills coming up in the next week, I ask the America people one question: Are you getting your money's worth? I doubt that the voters think so.

THE MICHAEL FLUELLEN SHOOTING

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, May 8 was a quiet Sunday afternoon as southwest Georgians celebrated Mother's Day in my hometown of Columbus, until gunshots blasted and echoed throughout the community.

In the pull of a trigger and the turn of a corner, 14-year-old Michael Fluellen was killed in front of his home, the victim of yet another senseless drive-by shooting.

Michael was a model student and a great athlete. "He went out of his way to make people feel good about themselves," one of his teachers said.

At his funeral, a Richards Middle School official read a proclamation establishing its own chapter of Students Against Violence Everywhere. SAVE, as it is known, works with existing community organizations to provide resources that will help students eliminate violence at school and throughout the community.

Columbus Mayor Frank Martin proclaimed May 13, 1994, Michael Fluellen Day and members of SAVE and the people of Columbus intend to see that Michael did not die in vain; something positive, they say, must come from this tragic event.

This tragic loss brings a plea to the Congress from southwest Georgia. We need a balanced anticrime initiative that will punish Michael's assailants, provide the youth of America with alternatives to violence, and restore sanity to the streets of our communities.

S.A.V.E. (STUDENTS AGAINST VIOLENCE EVERYWHERE)

This organization was created as a student response to the violent death of a fourteen-year-old eighth-grade student at Richards Middle School, in Columbus, Georgia. Michael Marcus Fluellen was gunned down outside his home on Mother's Day as he returned from a neighborhood basketball game. Michael was a model student, star athlete and excellent role model for his peers. Faculty and students are committed to ensuring that S.A.V.E. will be an organization which will eliminate violence at school, home and in the community. With the help of community organizations it is our goal to teach young people ways in which they can break destructive patterns of violence in their own lives. Because of Michael's ability to touch the lives of so many people, Columbus Mayor Frank Martin proclaimed May 13, 1994, Michael Markus Fluellen Day, and members of S.A.V.E. intend to see that he did not die in vain—something positive must come from this tragic event.

Sponsors: Katie Genes (friend and teacher of Michael Fluellen), Rita Irby, Algracie Jackson.

Principal: William W. Arrington.

MOURNERS OVERFLOW AT FUNERAL

DRIVE-BY SLAYING OF 14-YEAR-OLD RICHARDS MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENT TOUCHES DEEP CHORD IN COMMUNITY

(By Norval Edwards)

As mourners overflowed Corinth Missionary Baptist Church in Columbus Friday afternoon, some were overcome with grief over the death of Michael M. Fluellen.

But most in the standing-room-only crowd also seemed perplexed, as if asking why the 14-year-old Richards Middle School student had been killed.

"Why did something so terrible happen to someone so good?" Katie Gemes, a teacher at Richards, asked the packed audience.

Michael was killed Sunday as he was walking home along Eighth Street after playing basketball near Carver High School. Three men have been arrested and charged in what police are calling a random, drive-by shooting.

Michael was remembered by Gemes as "thoughtful and kind to others."

"He went out of his way to make people feel good about themselves," she said.

As people filed into the church to view Michael's remains, his sister, Michelle, wailed, "Lord have mercy! Why? My brother is dead!"

Ushers waved paper fans for family members in the crowded church; and two family members, overcome by heat and emotion, were escorted out temporarily.

During the service, a school official read a charter establishing a chapter of Students Against Violence Everywhere (SAVE) in Michael's name. Students decided this week to form the group as a lasting living memorial.

A.J. McClung, Columbus mayor pro tem, offered condolences to the Fluellen family on behalf of the city.

State Sen. Ed Harbison of Columbus challenged students to do their part to end violence in the city.

In his eulogy, the Rev. Raymond Mays said there's too much hatred today.

"People haven't seen the significance in living in this world," he said. "It's time to lose the better than thou attitude."

Mays urged the mourners to imagine what a better place the world would be if everyone learned to respect life and one another.

Gemes said she taught Michael in the seventh and eighth grades. She and Michael, in addition to being teacher and student, had become friends, she said before the funeral.

She said she will remember Michael's smile.

"I called it his 'million-dollar smile,'" she said. "He always had a group around him. He had so much self-confidence—the other kids loved to be around him. He never wanted to hurt anyone."

Students at Richards Middle School plan to get together next week to talk about how the community can reduce violence against teenagers.

They've formed a group they call SAVE, Students Against Violence Everywhere. The group plans to meet at 3:15 p.m. Wednesday at the school, 2892 Edgewood Road, Columbus.

Students, teachers and administrators have also established the Michael Fluellen Memorial Fund, to help the Fluellen family pay funeral costs. The account has been set up at Trust Co. Bank's Cross Country Branch, 3229 Macon Road.

SIGN DISCHARGE PETITION ON A-TO-Z SPENDING CUTS PLAN

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow most Members of this House will return home to their districts for 10 days.

That is 10 days to face the voters; 10 days to hear the voters' concerns; 10 days to be reminded that the voters want change; 10 days to hear that the voters want the real A-to-Z spending cuts plan.

Mr. Speaker, back home the voters will cheer those of us who are supporting the A-to-Z plan.

Back home, the voters do not accept excuses. And back home the voters do not accept anything but the real thing.

And, Mr. Speaker, the real thing is discharge petition No. 16. Today is the last chance for Members to sign the real A-to-Z discharge petition before the Memorial Day recess.

You all know that your phones have already been lit up to express support for A-to-Z. Would it not be great to go home to your town meetings and proudly announce that you have had the courage to sign the real A-to-Z discharge petition?

My friends, do not go home without it. Sign the A-to-Z discharge petition today and then go home and tell the voters that you care about the future of our country and you are doing something about it.

"OUNCE OF PREVENTION" GRANTS MUST BE FUNDED

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues—especially those who will be part of the conference committee on the crime bill—that it is imperative that the crime bill that we send to President Clinton including funds for the "ounce of prevention" grants as well as other prevention programs. These grants are vital to communities with high incidences of crime, poverty, substance abuse, unemployment, school dropouts, and teen pregnancy. The funds will allow cities and counties to become involved so that they may intervene and encourage and inspire youths at risk.

The moneys included will provide for critical community programs such as mentoring, tutoring, job placement, and substance abuse counseling.

These grants make these significant and important programs possible for disadvantaged communities. Without them, the future for our young Americans will not be so bright and promising.

It is not judicious, expedient, or economical to have a crime bill that does not contain strong prevention measures. Why should we only house criminals after crimes have been committed rather than prevent the crimes in the first place? It is shortsighted to only treat the ills of society and not solicit a cure.

□ 1120

COMMEMORATE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the upcoming 50th anniversary of D-day, the first day of the Allied Invasion of Europe at Normandy. The Allies, under the command of Dwight D. Eisenhower, landed on the beaches in France on June 6, 1944.

Our troops suffered massive losses. Yet, despite the onslaught from the German guns, the Allied Forces held their beachheads and pushed the Germans back. Within a year, the war was over.

Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of D-day is a day when we should remember all of those who fought and died at Normandy and, indeed, in all of World War II. Nearly 580,000 men and women from Florida served their country with honor and distinction in World War II.

We must always remember to pay tribute to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice. We must never forget those who have died, and those who were injured. We must never fail to help those surviving veterans who may be in failing health. And we must ensure that we never again have to send so many young men to die. The United States must continue to maintain a strong defense. Peace through strength must never ever be forgotten.

THE CRIME BILL STRIKES AN EQUITABLE BALANCE BETWEEN ENFORCEMENT AND PREVENTION

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, the summer is upon us, and the conferees on the crime bill have yet to meet. During the spring I and, I am sure, other Members promised their constituents enactment of significant crime-fighting legislation was a priority in Washington. Responding to our constituents' call for a strong, smart, and tough crime bill, the House passed a good bill that strikes what I believe is an equitable 60-40 balance between enforcement and prevention. The bill contains a broad range of provisions that our people at home want: 3 strikes and you're out; 50,000 more police officers on the streets; increased moneys to construct new correctional facilities; and commitment to fund the multijurisdictional task force under the Byrne memorial grant program.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to move on this sweeping piece of legislation. The people of Michigan and of this Nation want the House and Senate conferees to meet and present a tough but fair crime bill to the President for his signature.

We must begin to reclaim our schools, our streets, and our neighborhoods.

RETIREMENT ANNUITIES MAY BE TARGET OF NEW CLINTON TAX

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the same folks who brought us the largest tax increase in the history of the Republic last year are now drawing up plans to add an onerous tax on people's retirement annuities.

Currently, an annuity's increase in value over time—its inside buildup—is taxed when the owner begins to draw income. This is analogous to capital investments such as real estate or stocks, where any gains are not taxed until sale.

President Clinton is considering ending this tax deferral. We should not let this happen. Two-thirds of annuity owners have annual household incomes of under $50,000. These people are not rich and need their annuities to retire in dignity. Unfortunately, we have come to learn from painful experience that President Clinton's definition of "rich" includes many who view themselves as "middle class."

Both the Treasury Department and the Office of Management and Budget are already backing away from this foolishness. Let us heed their counsel.

RESIGNATION AS CONFEREE AND APPOINTMENT OF REPLACEMENT CONFEREE ON H.R. 3841, INTERSTATE BANKING EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore, laid before the House the following resignation as a conferee:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 25, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to be excused from services as a conferee on the conference committee on the bill H.R. 3841, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JACK BROOKS,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted

and without objection, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. MAZZOLI, to serve in lieu of Mr. BROOKS of Texas, resigned, as a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 3841.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4454, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 444 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 444

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4454) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, or to recommit with instructions if offered by Representative Young of Florida or a designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 444 is the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4454, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995. The resolution provides 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. House Resolution 444 also waives clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, against all provisions in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order only those amendments that are printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying this rule and the amendments are to be considered in the order and manner specified in the report and all amendments will be debatable for 10 minutes each.

The amendments made in order under this rule are not subject to amendment, are considered as read, and are not subject to a demand for a division of the question. All points of order against the amendments made in order in this rule are waived.

Mr. Speaker, the rule further permits the Chairman of the Whole to postpone consideration of a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and to reduce to 5 minutes the time for voting after the first of a series of votes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit or one motion to recommit with or without instructions, if offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, the bill brought before us today is the product of many hours of hard work and the Members and the staff certainly deserve our appreciation.

The bill is important in many ways because it funds not only the operations of the House of Representatives but it also provides for the funding of other agencies critical to the mission of the legislative branch such as the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, and the General Accounting Office. While most of the funds in this bill are for the salaries for our staff and for the staff of these other agencies, it must be noted that this is the first time in 4 years that there is an increase in this bill—however modest it may be.

The Appropriations Committee, has made some very hard choices so that there is the most bang for the buck in this legislation. The very lean funding provided in this bill will make it possible for us to fulfill our constitutional obligations and serve our constituents as well as possible.

I made the point yesterday in our Rules Committee hearing and I want to make it again—the legislative branch is a coequal branch of Government and must be treated as such. The trimming of the cost of governing is necessary but we cannot cut for the sake of cutting and we cannot cut and cut and cut when these cuts are not in the best interests of the country.

Traditionally, this bill has provided a wonderful opportunity for some to grandstand and say that this particular agency should be abolished or that this particular account is merely an example of Government waste. I view most of these arguments as flimsy at best and only allow for a slick soundbite and maybe a nice addition to a campaign brochure.

We received many valid and worthwhile proposals to this bill. The Rules Committee has made in order many amendments—some I agree with and some I don't—but all of them deserved to be brought before the House and debated on their merits. What I feel we must resist are the kind of amendments that make for good television but terrible public policy.

I would once again like to recognize the fine work that this bill represents and again make the point as forcefully as I can—the legislative branch has sustained continual cuts in its funding over the last 15 years. Vital capital projects have had to be postponed and we have not been able to maintain pace with the Consumer Price Index. The executive branch, on the other hand, has grown at a rate nearly 40 percent greater than the legislative branch over this same period.

This pattern does not serve anyone well. The U.S. Government is the most representative in all of the world and without a doubt, we are certainly the most responsive to the needs of our citizens. The funds in this bill will simply allow the functions of the legislative branch to be carried out.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that the Rules Committee has made in order 12 amendments to this bill that represent a total of $177 million in possible cuts—that's over 9 percent of the reported bill. There are three Democratic amendments, three Republican amendments, and six bipartisan amendments.

This is a fair rule.

It is the job of the Rules Committee to recommend to the body a structure that allows for a full discussion of the issues while at the same time bringing the matter to a final vote for resolution of the matter. This rule allows for that discussion, it allows for many cutting amendments, and it will bring the

bill to a final vote for a decision by this entire body.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, this is a bill of vital importance. It is a product of a lot of very hard work. There are many fine proposals that are made in order under this rule and I expect a very good debate. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support this important bill.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Edgefield, South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] one of the very respected Members of this body, for yielding me half of his time.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I ask every Republican to vote "no" on this rule and to vote "no" on the bill if the rule passes.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations justified a restrictive gag rule for the foreign operations bill on the grounds that President Reagan—listen to this now—President Reagan once asked him to seek such a rule. I am sure it must come as some surprise to his colleagues in the Democrat Caucus that he is still taking his marching orders from a Republican President who left office over 5 years ago. Mr. Speaker, I cannot wait to hear who has directed the chairman to seek this gag rule on the legislative branch appropriations bill. For all I know his latest marching orders must have been found in some newly discovered Presidential papers of Millard Fillmore.

It might all be funny, Mr. Speaker, if it were not so sad.

Here we are, about to debate a bill appropriating nearly $2 billion, $2 billion for the legislative branch of Government, and we are being told by this rule that Members of that very same branch are not competent enough to fully and freely debate and amend this bill. I mean what is going on around here?

Somebody from the majority side of the aisle says, "Beam me up." Who is that over there?

I say to my colleagues, "this rule is a little like buying a house and then being told that someone else will write our household budget for us because we are not capable of managing our own household affairs."

Here we are in this House, guardians of the people's purse, read the Constitution, being told that we are not mature or intelligent enough to vote on how the people's money should be spent on our own budget! Well, excuse me, Mr. Speaker, but this kind of rule turns the Constitution on its head, and it is just one more piece of evidence of why the people are increasingly frustrated with this Democrat controlled Congress. And I say to those colleagues, "Boy, it's going to come back to haunt you."

Mr. Speaker, the people sent us here to represent them, to vote for them, to decide on how their hard earned tax dollars should be spent or saved. That is what they learned in their civic books about how our republican form of government is supposed to work. Yet they see rule after rule like this that tie the hands of their duly elected Representatives and, in turn, disenfranchises all 600,000 of the constituents that each of us represent because we cannot offer amendments on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, the people also learned that the Congress is the guardian of the purse strings, that only Congress can appropriate money and raise taxes, and that only this House has the power to originate both tax and spending bills. Read the Constitution. And yet this rule says no to that concept embodied in our Constitution. This rule says that a pair of committees beats a full house, Mr. Speaker. The Committee on Rules and the Committee on Appropriations presumably have more collective wisdom than all of the rest of us put together.

Am I exaggerating when I make that claim? Sadly, I am not. It was confirmed in a marathon 15-hour Committee on Rules meeting yesterday when we were lectured by our Democrat colleagues over and over again that we had to shut down this rule to prevent, and I quote, "cheap shot amendments." Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to raise a question of the collective privileges of this House against such characterization of the Members of this body. Those statements reach an all-time low, in my opinion, in trashing this body. How can we expect the people to have confidence in us when those in positions of power and supposed leadership can go around calling Members a bunch of cheap shot artists? What kind of leadership is it that expresses no confidence in its own Members and the people they represent just because Members want to offer cutting-spending amendments that would cut our own budget?

I ask my colleagues, "What do you think the American people think about that?"

Is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the public's approval rating of Congress hovers around an abysmal 20 percent, and is going down? Why have they lost confidence in us? One reason is that our leaders arrogantly, and I say arrogantly, gag us by refusing to let the House work its will on this floor by offering cutting amendments to these big spending bills. Mr. Speaker, how can we expect to cut spending when the leadership denies us the opportunity to offer these cutting amendments—over 35 of them—when we are not trusted by the Democrat leaders to manage our own House?

I would suggest it is time for a change around here, time for a change from top to bottom, to put the people back in charge of this House through a free and open legislative process. And I say, "You can count on that happening, Mr. Speaker, if the American people kick out these Democrats who are blocking these amendments and put Republicans in charge of this House. You're seeing it happen with every special election; there was one just 2 days ago."

Mr. Speaker, the Democrat leadership tells us that this House is downsizing, downsizing its budget. Yet this bill appropriates 5.7 percent more than last year's bill, $107 million more. Keep in mind that the leaders of the Democratic Party are boasting that we are cutting legislative personnel by 4 percent, but we are still spending more money.

How is that?

Mr. Speaker, only in our Nation's Capital can we downsize and spend up. Yet that same Democrat leadership is doing all it can to dilute and divide and delay any House action on the joint reform committee's recommendation to streamline and improve this institution. They are blocking our own Republican amendments to further strengthen those reforms, like eliminating proxy voting, eliminating one-third of the committees, eliminating one-third of the staff. We cannot even offer those amendments, Mr. Speaker.

We can, if given an opportunity, reduce the size of this bureaucracy that has overcome us here in Congress and make this a leaner, more effective policymaking body. We have got committees and subcommittees and staff stepping all over each other around here, fighting over turf instead of focusing on making good laws for the people. We have got some 12 House committees alone, listen to this, and dozens of subcommittees working on just one health bill. Can anyone really think that good health policy can emerge from such a mishmash of tangled jurisdiction?

Where is congressional reform? It is being blocked by Democrat leaders, that's where.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to get so excited. We deserve a chance to make some meaningful and thoughtful cuts in this congressional bureaucracy so we can get back to the basics of doing what the people sent us here to do. And what was that? It is to work for them instead of for the greater enhancement of all our tiny little fiefdoms around here. I am asking for a no vote on this rule so we can bring this bill back to the House under the kind of open amendment process that was always over the last 200 years on regular appropriation bills.

□ 1140

We have always had that privilege. Let us start to do things right again

before we lose control of the purse strings in this House.

If this rule passes, I want every Republican to vote no on this bill, and I would strongly advise the Democrats to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following materials on open rules and rollcall votes, as follows:

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON MOTIONS TO PROPOSED RULE FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT (H.R. 4454) WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1994

1. Open Rule—Provides for one-hour of general debate followed by an open amendment process under the five minute rule. (See end of list for text of open rule.) Rejected: 4–9 Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Slaughter.

2. Motion To Make In Order Prefiled Amendments on Republican List—Rejected: 4–8. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Wheat.

3. Castle Amendment No. 2—Would terminate the current allowable practice of transferring up to $25,000 from Office Expenses Account to the Official Mail Account. Rejected: 4–8. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Wheat.

4. Hoke/Coppersmith/Jacobs Amendment No. 3—Would reduce funding in the bill by an amount equal to that requested for the purchase of calendars from the U.S. Capitol Historical Society for the use by Members. Rejected: 4–8. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Wheat.

5. Klug Amendment No. 7—Prohibits use of Members' official allowance for any Legislative Service Organization (LSO) except the Democratic Study Group (DSG) and the Republican Study Committee. Rejected: 4–8. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Wheat.

6. Boehner Amendment No. 8—Alters Official Mail formula and bans the transfer of funds from Member's Official Expenses Account to the Official Mail Allowance. [En bloc] Rejected: 4–7. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat.

7. Boehner Amendment No. 9—Reduces statutory funds for committee employees by $2.2 million. Rejected: 4–8. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Wheat.

8. Boehner Amendment No. 10—Reduces Official Mail Account by $3.2 million. Rejected: 4–8. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Gordon. Not Voting: Wheat, Slaughter.

9. Motion To Increase Cut in Lancaster/Klug No. 36 By $1 Million—Rejected: 4–9. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Slaughter.

10. Lancaster/Klug No. 36—Cuts $4.441 million from the GPO, Congressional Printing Account. Adopted: 11–0–2. Ayes: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Bonior, Hall, Gordon, Slaughter Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Present: Frost, Wheat.

11. Motion to Change Pomeroy/Quinn No. 21 to Quinn/Pomeroy No. 21—Rejected: 4–9. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Slaughter.

12. Boehner Amendment No. 11—Applies Freedom of Information Act requirements to certain congressional agencies. Rejected: 4–9. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Slaughter.

13. Camp/Zimmer Amendment No. 12—Permits Members to return unspend funds from Clerk Hire, Official Expenses, and Official Mail Cost accounts to the Treasury for deficit reduction. Rejected: 5–8. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss, Derrick. Nays: Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Slaughter.

14. Fowler/Torkildsen Amendment No. 13—Requires that each Member's monthly franking expenditures be made available to the public. Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Gordon. Not Voting: Derrick, Wheat, Slaughter.

15. Motion to Delete "To the extent practicable" from Traficant No. 1—Rejected: 3–8. Ayes: Solomon, Derrick. Nays: Moakley, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Gordon. Not Voting: Wheat, Slaughter.

16. Traficant Amendment No. 1—Sense of Congress that, to the extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this bill, must be American-made. Additionally, all entities receiving funds in this bill should be sent a notice of this Sense of Congress. Adopted: 8–0–2. Ayes: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Bonior, Gordon, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier. Present: Frost, Goss. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

17. Goss Amendment No. 15—Reduces all discretionary amounts in the bill by 20%. Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

18. Mica Amendment No. 19—Requires that funds for salaries and expenses of the Committee on Government Operations be allocated to the majority and minority staff proportional to the party representation in the House. Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

19. (En Bloc) Ewing Amendment No. 23—Provides $1.14 million for the LBJ Congressional Internship Program. Ewing Amendment No. 24—Cuts $1.14 million from the funding for committee investigative staff. Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

20. Dunn Amendment No. 25—Reduces the funding for committee investigative staff by 4% ($2.1 million). Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

21. Dunn Amendment No. 26—Requires that one-third of investigative funds made available for each committee be expended at the discretion of the ranking minority member of the committee. Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

22. Blute Amendment No. 27—Reduces official mailings to 1.5 per address, prohibits transfer of up to $25,000 from other office accounts to the official mail account, prohibits unsolicited mail within 60-days of an election, and directs that all unspent funds be returned to the Treasury. Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

23. Michel Amendment No. 28—Requires a 4% cut in the number of FTE employee positions from the Sept. 30, 1995 level and from the Sept. 30, 1996 level in each of the following: the House and Senate, Architect, Capitol Police, CBO, Copyright Tribunal, GAO, GPO, OTA, and the Library of Congress. Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

24. (En Bloc) Ramstad Amendment No. 29—Requires an across-the-board cut of 2.7%, and, Ramstad Amendment No. 30—Requires an across-the-board cut of 5.7%. Rejected: 4–5. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Beilenson, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

25. Schaefer Amendment No. 31—Reduces all committee staff funding by 25%. Rejected: 4–5. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Moakley, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

26. Thomas (WY) Amendment No. 33—Reduces funding for GAO by about 15%, from $439 million to $373 million. Rejected: 4–5. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Moakley, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

27. Goss Amendment No. 34—Reduces nursing position salaries under the Architect of the Capitol by $240,000. Goss Amendment No. 35—Reduces by 50% the amount appropriated to the Office of Attending Physician; reduces number of Navy personnel assigned to the Office from 14 to 8; and reduces by 50% the allowable reimbursement to the Navy for personnel and supplies. Rejected 3–7. Ayes: Solomon, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon, Quillen. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

28. Thomas (CA) Amendment No. 37—Sets the maximum statutory mail allowance at the first class postage rate multiplied by twice the number of eligible district addresses, rather than the current law 3 times the number of eligible addresses. Rejected: 4–6. Ayes: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

29. Motion To Report Rule—Modified closed. Adopted: 5–4–1. Ayes: Moakely, Derrick, Beilenson, Bonior, Gordon. Nays: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Present: Frost. Not Voting: Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

(Note: The amendments would not be subject to amendment but debatable for 20-minutes each divided between the proponent or a designee and an opponent; en bloc amendments would not be subject to a division in the House or committee of the whole; and appropriate waivers would be provided to those amendments which need them.)

H.R. 4454, PROVIDING AN OPEN RULE FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4454) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall

be dispensed with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill, and which shall not exceed one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.".

Explanation: This amendment to the proposed rule provides for a 1-hour, open rule for the consideration of H.R. 4454, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1995. Clauses 2 and 6 of the rule 21 are waived against provisions of the bill. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

RESTRICTIVE RULES ON APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, 95TH–103D CONGRESSES

95TH CONGRESS

Four restrictive rules were granted on regular appropriations bills: H. Res. 664 on H.R. 7932, the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, permitting open amendment process except only one specified amendment on the subject of Congressional pay; H. Res. 1236 on H.R. 12928, Public Works Appropriations, prohibiting amendments only in one specified area; H. Res. 1220 on H.R. 12929, Labor-HEW Appropriations, making in order only two amendments to the abortion section; and H. Res. 1230 on H.R. 12932, Interior, prohibiting amendments that would make the availability of appropriations contingent on enactment of the relevant authorizations.

96TH CONGRESS

One restrictive rule, H. Res. 335, was granted on a regular appropriations bill, H.R. 4389, Labor-HEW Appropriations, permitting only two amendments to the section on abortion.

97TH CONGRESS

No restrictive rules were granted on a regular appropriation bill.

98TH CONGRESS

No restrictive rules were granted on a regular appropriations bill.

99TH CONGRESS

One restrictive rule (H. Res. 481) was granted on a regular appropriations bill; H.R. 5052, the Military Construction Appropriations bill, but it did not affect the regular amendment process—only a new title relating to Contra Aid.

100TH CONGRESS

One restrictive rule (H. Res. 457) was granted on a regular appropriations bill, H.R. 4637, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, permitting only 18 amendments printed in the Rules Committee report (11 Republican and 7 Democrat).

101ST CONGRESS

One restrictive rule (H. Res. 425) was granted on a regular appropriations bill, H.R. 5114, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, permitting only 11 amendments printed in the Rules Committee report (8 Democrat and 3 Republican).

102D CONGRESS

First session

One restrictive rule (H. Res. 177) was granted on a regular appropriations bill, H.R. 2621, Foreign Operations Appropriations, permitted only 11 amendments (6 Democrat and 5 Republican).

Second session

Two restrictive rules were granted in the second session of the 102nd Congress on regular appropriations bills: H. Res. 499 on the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill for fiscal 1993 (H.R. 5427), permitting only 12 amendments (2 by Democrats and 9 Republicans, though five of the Republican amendments were left exposed to points of order, and one of which required a defeat of the motion to rise in order to be offered); and H. Res. 501 on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal 1993, permitting only 5 amendments (2 by Democrats and 3 by Republicans).

103D CONGRESS

First session

Three restrictive rules were granted in the first session on regular appropriations bills: H. Res. 192, a modified closed rule for the consideration of the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill (H.R. 2348), allowing for just 6 amendments (3 by Democrats and 3 by Republicans); and H. Res. 200, a modified closed rule for the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill (H.R. 2295), allowing for the offering of just 5 amendments (1 by a Democrat and 4 by Republicans); and H. Res. 203, a modified open rule providing for the consideration of the Energy and Water Appropriations bill (H.R. 2445), allowing for just one specified amendment on the Superconducting-Supercollider which is not subject to further amendment, but permitting an open amendment process on the rest of the bill.

Second session

As of May 26, 1994, of three rules granted for appropriations bills, two have been restrictive: H. Res. 443, a modified closed rule for the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act (H.R. 4426), making in order 8 amendments (3 by Democrats, 5 by Republicans); and H. Res. 444, a modified closed rule for the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act (H.R. 4454), a modified closed rule making in order 12 amendments (8 by Democrats and 4 by Republicans).

(Note: The above information does not include rules for continuing resolutions (CRs) or supplemental appropriations bills.)

Source: Congressional Research Service and Rules Committee Minority Staff, based on Rules Committee Calendars, Rules Committee's "Notice of Action Taken," and examination of the texts of reported rules.

AMENDMENTS MADE IN ORDER UNDER THE RULE FOR H.R. 4454, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FISCAL YEAR 1995

(Listed in the order they will appear in the report; amendments are debatable for 10 minutes each)

21. Pomeroy/Quinn: Reduces official mail costs by $4 million for FY 1995.

41. Thurman: Reduces by $2.942 million the amount appropriated for salaries and expenses of House officers and employees, specifying cuts for: Clerk's Office, Doorkeeper, Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services, Historian, Office of Law Revision Counsel and Legislative Counsel.

43. Strickland: Eliminates $6,580,000 for six new elevators in the Longworth Building.

36. Lancaster/Klug: Cuts $4.441 million from the GPO, Congressional Printing account.

14. Johnson (GA)/Torkildsen: Reduces congressional printing at GPO by $3 million.

39. Torkildsen/Byrne: Reduces funding for the Botanical Garden account by $7,000,000. (construction and renovation project)

38. Barca/Kleczka/Thomas (CA): Reduces funding for GPO by $1,500,000 (funds to be used in the depository library program for "electronic access" of Federal publications).

6. Roberts/Klug: Reduces full time equivalent (FTE) positions by 300. (revised)

22. Manton/Dunn: Raises the mandatory retirement age of Capitol Police officers from age 55 to age 57.

1. Traficant: Sense of the Congress that, to the extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this bill, must be American-made. Additionally, all entities receiving funds in this bill should be sent a notice of this Sense of Congress. (revised)

16. Bereuter: Reduces funding for the General Accounting Office by 5% ($30,868,250).

20. Boehner: Freezes the overall FY 1995 level at the FY 1994 level by: reducing GAO funding by 11%; eliminating $7.8 million for Botanical Garden construction, $103,000 for automobiles, and $21,931,000 for OTA; and freezing funds for the Architect of the Capitol, GPO, Congressional Printing and Binding, and joint items of the Congress.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	69	14	20	55	80

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through May 25, 1994.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176, A: 259–164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D–1; R–18)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171, A: 249–170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 243–172. A: 237–178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 248–166. A: 249–163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (d–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 247–170. A: 248–170. (Mar. 10, 1993).

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.—Continued

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental Appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1(not submitted) (D–1; R–0)	A: 240–185. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D–2; R–2)	PQ: 250–172. A: 251–172. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D–8; R–12)	9 (D–4; R–5)	PQ: 252–164. A: 247–169. (Mar. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase Public debt limit	6 (D–1; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 244–168. A: 242–170. (Apr. 1, 1993).
H. Res. 149 Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D–1; R–7)	3 (D–1; R–2)	A: 212–208. (Apr. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Nate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308–0 (May 24, 1993).
H. Res. 173 May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: United States forces in Somalia	6 (D–1; R–5)	6 (D–1; R–5)	A: Voice Vote (May 20, 1993)
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251–174. (May 26, 1993).
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D–19; R–32)	8 (D–7; R–1)	PQ: 252–178. A: 236–194 (May 27, 1993).
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D–6; R–44)	6 (D–3; R–3)	PQ: 240–177. A: 226–185. (June 10, 1993).
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 14, 1993).
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D–4; R–3)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 244–176.. (June 15, 1993).
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department. H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D–20; R–33)	27 (D–12; R–15)	A: 294–129. (June 16, 1993).
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33 (D–11; R–22)	5 (D–1; R–4)	A: 263–160. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-Postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and Water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 23, 1993).
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	A: 401–0. (July 30, 1993).
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261–164. (July 21, 1993).
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D–8; R–6)	2 (D–2; R–0)	PQ: 245–178. F: 205–216. (July 22, 1993).
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D–8; R–7)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: 224–205. (July 27, 1993).
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authority Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Aug. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authority	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (July 29, 1993).
H. Res. 246, Aug. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authority	149 (D–109; R–40)		A: 246–172. (Sept. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization			PQ: 237–169. A: 234–169. (Sept. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 250, Sept. 13, 1993	MC	H.R. 1340: RTC Completion Act	12 (D–3; R–9)	1 (D–1; R–0)	A: 213–191–1. (Sept. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 254, Sept. 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization		91 (D–67; R–24)	A: 241–182. (Sept. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 262, Sept. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1845: National Biological Survey Act	NA	NA	A: 238–188 (10/06/93).
H. Res. 264, Sept. 28, 1993	MC	H.R. 2351: Arts, humanities, museums	7 (D–0; R–7)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 240–185. A: 225–195. (Oct. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 265, Sept. 29, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D–1; R–2)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 239–150. (Oct. 15, 1993).
H. Res. 269, Oct. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2739: Aviation infrastructure investment	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 7, 1993).
H. Res. 273, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D–1; R–2)	2 (D–1; R–1)	PQ: 235–187. F: 149–254. (Oct. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 274, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 1804: Goals 2000 Educate America Act	15 (D–7; R–7; I–1)	10 (D–7; R–3)	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 282, Oct. 20, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 281: Continuing appropriations through Oct. 28, 1993	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 286, Oct. 27, 1993	O	H.R. 334: Lumbee Recognition Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 287, Oct. 27, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 283: Continuing appropriations resolution	1 (D–0; R–0)	0	A: 252–170. (Oct. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 289, Oct. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 2151: Maritime Security Act of 1993	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 293, Nov. 4, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 170: Troop withdrawal Somalia	N/A	N/A	A: 390–8. (Nov. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 299, Nov. 8, 1993	MO	H.R. 1036: Employee Retirement Act–1993	2 (D–1; R–1)	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 9, 1993).
H. Res. 302, Nov. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 1025: Brady handgun bill	17 (D–6; R–11)	4 (D–1; R–3)	A: 238–182. (Nov. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 303, Nov. 9, 1993	O	H.R. 322: Mineral exploration	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 16, 1993).
H. Res. 304, Nov. 9, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 288: Further CR, FY 1994	N/A	N/A	
H. Res. 312, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3425: EPA Cabinet Status	27 (D–8; R–19)	9 (D–1; R–8)	F: 191–227. (Feb. 2, 1994).
H. Res. 313, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 796: Freedom Access to Clinics	15 (D–9; R–6)	4 (D–1; R–3)	A: 233–192. (Nov. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 314, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3351: Alt Methods Young Offenders	21 (D–7; R–14)	6 (D–3; R–3)	A: 238–179. (Nov. 19, 1993).
H. Res. 316, Nov. 19, 1993	C	H.R. 51: D.C. statehood bill	1 (D–1; R–0)	N/A	A: 252–172. (Nov. 20, 1993).
H. Res. 319, Nov. 20, 1993	MC	H.R. 3: Campaign Finance Reform	35 (D–6; R–29)	1 (D–0; R–1)	A: 220–207. (Nov. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 320, Nov. 20, 1993	MC	H.R. 3400: Reinventing Government	34 (D–15; R–19)	3 (D–3; R–0)	A: 247–183. (Nov. 22, 1993).
H. Res. 336, Feb. 2, 1994	MC	H.R. 3759: Emergency Supplemental Appropriations	14 (D–8; R–5; I–1)	5 (D–3; R–2)	PQ: 244–168. A: 342–65. (Feb. 3, 1994).
H. Res. 352, Feb. 8, 1994	MC	H.R. 811: Independent Counsel Act	27 (D–8; R–19)	10 (D–4; R–6)	PQ: 249–174. A: 242–174. (Feb. 9, 1994).
H. Res. 357, Feb. 9, 1994	MC	H.R. 3345: Federal Workforce Restructuring	3 (D–2; R–1)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: VV (Feb. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 366, Feb. 23, 1994	MO	H.R. 6: Improving America's Schools	NA	NA	A: VV (Feb. 24, 1994).
H. Res. 384, Mar. 9, 1994	MC	H. Con. Res. 218: Budget Resolution FY 1995–99	14 (D–5; R–9)	5 (D–3; R–2)	A: 245–171 (Mar. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 401, Apr. 12, 1994	MO	H.R. 4092: Violent Crime Control	180 (D–98; R–82)	68 (D–47; R–21)	A: 244–176 (Apr. 13, 1994).
H. Res. 410, Apr. 21, 1994	MO	H.R. 3221: Iraqi Claims Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Apr. 28, 1994).
H. Res. 414, Apr. 28, 1994	O	H.R. 3254: NSF Auth. Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (May 3, 1994).
H. Res. 416, May 4, 1994	C	H.R. 4296: Assault Weapons Ban Act	7 (D–5; R–2)	0 (D–0; R–0)	A: 220–209 (May 5, 1994).
H. Res. 420, May 5, 1994	O	H.R. 2442: EDA Reauthorization	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (May 10, 1994).
H. Res. 422, May 11, 1994	MO	H.R. 518: California Desert Protection	N/A	N/A	PQ: 245–172 A: 248–165 (May 17, 1994).
H. Res. 423, May 11, 1994	O	H.R. 2473: Montana Wilderness Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (May 12, 1994).
H. Res. 428, May 17, 1994	MO	H.R. 2108: Black Lung Benefits Act	4 (D–1; R–3)	N/A	A: VV (May 19, 1994).
H. Res. 429, May 17, 1994	MO	H.R. 4301: Defense Auth., FY 1995	173 (D–115; R–58)		A: 369–49 (May 18, 1994).
H. Res. 431, May 20, 1994	MO	H.R. 4301: Defense Auth., FY 1995		100 (D–80; R–20)	A: Voice Vote (May 23, 1994).
H. Res. 440, May 24, 1994	MC	H.R. 4385: Natl Hiway System Designation	16 (D–10; R–6)	5 (D–5; R–0)	A: Voice Vote (May 25, 1994).
H. Res. 443, May 25, 1994	MC	H.R. 4426: For. Ops. Approps, FY 1995	39 (D–11; R–28)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 233–191. A: 244–181 (May 25, 1994).
H. Res. 444, May 25, 1994	MC	H.R. 4454: Leg. Branch Approp, FY 1995	43 (D–10; R–33)	12 (D–8; R–4)	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker, and I reserve the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The Chair will inquire, does the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] have any additional speakers?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman has no other speakers?

My goodness. Let me yield time, then.

Mr. DERRICK. We are just trying to save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. SOLOMON. That would be a first, then.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to my very good friend and distinguished chairman of our Policy Committee and the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I want to ask my friend, the gentleman from New York, a point of clarification. Did the gentleman say that the Democrats are offering this restrictive, very modified rule because they wanted to avoid cheap-shot amendments from the Republicans? Is that what they said?

Mr. SOLOMON. That is exactly what they said.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman interpret that remark, as I do, that amendments that cut spending and cut staff are cheap-shot amendments?

Mr. SOLOMON. They consider them cheap-shot because they know they would pass on the floor and they have to gag Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I understand the word, "cheap," is not in their lexicon, and that is a shame.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman on the other side has no further speakers, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], a member of the Committee on Rules, be allowed to manage the remainder of the time for us on this side of the aisle, and I yield to him whatever time he might consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for that purpose.

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the very

diligent ranking Republican on the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that yesterday I had the privilege of meeting with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], at the Committee on Rules to present a bill that we thought was a pretty good bill, but we also thought there were some amendments to be made in order that would make it a better bill and ones that would be acceptable to the House. As always, it was a real pleasure to work with the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] there at the Committee on Rules, as we did in the full Committee on Appropriations and in the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch Appropriations.

I was there primarily to ask for an open rule so that all Members would have an opportunity to offer an amendment that was germane to this bill and let the House work its will. I did not expect that to happen anyway, so I was not too offended when that did not happen. I did not expect it because it does not happen that much around here.

But I did intend to support this bill, and after many negotiations between the leadership on our side and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], we had come to what I thought was an acceptable agreement. We would like to have had more amendments, but we were ready to settle for what we had agreed to. But that is not what the Committee on Rules did. So I have to be in opposition to this rule.

I have listened to a lot of debates on a good many rules, and I hear my Republican friends on the Committee on Rules always arguing for the right to offer amendments. I am sure that people who observe these debates wonder, why is it that the Republicans are the ones who are always demanding and arguing for the opportunity to offer amendments to legislation? I do not think the answer has ever really been presented, but the answer is really simple. The answer is that the Democrats do not have to because they control this House. There are 178 Republicans and 257 Democrats, and they control the committees and the subcommittees with an even greater ratio than that. So the Democrats do not have to offer their amendments on the floor because for the most part they either are already included in the chairman's mark or they are included at the subcommittee level or at the full committee level and they get their job done in advance because they control everything. The Republicans do not control anything in this House.

So the only opportunity we have to be equal players, as the Constitution intends, is to have an opportunity to have amendments on this floor.

Yesterday at the Committee on Rules, one of the very distinguished members of the Committee on Rules asked the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] the question: "Well, didn't these Members have an opportunity to offer their amendments at the subcommittee markup or at the full committee markup? What about the chairman's mark?"

Let me tell the Members a secret about the chairman's mark. There are very, very few people who ever see the chairman's mark until the members of the subcommittee actually sit at the committee table to begin the markup, and if they cannot see the chairman's mark, how in the world do they know how to write their amendment?

I think that it is only proper and I think the Constitution intends for Members of either party, majority or minority, to have an opportunity to offer amendments that are germane to legislation before the House. And I would say this: Because of the numbers that I mentioned earlier, the majority party has the power to do what they want to do, but they do not have the right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has expired, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

The Chair understands that the gentleman from South Carolina has no additional speakers.

Mr. DREIER. There are still no additional speakers? Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend, the gentleman from Edgefield, are there additional speakers?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, we did not figure there was enough worthy of response yet.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to a very hardworking Member, the gentleman from Lexington, NE [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

We have a lot of talk around here about regaining control of Federal spending and deficit reduction. And we talk a lot about leading by example and getting our operation and offices in order, before we ask for further sacrifice from the people we represent.

But when it comes time to pay the piper, our talk is just that—nothing but talk. Again and again road blocks are raised when we try to make real and substantive cuts in spending, and to cut it here on Capitol Hill first.

Case in point: My colleague from California, Mr. THOMAS, has ready an amendment to reduce the official mail allowance by one-third, by changing the formula by which the mail allowance is calculated for each congressional district.

That would make for a real cut in how we spend the taxpayers' money around here, but we won't have a chance to debate it. Granted, the Rules Committee made in order an amendment to reduce the appropriation for official mail by $4 million or 11 percent. It's an amendment I'll support, but it doesn't get at the root of the problem. And that is the mail allowance itself, and how we are allowed to use those funds.

The Thomas amendment would help curb the large volume of mass mailings that account for approximately 86 percent of mail allowance activity.

It's no secret that some Members abuse the franking privilege, by using mass mailings to subsidize campaign activity, and this practice must cease.

Members on both sides of the aisle, who came to the floor when campaign finance reforms were being debated, discussed the need to make elections more equal between incumbent and challenger.

One way to achieve this goal would be to counteract the enormous advantage that incumbents have with their mailing privileges.

Presently, House members will spend more on mass mailings in the 1993–94 election cycle, than that spent by challengers for House seats in the 1992 general election.

We should defeat this rule and bring the legislative branch appropriations bill to the floor with the opportunity to consider the Thomas amendment and all other substantive, cost-cutting amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, again, are there any other speakers on the other side of the aisle, any other Members who are going to be speaking?

Mr. DERRICK. I would respond to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Laverne, CA, no, we have no more speakers at this time.

Mr. DREIER. So can we anticipate that there will just be one closing speaker?

Mr. DERRICK. We do not have additional speakers at this time. I would rather not commit to that in case somebody else over here would decide to speak, but we do not have any at this time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we are just trying to figure out whether we should proceed with using up all our time over here and having 30 minutes available on this other side of the aisle. That would not be very fair as we try to proceed with the debate process.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, we always try to be fair in the situation. I simply have no speakers.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. There is some time on the other side of the aisle. Perhaps the gentleman from South Carolina will yield.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I simply have no more speakers. All right, go ahead.

□ 1147

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman, we respect him, and think he will be fair. But considering what happened in the 15 hour marathon last night, I am just concerned that we might have other Members, not as fair as the gentleman, come here in the last 15 minutes, and then use 15 minutes of the time, when we have no time left.

I would suggest if the gentleman really only has one closing speaker, that at some point he will yield back about 10 or 15 minutes of his time, so we are not being sandbagged like we were last night, out of fairness.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], there is no precedent for anything like that. The only thing I can tell you is I have no reason whatsoever to suspect we will have a rush at the end here to try to do you in. I will manage it, and be just as fair as I possibly can. I have no reason to think we will have any other speakers.

Mr. SOLOMON. As I said before, I trust the gentleman. I am not so trustworthy of others, perhaps.

Mr. DERRICK. I am not willing to guarantee that or willing to give back the balance of my time. If the gentleman wants to give back the balance of his time, I will be glad to give back the balance of mine, and we can go ahead and vote now.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the chair, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). This time was coming out of Mr. DERRICK's time. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] has 22 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield one minute to one of the diligent reformers who came to this Congress attempting to bring about the kinds of changes that the American people want, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE].

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California, and I rise in opposition to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I offered an amendment to H.R. 4454, the legislative branch appropriations which would have brought vital reform to the House franking budget. My amendment would have allowed a cut of more than $7.5 million from the House franking budget in four ways:

Cut each member's franking allowances by one half.

Banned the process of transferring funds into the franking account from other official expenses.

Banned all unsolicited mail within 60 days of an election, and

Directed all unspent franking funds to the treasury and cut the deficit.

The majority of Members in this body already comply with these guidelines. So why can't the entire House have an opportunity to vote on them? There is no good answer to this question.

Mine was not the only amendment that was thwarted though. More than 30 well thought out ideas were rejected by a majority in the Rules Committee. In my short time here I have seen an unprecedented number of closed rules that prohibit the open discussion of ideas. The public is demanding reform of the Congress and the Rules Committee is continuing to perpetuate the status quo.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to another new Member of Congress, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank him for presenting my amendment last night as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult subject, but I came to Congress last year with a lot of other people realizing this is a place that spends entirely too much money. Today we are facing a piece of legislation which is going to increase the spending of Congress, that is what this bill is all about, by 5.7 percent. Our own internal controls, we are going to increase this by 5.7 percent.

We have talked about Congressional reform, and we have not seen congressional reform on the floor. I have in front of me about 43 different cuts which were not approved by the Committee on Rules last night. There are another dozen or so that were approved by the Committee on Rules, probably good cuts, things we should do.

But the interesting thing is not one piece of legislation introduced as an amendment did anything but try to reduce the spending which we have here. That must tell us something.

One example, the area I am concerned about, is called the franking privilege. It is a privilege by which Members of Congress write to their constituents. In my allowance last year, I had $200,827 by which I could send 3 pieces of first class mail to everybody in my district. I spent $5,488.94, or 2.73 percent, and I sent out more letters than I received in answering all my constituents.

Do we really need to spend the rest of that money? If we multiply that by 435 people, we really begin to save money. Do we need to send out calendars, questionnaires, and newsletters? Do we need to have all these reelection techniques built into the budget of the legislative body of the Congress of the United States of America? I think the answer to that is not.

I merely wanted in an amendment to make absolutely sure you could not transfer an additional $25,000 from your expense account into the account by which you do your mailing. And that was turned down. I thought it was the simplest amendment possible, and yet that was not allowed last night by the Committee on Rules.

So I thank those who supported my amendment. I thank those who stayed up so late last night supporting good measures that would help save money for the taxpayers of the United States of America. I would encourage us today to vote against this rule, to vote against the bill, but to support the amendments which would produce further cuts.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentlewoman from Jacksonville, FL [Mrs. FOWLER], a leader in the reform effort.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I know there was a day when appropriations bills came to the floor under open rules. That is not the case anymore, and Members must now present their amendments to the Rules Committee.

Forty-three of us did that yesterday. Today, you will have the opportunity to debate and vote on just 12 amendments.

My amendment was simple and straightforward, and its demise in the Rules Committee is a good example of why Members should oppose this rule.

Each of us gets a monthly franking report, detailing franked mailings and their cost. My amendment would make those reports public. The national taxpayers union is already getting the information through freedom of information requests. It just makes sense that we should provide the information voluntarily, after all it is taxpayer money we are spending.

Under this rule, those reports will remain secret. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this restrictive rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the chief deputy whip, the gentleman from East Petersburg, PA, [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when we heard that Washington was going to be given the privilege of operating under one-party government a couple of years back, we were told that one-party government was going to produce enormous change. That Washington was going to be presented with a reform agenda, and that things were going to be better for middle-class America as a result of one-party rule in Washington.

Today what we see is that one-party rule has simply produced one-party irresponsibility, because what you have

before us is a business-as-usual budget. One of the things that the American people have said over and over again that they want to see changed is the Congress. There have been attempts here to paper over the fact that we are not changing.

For example, we went through an exercise of reform called the Hamilton-Dreier committee, which was to present to the Congress a series of reforms. The reforms suggested by the Hamilton-Dreier committee after a year of work have literally been buried. We have not seen any of them. And, guess what? We are running a budget out on the floor today without having put in place any of those reforms, with no intention of moving ahead with those reforms, evidently, in the future, and a business-as-usual budget on the floor.

And, oh, guess what? We are even going to play some little games with this budget. They were going to pump the budget up in money so that then people could come to the floor and offer amendments to cut back down the budget and take credit for the cutting back down of the budget. And then what we were going to say was look how much we have saved. And we were going to make certain that none of those little bitty cuts really did any harm.

So what we did was we went to the Committee on Rules, and I took the time to go up to the Committee on Rules and watch this performance last night, as we made in order some amendments that we knew would do no particular damage. But the amendments that were real, we simply lopped out.

The rule that you have before you today is a rule designed to make certain that nothing really happens; that the Congress continues to go forward spending money on itself as though there were no tomorrow; and that any amendments that are offered do no real damage to that approach; and, oh, by the way, the amendments that were real in terms of reform never get to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is just absolutely the wrong rule, it is the wrong bill.

Let me tell you one thing: I think America is in the mood for a change. Middle-class America has had it with exactly what they see going on in the Congress at the present time. I have got one message to middle-class America then, Mr. Speaker, and that is, if you want to see this kind of performance change, change the House of Representatives.

I will guarantee one thing: If you put Republicans in charge of this body next January, one of the first bills that we will revisit is this legislative appropriations bill. We will go back and make certain that there is reform. We will pull it into the discussion again. We will revisit it. We will get real reform as of next January. But it is obviously going to take a new majority here to do it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Addison, MI [Mr. SMITH], a hard working new Member who came here on that platform of reform.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the question is what is going to inspire Members of Congress to spend less on their office expenses?

Here is what the kind of rule that I think we should be considering today is: allowing each Member to take 25 percent or maybe even 50 percent of their unspent authorization to go toward deficit reduction.

I turned back a quarter of a million dollars. I am told I am the lowest spender in the U.S. Congress. I asked the Speaker and the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. ROSE], if it would be possible for any of that to go towards deficit reduction. It just seems reasonable that if we wanted to excite, inspire, and encourage individuals to have some of that money go towards deficit reduction, that would be one way to do it.

Now that we are underfunded, then, of course, we have to use up everything. But using up everything that is turned back at the same time sends a signal to those Members that they should spend everything that they have got.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and would like to say that over the past year, 1993, I had the opportunity to serve with my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who have just been on the floor, on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. We were charged with trying to bring about reform of this institution.

□ 1200

Tragically, that reform package has fallen by the wayside. We are still hoping that we can bring about some kind of proposal for the House to consider, but this legislative appropriation bill demonstrates the fact that they are trying to proceed with business as usual.

This rule is extraordinarily arrogant, prevents Members from having the opportunity to offer the cutting amendments which should be considered under the standard operating rules of this House. This is blatantly unfair, and I believe both Democrats and Republicans should vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives is the most representative body in the world, as one of the three branches of Government that in my opinion has provided our country with prosperity, a framework for prosperity, and a free and open Government for over 200 years.

If we want to examine the House of Representatives, as many who have gone before me have, if we want to examine it in a vacuum, we can certainly find many imperfections, but if we want to examine it and compare it with other systems, I would suggest that if we did not have a House of Representatives, a Congress of this country, that we would have one of two things, or we could have one of two things: We could have anarchy, we could have people shooting each other in the streets; or we could have tyranny, where the Government would be shooting us.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is the U.S. House of Representatives, the Congress as a whole, that stands between the American people and some catastrophe such as this.

To continue, we must be funded. We have people who work here. We have Members who serve here. We have expenses that are incurred. That is what this bill is all about. This bill represents a cut of 9 percent, $177 million, out of proposed expenditures. We are continuing to cut back and have cut back on a number of areas over the last few years.

I said it last night on the Committee on Rules and I will say it again, it is very easy to come up here and to criticize this body. It happens on both sides of the aisle. What I feel is that if we do not stop it, we are going to weaken our institutions, and this institution, to the point that one of these days somewhere down the line a very strong person could come into the White House that was not democratically inclined and could take away our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Members of this body that this is a very fair rule. There are six bipartisan amendments, three Democratic amendments, three Republican amendments, giving ample opportunity for the Members to express themselves as far as cuts are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Members of this body to vote for the rule, and to also vote for the appropriation bills which it allows.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 177, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—249

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bellenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—177

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Coppersmith
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Blackwell
Clayton
Cox
Grandy
Horn
Lewis (FL)
Neal (NC)
Wilson

□ 1226

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Wilson for, with Mr. Cox against.

Mr. LIVINGSTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, because of a family health emergency, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall votes No. 209 and No. 210. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 209 (on approving the journal) and I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 210 on agreeing to the resolution providing for consideration of the bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1995.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 4454, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 444 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4454.

□ 1228

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4454) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MINK of Hawaii in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman for California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chair, I want to begin by saying it is a pleasure to bring H.R. 4454, the legislative branch appropriations bill for this coming fiscal year 1995, to the floor; but if I said that, it would probably not be quite accurate. It is not really my pleasure, but it is our responsibility and, regrettably, it always falls to the majority to take responsibility for the maintenance of the institution.

So, the almost party-line vote that we saw on the rule should not be surprising. It is normally going to be the job of the majority to stand and fight for those elements of the institution that must be protected if this coequal branch is to be able to exercise its responsibilities.

I do hope, at the end of the day, by the time we have gone through a number of amendments, we will have some bipartisan support for this bill. I think it is important because, frankly, up to

this point we have operated in a very bipartisan manner.

I would like, first of all, to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], who is in the first Congress of his acting as ranking member on this legislative branch Appropriations Subcommittee.

□ 1230

It is not a chosen task on his part. It was an obligation he accepted, and I want to pay tribute to him because, as a member of our committee for many years, 20 years I believe, it was certainly not his responsibility to take up this burden, but he has taken it up and performed it in the best possible manner, and I have enjoyed very much working closely with him as we fashioned this bill and brought it to the floor.

I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], my colleague who has been the ranking member for the first time in this Congress. This is the second bill that he has helped us bring to the floor, and he has been a true friend and colleague sitting through all the hearings and participating in a very meaningful way in our work.

I also want to thank the other members of our commitee: The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] who is chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] who presided over the rule; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], who also contributed to the bill and helped us bring it to this point.

I also want to point out, Madam Chair, that we worked very closely with the Committee on House Administration, and other subcommittees, other standing committees, but none more important than the Committee on House Administration, and so I want to thank that committee, primarily its chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the minority ranking member of that committee and all those who contribute to the committee's work, particularly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Accounts, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], the chair and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Personnel and Police, and then, of course, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials, which is important to a major element of this bill.

Madam Chairman, this, of course, is the annual appropriation for the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Government. We are a small part of the total budget picture. Despite all the hue and cry and the lengthy debate that will last all day and into the night, this bill only constitutes .12 percent of the entire Federal budget. That is twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent, or one-eighth of 1 percent, of the Federal budget, and yet we are one-third of the Federal system under the Constitution. This is a fundamental branch, necessary to carry out the constitutional duties of the Federal Government. We enact laws, we conduct the oversight. The Executive spends the money and, of course, executes the programs, and the judiciary upholds and interprets the laws of the land. But we have a fundamental coequal responsibility, and this very important bill provides for it.

Included in it, of course, Madam Chair, are the House of Representatives and the Senate, the support agencies, such as the Architect of the Capitol, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Technology Assessment, the Congressional Research Service, and then, of course, a number of agencies that we look to ferret out waste, and fraud and abuse, conduct financial audits; for example, the General Accounting Office. We have included in this bill the Government Printing Office and the Library of Congress. Decisions by our Founding Fathers to include them in this branch have remained intact for over 200 years. Also, of course, important entities like the Copyright Office, the Books for the Blind, and physically handicapped program, the National Library Service, the depository library program, that serves so many regional and other Federal document libraries around the country, and the Botanic Garden.

Madam Chair, the bill before us totals $1.88 billion in budget authority for fiscal year 1995. At this point, these figures do not include Senate items which will be added when the Senate takes up this bill in the other body. The budget request was just under $2 billion. It has been reduced by some $87.1 million. That is a 4.4-percent reduction under the detailed requests that were submitted in the President's budget. Under the Budget Act, Madam Chair, our committee has allocated 2.4 billion for the legislative bill. The bill before us contains 1.8 million in discretionary budget authority. That means we are $587 million under the target. A large amount of that, of course, is because Senate operations are not included in the bill before us. But if we add the Senate request, we would be $45.6 billion below the amount that has been allocated to us under the budget process by the full Committee on Appropriations. That is a 2.4-percent reduction below our share of the total pie. We did a similar analysis on our outlay target, and our calculation is that the bill is about $45 million under the 602(b), so called, outlay ceiling, a 2.3-percent reduction.

Now we heard a lot of rhetoric on the rule today about the burgeoning size of the legislative branch and the need to provide leadership. I think we are doing that, and over the next few minutes I hope to show in greater detail just how that has been accomplished and how much progress has been made.

In the past 2 years, beginning with 1992 as a basis point, we have reduced the legislative full-time employment by a least 5.6 percent. That is over 1,600 employees. That is due to a 4-percent reduction plan in last year's bill and an additional full-time equivalent employee savings due to budget cutbacks and a retirement incentive program. Appropriations funding for the last two fiscal years, 1992 through 1994, have actually reduced legislative branch operation funds by $27 million. That is an absolute cut. In 1992 we provided $1.81 billion in operational funds. By 1994 the operating funds levels have been reduced to $1.78 billion. Several rescissions were enacted which subsequently reduced the appropriated amounts even further. They came after the fact. If we go back to fiscal year 1992, when the Federal downsizing effort began, the fiscal year 1995 legislative bill is now $224.5 million below the CBO baseline projected from 1992. That, in effect using the same standard which is used for the other bills that will come to this floor, reflects a 10.7-percent drop in budget authority under where we would be if we had maintained normal current service growth in the past 3 years. That is, I think, testimony to the willingness of this Congress to show leadership.

I would like to use this chart and several others that follow to show in more graphic terms the way we have made progress in reducing not only the number of dollars spent on this branch of government, but also the number of people employed here.

The first chart shows how appropriations have declined over the last 15 years. We actually have a very abrupt reduction from 1979 to 1994 in millions of dollars in terms of what is now being spent on the legislative branch, and perhaps the best way to indicate how we have made that is to put it in the context of other bills that will be coming before us.

As my colleagues can see, this is practically flat. The legislative bill in the House has been actually almost flat compared to the consumer price index which has gone up rather markedly, more than double, and the executive branch which shows a rather dramatic decline from 1978 to 1995.

To more specifically cite where we stand in light of the other branches of

Government and the increases that they have made in appropriations, the legislative branch has actually shown a 1.4-percent reduction in real dollars while the executive branch has gone up almost 30 percent and the judicial branch almost 166 percent since 1979. This shows that we have once again been providing leadership.

The next chart will show even more graphically just how well we have done in terms of other administration agencies that really are in some ways comparable to us. This shows the percent of increase for a number of agencies in the last 4 years. Ours has gone up 3.7 percent while OMB, which is the administrative servant of the executive branch, 10.6 percent; the average Cabinet secretariat, the administrative employees in each Cabinet, by over 14 percent; the judicial branch, 44 percent; and White House policy people, almost 51 percent.

□ 1240

Most of this, of course, occurred in the last Bush administration.

Now, trends in the appropriation as it relates to staff for committees and Members also shows dramatically the degree to which we have provided the very leadership that others were demanding of us in the debate on the rule just a minute ago. The committee staff, since 1979, in real dollars, adjusted for inflation, shows a 5-percent reduction. Members' personal staff in real dollars is down 6.4 percent. That is a dramatic example of just where we have made the tight fit that people have demanded of this legislative branch of Government.

The next chart once again shows how we compare with the judicial branch and the executive branch in terms of increased staff since 1979. The judicial staff has gone up almost 100 percent. Perhaps the effort to fight crime is reflected in those statistics. The executive branch has gone up a modest 3.3 percent.

This branch of Government, despite all the rhetoric we have heard, has gone down 8.6 percent since 1979. We hear the constant rhetoric about the burgeoning staff, the overloaded congressional staff, with nothing to do except serve the needs, the political needs often, it is said, of the Members. We have shown leadership since 1979. And let us show once again how that leadership compares to other agencies that are essentially administrative.

The Treasury Department, essentially an administrative agency, shows a dramatic increase since 1981, through 1995. The Justice Department again has part of that effort to fight crime, goes up rather significantly. The judiciary in general is clearly on the rise. The House tracks almost straight across-the-board. We have actually seen a reduction in our staff, and that can be seen even more clearly on this chart where we can see that in 1981 there were 11,000 people working for the House and now just a little over 10,700. The legislative branch in general is below where it was in 1981 by almost 3,000.

The executive branch, of course, if we look at this chart, while it jumped up in the 1980's and into the 1990's, has gone back down again in the reinvention of Government to the level it was at in 1981.

This chart here is also reflective of the real effort that has been made here in every area of our bill, and certainly in the House of Representatives, to find the necessary restraint. Members' staff is lower today than it was in 1981 by several hundred. Committee staffs is lower than it was in 1981 by several hundred.

The only increase in our branch of Government that has occurred at all is in the support agencies that do not individually support Members but help the entire administration on a bipartisan basis. This is where we get the efficiency and productivity to serve the needs of the committees and to make the public policy decisions that are essential.

I would like to go on and give the Members a little information about the components of this bill because they are also misunderstood. The most important thing to point out is that almost 75 percent of this bill is in people whom we employ to work in this branch of Government. We are spending money on the people whose intelligence contributes to the efficient effort of our responsibilities and the policy formulation that the Founding Fathers gave us to do. So 75 percent of this bill is simply the compensation, the total package of pay and benefits for our employees, which, as we have indicated in our prior charts, have been reduced in number.

We also have 15 percent of this bill providing information, support, telephones, computers, business equipment, things that make it possible for these people to be efficient in the use of their time. And the reason we have been able to take on the tremendous burdens of this Congress in the last 10 to 15 years is reflected in the information support that increased the productivity of all these individuals and made it possible for them to get the ever-larger job done.

The maintenance of structures here at the Capitol, the capital outlay kinds of expenditures, these are very, very small. We have probably been guilty of neglecting our physical plant. Today we will do what we can to repair some of that, because in fact this is not just an office building for Congress, it is a National Monument and something that is there for the American people hopefully to have perpetuated for generations.

But this leads to a problem that I think is inherent in this bill. When 75 percent of this bill goes to pay people for their compensation, including their benefits package, we can see immediately how complicated that is when it comes to budget, because the typical Federal employee, when we total up their COLA's, their locality pay, their longevity, which means a merit increase on average, not all of them getting them every year but some getting them periodically, and the cost of benefits which increasingly falls on the House, given the requirement under the Social Security law that we joined in the mid-1980's that we are the employer and contribute for the employee, and also under the new Federal Employee Retirement System, where we provide the employer match, not the Treasury under the old Civil Service System, and yes, as well, in the health care area where all the Federal employees' health care costs continue to go up. We pay, if we were to fully fund all these categories, before we do anything else in a new fiscal year, a 6.2-percent increase per every one of those employees that make up 75 percent of our branch of Government.

We did not do that in this year's bill, and I want to outline, if I can, what we did do. This does remain subject to adjustment as general decisions about employee pay are made, but the most important thing to point out now is that this committee did not provide 6.2 percent, it provided 3.76 percent, and we did that by providing a 1.6-percent COLA and no locality pay. That has provided us relief to the tune of $20 to $30 million in this bill.

I am hopeful that we will be able to reconcile whatever was done here with those decisions that were made for the entire Federal work force.

The most important thing I would point out is that there is documentation available to show that those people who work in comparable positions for the House of Representatives are paid 40 percent less than those in the other body, the Senate. We have probably been overly parsimonious with the people who work here, and, therefore, we have a lot of turnover and fewer senior people to provide us with the intelligence we need. I can see among us people shaking their heads who are directly affected by our tight-fisted approach.

The last chart I would like to show is one that goes to the question of mail. Poll after poll shows that 70 to 75 percent of the American people, when questioned about the frank, indicate that they would like at least as much or more communication with their Members of Congress, and yet when we come to the floor to debate these bills, all we hear about is the need to cut or eliminate our ability to do that. I want to show what we have accomplished since Mr. Frenzel, a former Republican Member from Minnesota, and I worked to reform the franking system.

□ 1250

The bottom line is in 5 years since that reform has been in place, we have saved $269 million that would have been spent on the frank. We did not do it by any magic. We did it by simply giving each individual Member an amount they could spend, that they were individually accountable for. And as a result, I think you can see, there has been an abrupt decline in the amount that has been spent annually on the frank.

People are using it responsibly for town hall meetings, to communicate substantively with their constituents. The profligate use which a few engaged in to the detriment of all is over. I think you can see we have now operated at a rather low level in light of what is currently available to spend. Members are being responsible.

Last, I would like to show a trend that I think is maybe the most effective way of showing the American people how we have progressed in getting the message that they have been sending us about setting an example in this branch of Government, not leading the trend to increased spending, but leading the trend to reduce spending on us, those of us who are the direct representatives of the people.

This shows that in 1979, when I first came to Congress, we were spending $6.82 as the cost of representation, really as representative of the entire legislative branch. This includes all those agencies that do not just support us, like the Library of Congress that does the cataloguing for all our local libraries, and like the General Accounting Office that ferrets out waste. But for purposes of argument, we put them all together: $6.82.

Today, in constant dollars, it is almost one dollar less, $5.94. If you really indicated exactly what is being spent on the House of Representatives itself, it would be somewhere in this area, probably less than $3. It is not a lot, when you are considering this entire branch of Government.

So let me say, Madam Chairman, I would at this point place my remarks in the RECORD, and indicate that I think this is a bill that Members can be very proud of. I think it is the kind of bill that really does speak to what the American people have been telling us. We understand this is an occasion for rhetoric and hyperbole. It always has been thus, it will continue to be. It is apparently part of the American political fabric.

It seems to me we will have a number of votes today that will probably pare this bill back quite dramatically from a 5.7 percent budget authority increase to much less. I do think when we get to the end and Members have expressed themselves on the 10 or 11 amendments that have been made in order, we will have an opportunity to show whether or not we want to take political advantage, and certainly those in the minority are in a position to do that. They do not have to do the heavy lifting. Those who are in the majority have the burden of carrying the responsibility that our Founding Fathers thrust upon us.

I may not have enjoyed the task, but I am proud of the work. I am proud of the service that has been rendered by members of this committee.

COMPONENTS OF INCREASE OVER 1994

There is an increase of $101.6 million in the bill: $56.4 million of the increase is for mandatory items—COLA's, 1.6 percent, annualizations of last year's locality pay, recurring longevity, merit, step increases, benefit costs, and an overdue printing bill owed to the Government Printing Office; $17.1 million for changes in prices to acquire the same services as in 1994—printing rate increase, postal rate increase, book acquisitions, talking book machine prices.

The balance, +$32.8 million, is for several much needed projects. $6.58 million for six new elevators at Longworth; $7 million to begin reconstructing the Botanic Garden Conservatory; $4.65 million to begin a phased upgrade of the House telephone switch; $2.94 million for several other House equipment purchases; $2 million for additional depository library documents; $3.2 million for various other physical plant projects; $4.3 million for the asbestos removal and building renovation at the GAO building; and $3 million for the roll-out of a new ADP network at GAO.

These increases are offset by decreases of $4.6 million—primarily a reduction in House mail volume and some program efficiencies at the Library of Congress.

MAJOR ITEMS IN BILL

House of Representatives: The bill provides $735.5 million for the operations of the House. This will cover payroll costs for about 10,730 full-time equivalent positions, pay increase capped at 1.6 percent, merit increases funded. That's 2,565 less than authorized. We have included funds for an upgrade to our telephone switch, and various other equipment expenditures. House franked mail is reduced by $5 million under this year's level, even with a 10.2 percent rate increase. CRS has estimated we have saved $69 million because of the franked mail reform enacted in January 1990.

Joint Items: Allowing $82.8 million for joint items, including the Capitol Police, the joint committees of House and Senate, the Guide Service, and the Attending Physician.

Architect of the Capitol: Allowing $131.3 million overall, includes Botanic Garden and Library buildings and grounds maintenance. We have to keep up with repairs to our physical plant—which has been neglected for several years because of budget cutbacks. Allowed—start renovation of conservatory, $7 million; six new elevators at Longworth, $6.6 million; escalator and elevator modernization; some drainage improvement projects, and continuation of work on ADA and the Cannon rewiring projects.

Study agencies: CRS, OTA, and CBO will be funded at current service levels.

Library of Congress (Non-CRS part): $260.2 million allowed and authority to spend another $132 million in receipts. The Library has assured us that this budget provides enough to keep arrearage reduction project on schedule. Also, we have provided the funds needed to improve their affirmative action and human resources goals and to pursue methods to digitize collections, the future input to the information superhighway.

Government Printing Office: The depository library program will have a $3 million increase. We also allowed funds for a printing rate increase for GPO charges for congressional printing.

General Accounting Office: $439.5 million—allows "roll out" of an agency-wide ADP audit data collection network; and continuation of the asbestos removal and building renovation project.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH STAFFING

This is the second year of a 4-percent staffing [FTE] reduction program. Overall, legislative branch FTE's will be down by about 1,680 employees—without including the Senate reductions which are unknown at this time. The 1,680 represents a 5.6 percent staffing [FTE] reduction from 1992 in the legislative branch payroll. The House share of this reduction is 452 FTEs.

GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 101: an administrative provision transferring authority over the majority and minority printers to the Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services and charging a reasonable monthly fee for rental of offices and utilities.

Section 103: adds a grade 12 salary level to the current grade 11 authority for the nurses in the attending physician's office.

Section 305: repeals the provision of section 307 in last year's act that requires 10 percent of all full-time equivalent reductions be made in positions that are GS-14 and above in salary grade levels.

Section 306: transfers leave balances for four employees who were transferred from the House Post Office to the Architect of the Capitol last year.

Several housekeeping provisions that facilitate the operations of the House and other agencies.

INTERESTING COMPARISONS

Since 1978: CPI has increased 5.2 percent per year, on average; the legislative branch appropriation—Senate excluded—has increased by 4.6 percent per year—that means we have reduced

our budget in real dollar terms; Congressional Operations has averaged 5.1 percent per year—that's also a decline in real terms compared with the 5.2 percent; executive branch budget, 6.7 percent per year;

40 percent higher rate of growth than legislative branch.

In last 2 years—between fiscal 1992 and 1994: we have begun a statutorily required 4 percent FTE reduction program; we have exceeded the 4 percent—we are now estimating 5.6 percent; we reduced House budget from $709 million in 1992 to $686 million in 1994; at $735 million in 1995—that's only a growth of 1.2 percent per year, not enough to keep up with modest growth in current staff salaries.

SUMMARY

The bill: $1.88 billion.

BA compared to: 1994 operating level: A $102 million, 5.7 percent increase; 1995 request: An $87 million, −4.4 percent reduction; 1995 CBO baseline: A $27.9 million, 1.5 percent increase; 1995 baseline projected from 1992 bill: A $224.5 million decrease, −10.7 percent; and 1995 602(b): A $45.6 million, −2.4 percent reduction—Senate excluded.

Outlays compared to: 1994 operating level: A $78.3 million, 4.4 percent increase; 1995 request: A $78.7 million, −4.4 percent reduction; 1995 CBO baseline: A $23.4 million, 1.3 percent increase; 1995 baseline projected from 1992 bill: A $104.5 million decrease, −5.3 percent; and 1995 602(b): A $45 million −2.3 percent decrease—Senate excluded.

CONCLUSION

We have a good bill. There will be amendments. But after we deal with the amendments—I believe we can pass this bill—and defend it on the merits.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

Mr. GRAMS. Madam Chairman, during consideration of the fiscal year 1993 legislative branch appropriations bill, I offered, and this body passed, an amendment to prohibit midterm office moves in the House of Representatives—with an average savings of $15,000 per vacancy.

I am pleased to say to my colleagues that it worked. Both VERN EHLERS and FRANK LUCAS now occupy the offices of their predecessors, and they will continue to do so until the end of this Congress. Our newest colleague, RON LEWIS, will move into the office of the late William Natcher—and I am willing to bet anyone that this will save the taxpayer more than $15,000.

Sure, it may seem like a drop in the bucket. But last year's amendment showed the American people that Congress is starting to hear and heed their concerns, that Members of the House are capable of spending their money as wisely as we spend our own.

It's about time.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this prohibition expires in October. So I urge the House Building Commission to make this commonsense reform a permanent change that does not need to be renewed annually. I also urge the Commission to rethink the House office lottery system to make it less costly to the American taxpayer.

It is a small step, but an important one—and one which has already saved precious taxpayer dollars.

For those reasons, let us change the way the House allocates office assignments—before another freshman from the seventh floor of Longworth offers the same amendment to the fiscal year 1996 bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Chairman, I would like to echo the comments of my good friend and chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] about the members of the committee and how diligent they have all been in trying to present to the House a bill that would be acceptable to the Members, and especially to the chairman, who is a real gentleman and has been very, very helpful and constructive with those of us in the minority as we work to make this bill happen.

I would like to call attention to the members of the staff as well, which the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] mentioned. In addition to those, Mrs. Liz Dawson, who has worked this committee bill for some time. This will be the last time she works this bill. She is moving on to another assignment. Also Mr. Greg Lankler, who has learned a lot quickly about this particular bill.

This is not a bad piece of legislation. We have worked hard to make the House of Representatives and the Senate, the legislative body, be recognized as such. I really do not like the many, many attacks that we see on the House of Representatives as an institution, for whatever the reason, whether it is rhetoric or whether it is a cheap shot or for political purposes, because I have a tremendous respect for this, the people's House. And I might not agree with everything that this House does, and I do not, but I have a great respect for the House and a great respect for the Senate. And it is important that we fund these bodies, because we are the people's representatives.

Because we are the people's representatives, though, we have an obligation I think to set an example for the other agencies of the Government, and especially in these really hard fiscal times when we do not have the money that we would like to have to fund all of the programs that we would like to fund.

With that in mind, I would have to report that this bill is an increase over last year's bill. Now, if you relate that increase to the national defense budget, it is a little blip on the screen, barely that. But if you relate it to the small amount of this bill, and I want to say again what the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has already said, this is a very small amount. The legislative branch appropriations bill, if you drew a chart, would barely be a blip on the line. That is how small it is relative to the rest of the Federal Government. But nevertheless, a small increase in a small account adds up to a 5.7-percent increase over what we appropriated last year.

Now, during the subcommittee markup and the subcommittee consideration, we basically went along with this, with the understanding that the Members of the House would have an opportunity to work on this bill to bring it down below the 5.7 percent increase that it represents today. And we have some amendments today that we hope will be considered seriously by the House, that are not rhetoric, that are not cheap shots, and they are not political. But they are an attempt to have the House set an example for the rest of the Government agencies, that we could get by with a little bit less.

Some of the amendments that we hoped would be made in order were not. We fought that battle and we lost that battle, which is usual. But, nevertheless, there are still some other amendments we would like to see considered today.

Before we get into the amendments, I would like to say that there are some parts of this bill where actually we have made some reductions. We reduced the official mail account by a small amount; the LBJ intern program has basically been eliminated for this year; former Speaker's staff has been reduced by $127,000; the office of the attending physician has been reduced by $167,000.

In closing, we do some constructive things here. We have included language to transfer the authority over the majority and minority printers to the director of nonlegislative services and require they be charged a reasonable monthly rent for the space and utilities that they use. That is a step in the right direction toward getting more accountability.

□ 1300

We also directed the Acting Director of Nonlegislative Services to conduct a study for the purpose of possibly consolidating and/or contracting out the printing, folding, and mailing services of the House. We believe that this is another step in the right direction. We applaud the inclusion of these items in this bill.

Still, there is a lot to be done. We can set the example that we ought to be setting. We can reduce this bill by some of the amendments that will be presented and go on to hopefully fund

the legislative branch of Government in a responsible way, while still setting the example for the people that we represent that we really can get by with less.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding time to me, and also thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for this courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to amendments 11, 12, and others which would significantly cut this legislation. I am particularly opposed to 11 and 12, because they would attack the funding in the General Accounting Office.

Madam Chairman, these kinds of amendments are directed at blinding the Congress, at denying us the ability to gather the information we need to legislate well. What does the General Accounting Office do? The General Accounting Office is the arm of the Congress whose purpose and function it is to go out and audit, both on a performance basis and on a simple bean-counting basis, the expenditures of public money.

This is the agency which has worked with us to catch cost overruns in defense, contracting misbehavior of the Defense Department, contracting misbehavior at the EPA, contracting misexpenditure of money in connection with grants and public colleges, misexpenditures in connection with defense, misexpenditures in connection with space, misexpenditures in connection with leases of public lands, misexpenditures in connection with expenditures under Medicare and Medicaid.

To cut an agency of this kind is absolutely wrong. If a Member of this body professes to be in favor of saving money, the way to save money is to see to it that we have a strong, active GAO—an agency which engages vigorously in pursuing wrongdoing, waste, fraud, and abuse. Our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the committee chaired by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the Committee on Government Operations, use this agency for the purpose of seeing to it that wrongdoing is cut, that misexpenditures and misappropriations of public money and the wastage of public resources, is brought to a halt.

If we are serious in this Congress about preventing waste, fraud, and abuse, if Members are sincere about cutting public expenditures and reducing the deficit, then the one tool that is available to us that works better than any other, is the General Accounting Office.

I find it most strange, Mr. Speaker, that attempts are made in this Chamber by Members sitting on this side of the aisle, Members who profess to be outraged about deficits, to cut the General Accounting Office, to reduce its ability to serve this Congress, to eliminate its ability to catch wrongdoing, to catch waste, to catch fraud, and to catch abuse.

An expenditure on GAO saves money for the taxpayers. It produces a much more efficient government. It enables the Congress to know what is going on with regard to public expenditures. It enables us to have a tool which not only can audit expenditures of public money, but which can engage in analysis of expenditures of public money and expenditure policies, so we know what it is in fact we are doing.

Without this kind of tool, without this kind of ability, this body is not able to take the steps that have to be taken to reduce public expenditures and to see to it that the will of the Congress, the will of the people, and the public moneys are properly dealt with.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I would hope that maybe I could ask the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] a couple of questions about a news report that appeared today indicating that there are $13 million in unpaid bills in the HIS system.

Can the gentleman from California tell us whether or not he can confirm that that is the reality?

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I have no knowledge, have not read the news report, nor have I any knowledge about that issue. I would suggest it should be addressed to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. That is the responsible party for HIS.

Mr. WALKER. What occurs to me, Madam Chairman, is we have the appropriation bill before us today. This is the only time we are going to get to address it. If I understand correctly what the chairman of the Committee on House Administration has stated, it is that the Architect of the Capitol owes HIS $7.4 million; the Finance Office owes $3.6 million, the Joint Tax Committee owes $1.4 million; the House Administration Committee, the chairman's own committee, owes $305,000; the House Clerk owes $28,000; the postal operations owe $51,000; the Attending Physician owes $23,000; office furnishings owes $36,000; and the office systems management owes $277,000.

The chairman of the Committee on House Administration describes these people as deadbeats who need to be paying this money to the proper authority. The question that I have is, would not one way of assuring that these deadbeats get done justice would be to cut $13 million out of that account and force HIS to go and get this money?

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Madam Chairman, I certainly want to reiterate my initial comment. I do not have any information at all about what the gentleman is pointing to.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, none of the testimony that the gentleman took indicated this kind of shortfall?

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we took no testimony to the effect that those bills were outstanding and remain due. I would suggest, however, that if that money is actually due, and there will have to be, obviously, some effort to determine that, the way to make sure it can be paid is certainly not to be cutting their appropriation. Those agencies need to be able to make those payments, if in fact they are due.

Mr. WALKER. What I was suggesting was that HIS should be cut, that HIS maybe should be reduced to force them to go out and get this money. It appears to me that part of the problem here is that HIS has not been very diligent about going after the money. If you have the House Architect owing $7.4 million, I assume that that is probably more than a 1-year kind of problem, and it just occurs to me that maybe HIS has not been particularly of a mind to go get the money that is owed them from all these various places. That is a pretty long list of people who are now being described as deadbeats.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, it may well be that those bills are outstanding and do need to be paid. I certainly would hope that they would be.

However, the budget that we are submitting today is for 1995, for the next fiscal year, and I believe that the budget request that has been made is a reasonable one. HIS is really a utility to us.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, how much is in it for HIS?

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, $16 million, I believe. That is basically the cost of running the utility that serves all of us with computers.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, let me understand. They have a total appropriation of $16 million and $13 million worth of deadbeats? Do I understand correctly, Madam Chairman, that the entire budget is $16 million, and they have $13 million of money owed them?

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this is an entity which bills customers. It is like a utility, as I was saying earlier. We have for the first time in the last Congress begun to actually appropriate for them in this bill, but I really would not be able to speak to the question of how much may be owed.

I believe the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], who has just joined us, may be able to handle that question.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], I was just asking if this is something where HIS at this point is owed $13 million.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentlemen from North Carolina.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Chairman, we do believe that is the case.

Mr. WALKER. The question is, Madam Chairman, for how long have these bills been accumulating?

Mr. ROSE. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think some of them are 3 or 4 years old. I will be very candid with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The time is controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] or the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I want to say first that I strongly support the passage of the legislative appropriation bill. I think the Chairman has done an excellent job.

Madam Chairman, we are going to make sure in the future that appropriations and authorizations track each other more carefully for purposes of avoiding the kinds of shortfalls that we have experienced for fiscal year 1994.

Madam Chairman, the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is how long have these things been owing. The Senate has had the Architect do things for them that the Architect has paid for out of its budget. We believe that these things fall into that category.

□ 1310

In other words, we believe that the Architect, even House Administration, have had things done for it by HIS that they should now pay for.

We believe that in an austerity-type situation we are in in 1994, that the best answer is to bill these entities for work that they have done to HIS. That is a short-term solution, it is not a long-term solution, but we believe that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] have crafted what can be a long-term solution for 1995 and a model of that followed for the future.

But I restate: We do need to talk more in the future about a matching of authorizations and appropriations. We have always allowed some slack because that gave the committee flexibility to reprogram some funds, but we may have to change that in the future.

Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Madam Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, during the marathon discussion of this bill in the Rules Committee, we had an impassioned debate about commitment to this institution and the merits of trying to change the way Congress works to improve its present low standing with the people. In frustration with the low performance ratings Americans continuously give us, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, lashed out against those they say seek to take cheap shots at Congress and grandstand about reform. I understand their frustration with the lack of trust this Congress engenders with the people it is meant to serve—but I sincerely believe such criticism is off-target. It is, in fact, tantamount to shooting the messenger. I submit to my colleagues that the ill-repute with which so many Americans hold this institution is not caused by those who point out its failings, but rather by those failings themselves and the fact that we continuously appear to take better care of ourselves than we do of the people we serve across this Nation. Americans are dissatisfied with Congress because they do not see desired results—and one reason our job approval ratings are dismally low is that we have failed to get control of the Nation's budget. So, in this time of belt-tightening and fiscal constraint, as we consider the bill that includes funding for our own offices, our staff, our salaries and our mail, should we not be leading by example, as BILL YOUNG suggests? Some 30 amendments to tighten up that were offered in good faith by colleagues on both sides of the aisle were denied by the Rules Committee last night. Despite efforts on the part of the minority to negotiate a fair compromise—in which major, significant cutting amendments for the entire legislative branch, the GAO, franking, the GPO and legislative service organizations could have been considered. The majority would not yield or granted only minor concession. And so, once again, the majority is limiting Members' accountability for making tough choices in full view of the constituents. Once again, the majority is exempting Congress from laws—such as the Freedom of Information Act that other Americans are required to obey. Once again the majority is denying scrutiny and debate of their special interests—things like the legislative service organizations. Once again the majority has preempted the right of all Members under the standing rules of the House to come straight to the floor to offer cutting amendments.

This appropriations bill does a few good things toward cutting costs and I congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. But there is missed opportunity to do so much more to restore faith that we really can be trusted with the tax dollars of hard working Americans.

After 40 years of majority party management of the House, the facts are we are bigger and further in debt than ever. This bill does not turn that around and it does not deserve a yes vote.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, we cannot begin this discussion without paying tribute to the chair and the floor manager of the Committee on Appropriations Legislative Subcommittee. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] goes through this every year. The gentleman is asked questions about subject matter that are not truly appropriate to his jurisdiction, and the gentleman gives a good account of himself.

Madam Chairman, I join in the support of the measure that is now before the House, but I strongly oppose any attempts by amendments that will affect negatively the General Accounting Office. Here is why: I oppose any attempt to sabotage Congress' ability to ferret out fraud, waste, and abuse in any Federal program. That is what the Congressional Committee on Government Operations does. That is exactly what we would do, is sabotage our own ability if we were to adopt amendments that will be coming from my colleagues from Nebraska and New York who would further cut GAO funding which has already been reduced in the bill that is before us.

Madam Chairman, the GAO has been already hit hard by budget cuts. Adjusting for inflation, past cuts have slashed 20 percent from the GAO's budget since fiscal year 1992. This has forced the GAO to reduce its staff by over 500 employees, while spending for travel, training, and other programs have been cut by 40 percent.

Madam Chairman, there is another part of this that bothers me about the amendment of the gentleman from New York that may come up further. The gentleman's amendment would cut the GAO budget by 11 percent and it would begin in my judgment the dismantling of GAO. If this amendment were to succeed, over 600 of GAO's remaining employees would have to be reduced through the discriminatory process of a reduction in force where the most recently hired would be the first fired.

Please join us in opposing these amendments when they come up to reduce GAO.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I support many of the cuts proposed here today, but my concern is also the manner in which taxpayer dollars are being expended.

I serve on the House Committee on Government Operations. The important mission of the House Committee on Government Operations is different from any other committee in the House. It is responsible for investigation and oversight. It performs a critical audit function in the House of Representatives and for the Congress. It had a long, rich history. In fact, it was broken off in 1814 from the Committee on Ways and Means at that time to perform this important audit function.

Democrats now control the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. They are unquestionably the majority party. But it is crucial that the committee responsible for overseeing and auditing the executive branch be completely bipartisan and balanced in staffing and funding.

At stake, ladies and gentlemen, really is a question of fairness and the very integrity of this body. This question goes to the very heart of the system of checks and balances, the very foundation of our system of government.

Majority and minority staff disparities make a mockery of the congressional process of oversight and investigations. Look at these charts. This is the way the money is being divided here. I will update this chart. They have given the minority one additional staffer, 10 to 52, represents the number and distribution of these investigative staffers.

Look at how the money is being spent here: 14 percent to the minority, 85 percent to the majority; several hundred thousands of dollars to the minority, and millions to the majority.

Madam Chairman, the House has voted twice to grant the minority one-third of investigative committee staff, and again we are denied in this bill that provision.

The other body has granted the minority at least one-third of the committee staff since 1977.

Madam Chairman, I am not here asking for another penny. I am asking here for fairness. I am asking here for integrity. We have had investigations thwarted, we have had requests for additional information thwarted. Here we are asking about the question of fairness and equity and the very system of checks and balances on which this country and this system of government is founded.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 30 seconds, to my good friend, the gentleman from Poland, OH, Mr. TRAFICANT.

□ 1320

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, in a spirit of comity, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] so that he will have a total of 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam President, even though I get screwed once again by Chairman FAZIO, he does a great job, and I am going to support his bill. I know that he is concerned when he gets out his little pointer and his little graphs and starts like Ross Perot on the floor. You know, doggone things—I was waiting for him to say that.

But, you know, let me tell you what I do with my money. I help my constituents work out their Social Security problems, their unemployment compensation problems, their veterans' problems, their Medicare problems, their financial concerns, the problems they have with the Labor Department, their pension matters, and a number of other issues because my staff and I are basically just helpers and we utilize the money that we get through this bill. We do not abuse it, we use it to help keep our constituents free.

I do not want to cut any of this money. Chairman FAZIO and ranking Member, Mr. YOUNG, I think they have done a good job, a great job. I am proud to support them.

Now, I did have a concern that dealt with the Capitol Police, and later in this debate I am hoping Chairman ROSE may be back on the floor, and I am going to ask for an opportunity to engage in a colloquy because I believe that the Capitol Police believe they are being discriminated against at times, treated like kids, and that we have a serious morale problem.

Now, a lot of the leaders around here may not agree with that at this point, but let me say this to you, especially as deals with our Capitol Police: An ounce of prevention, Congress, is worth a pound of cure. And our Capitol Police do have a serious morale problem.

So I plan to support the bill even though the chairman was walking and talking like Ross Perot. It is a good bill, and I appreciate the time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this legislative appropriations bill and to commend my colleagues, especially my freshman colleagues, who have joined in the fight to change the way that Congress works.

In the time that I have been in Congress, it seems we have grown too fond of the idea that average, hard-working Americans should sacrifice more. Pay more taxes, sacrificing the well-being of their families to the well-being of the Government. Accept cuts in your Social Security, sacrificing your security for the Government.

Well it is past time for us to start sharing in those sacrifices. Instead, we have before us a bill increasing funding for Congress by 5.7 percent. That is more than twice the increase in inflation. And what are these increases going for? Here are a few of the dubious items—

$11.1 million for increased workload. Did we add new territory to the United States that has caused this increased workload?

We also have an increase of $8.4 million for the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, an agency that has been roundly criticized for its management practices.

It is long past time for Congress to accept its fair share of sacrifice. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this appropriations bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I have several other requests for time, but those speakers are not here. I do have time left, and I wonder if the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] would like me to share some time with him.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman would, I have unanimous consent requests.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995.

I object not only to the level of funding provided in the bill but to the unfair manner in which this critically important legislation was brought before this body today.

First, there is nothing more important than addressing the $4.5 trillion national debt, which is keeping badly needed capital out of

the hands of the private sector of our economy, the engine of growth and job creation. But, the goal of deficit reduction will only be met if we are willing to make some very difficult choices in our spending priorities.

Today, we have the opportunity to prove to our constituents that we are serious about the addressing the national debt by leading by example and making cuts to our own budget. Yet, this bill includes a 5.7-percent increase over last year's expenditures. It seems hypocritical for this body to demand of other Federal agencies and programs that they hold the line on spending, and even to make cuts, at a time when Congress chooses to give itself a 5.7-percent increase.

Second, there were numerous amendments that Members of Congress wanted to offer that would have gone a long way to bring not only some fiscal responsibility to this budget but also make reforms to the way Congress does business. Yet, fully 31 amendments were not even permitted to be brought to the floor for consideration. Perhaps the reason that votes on these measures were not permitted was the fear that they might actually pass.

But, for whatever reason, we are not being afforded the opportunity to make meaningful cuts to the Congress' budget. We cannot cut the funds used to purchase and mail out calendars at taxpayer expense. We cannot even vote on an innovative proposal that would eliminate a congressional committee, or one that would ban the practice by which Members of Congress shift their office funds around to boost the amount they spend on free mailings.

As we return to our districts for this Memorial Day, I believe that our constituents will rightfully be demanding explanations for what has occurred here today. At a time when the House is asking others to make significant sacrifices, I am disappointed that this body isn't responsible enough to tighten its own belt. Today, I will vote against the legislative branch appropriations bill. I would hope that in the future, the House will lead by example rather than give itself special treatment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon Congressman CHRIS COX and his wife Rebecca were blessed with the birth of their second child. We all offer our congratulations and best wishes for a healthy and happy little girl.

My friend did advise me, however, that if he had been present this afternoon, he would have voted in favor of a number of the amendments that came before us on the House floor.

Mr. COX would have voted against the rule for H.R. 4454, because it prevented more than a dozen Members from offering amendments to the bill.

He would have voted in support of the Thurman amendment which would have reduced congressional staff salaries by $2.9 million. He also would have supported Mr. STRICKLAND's amendment to strike $6.6 million in funding for six new elevators to be located in the Longworth Building.

Because he believes in reducing the opportunity of Members to use franked mail in furtherance of their reelection campaigns, he would have voted "yes" on the amendment offered by Congressman POMEROY and Congressman QUINN. This would have reduced official mail costs by $4 million.

As a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, CHRIS has long been a supporter of efforts to reduce funding for the General Accounting Office. Mr. BEREUTER from Nebraska offered an amendment making a modest reduction of 5 percent in the GAO's budget for the 1995 fiscal year. Mr. COX would have voted in favor of the amendment.

He would have also supported Mr. BILL YOUNG's effort to reduce funding for additional computer systems for the House information system by $13 million.

Mr. COX was prepared to offer an amendment cutting legislative branch spending by 25 percent—matching the cuts President Clinton promised to make in the White House operating budget. Unfortunately, the majority of the House Rules Committee refused to make this amendment in order. Instead, the committee made in order another amendment freezing House spending at its 1994 level. Mr. BOEHNER graciously agreed to offer this amendment in Congressman COX's absence. Mr. COX would, of course, have strongly supported this reasonable effort to restrain the burgeoning budget of the House and associated agencies. Indeed, total congressional spending each year tops $2.3 billion, and in this bill, the House was voting to grant itself a $101 million perk increase for next year.

As a result, Congressman COX relayed to me that he would have opposed final passage of this wasteful piece of legislation. And he will continue to work to bring fiscal sanity to our Nation's Capital.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4454, the legislative branch appropriations bill.

We have begun our annual exercise in self flagellation—consideration of the legislative branch appropriations bill. Over the next few hours we will undoubtedly be treated to some amendments intended solely to cripple this institution's ability to operate. Others, perhaps, may be offered in an attempt to embarrass this House and its leadership. In recent years some Members have used this bill to try to score political points at the expense of the House. I hope this will not be the case again this year.

The Committee on Appropriations has brought us a good bill, and I want to commend the work of Chairman FAZIO, ranking member YOUNG, and the members of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch who each year face the thankless task of developing this legislation.

This is the leanest legislative branch bill I can remember in my 30 years in the House. It continues the multi-year downsizing which began with last year's bill and will result in the elimination of more than 1,500 positions.

I am concerned, however, that in our efforts to demonstrate to our constituents that we are fiscally responsible we will impair our ability to operate and to oversee the executive branch. If we adopt some of the amendments which have been noticed, we could shoot ourselves in the foot.

Some, particularly on the other side of the aisle, may want to impair our ability to conduct effective oversight. From a partisan standpoint that is understandable. It was the Democratic Congress that exposed executive branch scandals such as Watergate, Iran-Contra, the HUD scandal, and the savings and loan debacle. But it is the responsibility of the Congress to oversee the executive branch, and it would be irresponsible to adopt amendments which impair our ability to meet that responsibility.

An example of such an amendment is one that may be offered to cut the General Accounting Office [GAO] budget by 5 percent. This amendment would gut GAO's ability to serve as the investigative arm of the Congress. I have always been impressed by the impartiality and professionalism of GAO. When I chaired the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, GAO investigators unearthed the inappropriate financial relationship between top presidential advisors, Mr. Deaver and Mr. Meese, and the Chairman of the Postal Service Board of Governors whose appointment, coincidentally, had been recommended by Mr. Deaver. It was GAO which examined the sweetheart contract Ross Perot entered into with the Postal Service, a contract which virtually guaranteed that Mr. Perot's company would have a monopoly on Postal Service business. That contract was nullified when the full details of the contract became public.

GAO has been instrumental in enabling the Committee on Education and Labor to pursue savings and improvements in the Departments of Labor and Education. For example:

Over $700 million in financial benefits were realized in programs providing financial assistance to postsecondary students—the Pell grant and guaranteed student loan programs. These financial benefits consisted of: First, $140 million in reduced federal expenditures when legislation was enacted requiring that Pell grant recipients have a high school diploma; second, $305 million in increased defaulted student loan collections due to the extension of the Internal Revenue Service's income tax refund offset programs; and third, $279 million in guaranty agencies' reserves in excess of their needs.

Funding for the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA] was reduced by 13.8 million in fiscal year 1990 to reinforce GAO's finding that local programs were entering into contracts for excessive on-the-job training to place participants into low skill jobs.

As a result of GAO's work concerning the employment conditions of foreign workers brought into the United States to harvest sugar cane, the largest user of this labor revamped certain aspects of its contract with the workers to improve the accountability of workers' wage deductions.

On the basis of GAO briefings, testimonies, and a report on the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, the Congress made major revisions to the act, such as improving allocation of program funds.

Using information from GAO reports on the limited extent of advance notice provided by employers to workers concerning plant closings, legislation was enacted requiring large employers to provide 60 days' advance notice to workers in the event of a plant closing or mass layoff.

Based in part on GAO reports and testimony, Congress raised the maximum penalties for violations of workplace safety and health regulations and child labor laws.

The GAO report on legislative and administrative options for improving workers' safety and health led to the first comprehensive reexamination of OSHA's authorizing legislation

in its 20-year history. Both the Senate and the House legislators drew heavily on the options GAO identified, incorporating most of them in H.R. 1280, the Comprehensive Occupational Safety and Health Act.

My colleagues, this is a good bill. Support Chairman FAZIO. Oppose those amendments which hinder Congress' ability to do its job. And, vote for the bill.

Mr. KIM. Madam Chairman, I am concerned that at a time when the House is unable to fund the President's request for 100,000 new police officers in the crime bill, that Congress is seeking an increase of $100 million in spending.

This week we voted on a military construction bill that was $600 million lower than last year in real dollars. We voted last night on a foreign operations bill that was more than $380 million below the President's request. We have also been considering on the floor this week a defense authorization bill that will slash many important defense programs.

Furthermore, although Congress has instituted automatic cost-of-living adjustment increases for its Members, COLA's for Federal retirees are being delayed, as are COLA's for veterans and military retirees. How can we ask people who have laid their lives on the line for our country to wait for their COLA's when politicians don't have to?

Madam Chairman, with all due respect to this institution, I cannot express enough my firmly held conviction that we must hold the legislative branch to the same fiscal restraint and budgetary standards that we are requiring the American people and the rest of the Federal Government to live under. This is the only way that we can be truly honest in our effort to control Federal spending and to reduce the budget deficit.

I must urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this measure, so that we may be able to draft legislation that deals with the needs of this House of Representatives in the context of the fiscal realities the rest of the Government faces.

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Chairman, as we take up the legislative branch appropriations bill, I would like to take this opportunity to thank subcommittee Chairman VIC FAZIO and ranking member BILL YOUNG for their stewardship on this legislation. As a member of the subcommittee, I have certainly appreciated all of the hard work they and their staffs have put into this bill.

In the last 2 years, Congress was able to tighten its belt and cut spending. But this bill increases it—a 5.7-percent rise from fiscal year 1994. While most of the Federal Government has been forced to cut its profligate spending habit, Congress is increasing it.

Even if this legislation is amended to include cuts in franking and funding for minor construction within the Capitol complex, these cosmetic reductions fall far short of the kind fiscal constraints Members must practice.

At the beginning of the 103d Congress, I substantially cut my own staff and expenses in an effort to send a message to the American taxpayer, that the money they send to Congress is being spent in an efficient and cost-effective way. I believe the whole House must take the same kind of initiative.

Therefore, I reluctantly cannot support this bill. Congress must show the American people that we can get a handle on our own spending.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate having expired, pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4454

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to the estate of William H. Natcher, late a Representative from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, $133,600.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $735,410,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, $6,096,000, including: Office of the Speaker, $1,444,000, including $25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $1,042,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $1,429,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, $1,284,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip and not to exceed $563,000 for the Chief Deputy Majority Whips; and Office of the Minority Whip, $897,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip and not to exceed $104,000 for the Chief Deputy Minority Whip.

MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE

For staff employed by each Member in the discharge of official and representative duties, $240,417,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For professional and clerical employees of standing committees, including the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget, $73,925,000.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET (STUDIES)

For salaries, expenses, and studies by the Committee on the Budget, and temporary personal services for such committee to be expended in accordance with sections 101(c), 606, 703, and 901(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed, $401,000.

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by the House, $53,191,000.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

HOUSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS

For salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Systems, under the direction of the Committee on House Administration, $22,437,000, of which $16,017,000 is provided herein: *Provided,* That House Information Systems is authorized to receive reimbursement for services provided from Members of the House of Representatives and other Governmental entities and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account: *Provided further,* That amounts so credited for fiscal year 1994 and not obligated shall be available for obligation in fiscal year 1995.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $244,572,000, including: Official Expenses of Members, $79,800,000; supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, $6,103,000; net expenses of purchase, lease and maintenance of office equipment, $11,779,000; net expenses for telecommunications, $10,872,000; furniture and furnishings, $2,012,000; stenographic reporting of committee hearings, $1,100,000; reemployed annuitants reimbursements, $1,279,000; Government contributions to employees' life insurance fund, retirement funds, Social Security fund, Medicare fund, health benefits fund, and worker's and unemployment compensation, $130,849,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, $778,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(d)(1)), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS)

For salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed, $6,495,000: *Provided,* That the Federal Bureau of Investigation, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may in any fiscal year pay all administrative uncontrollable overtime accrued by its employees while on detail to the Committee on Appropriations.

OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

For expenses necessary for official mail costs of the House of Representatives, as authorized by law, $35,000,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, $59,296,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not to exceed $1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $14,936,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including not to exceed $500 for official representation and reception expenses, $1,502,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Doorkeeper, including overtime as authorized by law, $12,621,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services, $17,267,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $295,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, $762,000; Office of the Chaplain, $124,000; Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and $2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, $983,000; for

salaries and expenses of the Office of the Historian, $359,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, $1,730,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, $4,420,000; six minority employees, $747,000; the House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee and the Democratic Caucus, $1,523,000; the House Republican Conference, $1,523,000; and other authorized employees, $504,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 101. (a) TRANSFER OF MAJORITY AND MINORITY PRINTERS TO DIRECTOR OF NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—As soon as practicable, but not later than October 1, 1994, authority over the Majority and Minority Printers of the House of Representatives shall be transferred to the Director of Nonlegislative and Financial Services of the House.

(b) FEES FOR OFFICES AND UTILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the transfer required by subsection (a), the Director shall charge the Majority and Minority Printers a reasonable monthly fee for the rental of offices and utilities.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF RECEIPTS.—The amounts received under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States for credit to the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses of the House of Representatives", and shall be available for expenditure in any fiscal year to the extent provided in appropriations Acts.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any fiscal year.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $4,090,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, $1,370,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $6,019,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of $1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of $500 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Attending Physician's office; (3) an allowance of $500 per month each to two assistants and $400 per month each not to exceed nine assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistance; and (4) $918,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $1,335,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries, including overtime, and Government contributions to employees' benefits funds, as authorized by law, of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, $65,991,000, of which $31,833,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House, and $34,158,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That of the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1995 for salaries, including overtime, and Government contributions to employees' benefits funds under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, the employee assistance program, not more than $2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and $85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, $2,000,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 1995 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 102. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1995 for the Capitol Police Board under the heading "CAPITOL POLICE" may be transferred between the headings "SALARIES" and "GENERAL EXPENSES", upon approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service, $1,628,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to employ more than thirty-three individuals: *Provided further*, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Special Services Office, $363,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-484), including official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $5,500 from the Trust Fund), and expenses incurred in administering an employee incentive awards program (not to exceed $2,500), and rental of space in the District of Columbia, $21,931,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Office of Technology Assessment in excess of 143 staff employees: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for assessments or activities not initiated and approved in accordance with section 3(d) of Public Law 92-484: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of employees of the Office of Technology Assessment in connection with any reimbursable study for which funds are provided from sources other than appropriations made under this Act, or shall be available for any other administrative expenses incurred by the Office of Technology Assessment in carrying out such a study.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), including not to exceed $2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $23,133,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Congressional Budget Office in excess of 221 fulltime equivalent positions: *Provided further*, That any sale or lease of property, supplies, or services to the Congressional Budget Office shall be deemed to be a sale or lease of such property, supplies, or services to the Congress subject to section 903 of Public Law 98-63: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by inter-agency transfer, donation, or discarding.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

SALARIES

For the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law, $8,927,000.

TRAVEL

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of $20,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to make surveys and studies, and to meet unforeseen expenses in connection with activities under his care, $100,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment; including not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; security installations which are approved by the Capitol Police Board, authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 550, Ninety-Second Congress, agreed to September 19, 1972, the cost

limitation of which is hereby further increased by $200,000; and attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, $22,340,000, of which $2,763,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $5,201,000, of which $25,000 shall remain available until expended.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, including the position of Superintendent of Garages as authorized by law, $41,364,000, of which $10,260,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, Union Station complex, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $33,342,000, of which $865,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,200,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1995.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 103. The matter in chapter III of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1975 under "Capitol Buildings and Grounds" under the heading "ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL" (40 U.S.C. 166b-2) is amended by striking "to grade 11" and inserting "at not to exceed grade 12".

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $58,938,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $95,158,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) nor for copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1995".

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $10,182,000, of which $7,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress, not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $207,857,000, of which not more than $7,869,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1995 under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the $7,869,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $8,458,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including $40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, $27,186,000, of which not more than $14,500,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1995 under 17 U.S.C. 708(c), and not more than $2,891,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1995 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $17,391,000: *Provided further*, That up to $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,250 may be expended on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $44,622,000, of which $10,896,000 shall remain available until expended.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, $5,825,000, of which $1,886,000 shall be available until expended only for the purchase and supply of furniture, shelving, furnishings, and related costs necessary for the renovation and restoration of the Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Library buildings.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be available, in an amount not to exceed $194,290, of which $58,100 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 202. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Library of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

(1) applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15; and

(2) grants such manager or supervisor the right to not be at work for all or a portion of a workday because of time worked by the manager or supervisor on another workday.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "manager or supervisor" means any management official or supervisor, as such terms are defined in section 7103(a) (10) and (11) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 203. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

(1) in the case of a reimbursement, only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts; or

(2) in the case of an advance payment, only—

(A) to pay for such general or administrative overhead costs as are attributable to the work performed for such agency; or

(B) to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, with respect to any purpose not allowable under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 204. Not to exceed $5,000 of any funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Library of Congress incentive awards program.

SEC. 205. Not to exceed $12,000 of funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 206. Under the heading "Library of Congress" obligational authority shall be available, in an amount not to exceed $75,236,000 for reimbursable activities, $8,706,000 for revolving fund activities, and $6,150,000 for non-expenditure transfer activities in support of parliamentary development during the current fiscal year.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $9,860,000, of which $941,000 shall remain available until expended.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $32,100,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed $130,000: *Provided further*, That funds, not to exceed $2,000,000, from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional Serial Sets and other related Congressional/non-Congressional publications for 1993 and 1994 to depository and other designated libraries.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the "Government Printing Office revolving fund": *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of passenger motor vehicles, not to exceed a fleet of twelve: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316): *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the paragraph entitled "OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, SALARIES AND EXPENSES" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 4,493 workyears: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for expenses not to exceed $500,000 for the development of plans and design of a multi-purpose facility: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS–15: *Provided further*, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed $75,000.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not to exceed $7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315); hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries and travel benefits comparable with those which are now or hereafter may be granted single employees of the Agency for International Development, including single Foreign Service personnel assigned to AID projects, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—or his designee—under the authority of section 636(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2396(b)); $439,525,000: *Provided*, That not more than $1,000,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in fiscal year 1995: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That to the extent that funds are otherwise available for obligation, agreements or contracts for the removal of asbestos, and renovation of the building and building systems (including the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system, electrical system and other major building systems) of the General Accounting Office Building may be made for periods not exceeding five years: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions herein for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. The last sentence of section 307(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 60–1 note) is repealed.

SEC. 306. Annual and sick leave balances of employees transferred from the Office of the Director of Non-legislative and Financial Services, House Postal Operations, to the Architect of the Capitol, as of October 31, 1993, shall be credited to the leave accounts of such personnel, subject to the provisions of section 6304 of title 5, United States Code, upon their transfer to the appropriation for House office buildings.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995".

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment shall be in order except those amendments printed in House Report 103–532. The amendments may be considered in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as

read, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

Debate time for each amendment shall be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

The Chair of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by the resolution. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1, printed in House Report 103-532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMEROY

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order pursuant to the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POMEROY: Page 5, line 21, strike "$35,000,000" and insert "$31,000,000".

Conform the aggregate amount set forth on page 2, line 10, accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I rise today to join my colleague, Representative JACK QUINN, in offering an amendment to cut the franking budget by $4 million.

The bipartisan Quinn-Pomeroy amendment would bring the fiscal year 1995 appropriation down to $31 million, representing nearly a 25-percent reduction from last year's appropriation. Members of this body will recall that last year I offered a similar amendment. We brought the official mail account for 1994 down to an all-time election year low of $40 million.

Madam Chairman, the population I serve is broadly dispersed throughout an entire State. In my district, the State of North Dakota, there are 9 people, I repeat, 9 people per square mile. This compares to around 58,000 people per mile for the 11th District of New York. If anyone needs to communicate with their constituents through the mail, it's me. But I have made a commitment to return 25 percent of my franking allowance each year. And I think all of Congress can accept a significant reduction as well.

The simple reason for my commitment is this: We need to make cuts in Congress' budget and the frank is a good place to start. I am convinced we will not threaten our ability to communicate with our constituents, rather we will do it at a much more economical level. If we are to meaningfully reduce the deficit, Members need to step to the plate and show our willingness to do our part.

Madam Chairman, as little as 3 years ago, the House appropriated $80 million for the frank. Since that time, the official mail account has come down substantially. The committee itself cut the frank $5 million below last year's appropriation. I still believe more can be done. That is why I am pleased to join Representative QUINN in offering this amendment. I urge its adoption.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I ask that I be permitted to control the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the Republican sponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN].

Mr. QUINN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment I would like to offer with my colleague, the distinguished Member from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Madam Chairman, each year the Congress spends millions of dollars on franked mail telling our constituents how much we are doing in Washington, how much we are changing and reforming.

We hear a lot of talk about cutting the cost of Government in various ways. This amendment is a good first step in the right direction. It is action and not just talk.

Communications with our constituents is very important, but more than anything my constituents want us here in Congress to live like they do everyday. Many Members have recognized the need to cut back—but we need to do more to change the way Congress works and spends money.

This amendment strikes $4 million from the official mail account, Madam Chairman.

In fiscal year 1993, the House spent $24 million on franked mail. For fiscal year 1994, the current estimate is that the mail cost will be about $41.5 million. The Committee on Appropriations has recommended $35 million for fiscal year 1995. This amendment would reduce the frank in fiscal year 1995 to $31 million, which should address the postal needs for the House.

This amendment will reduce our frank by $10 million from last year, which is approximately 25 percent.

This amendment is an opportunity to show the American people that we can cut spending in our own operations, in our own House, while we pursue cuts in other areas. It is an opportunity to lead by example.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Quinn-Pomeroy amendment.

□ 1330

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I would just like to add that I am very proud of the fact that in the office account that I have control over, for the 10th District of Florida, each year I am able to spend about 65 percent of that account, and I return unspent about 35 percent, and so it certainly would not hurt my operation, and I do not think it should hurt anybody else's, and I think it is a really good amendment.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for yielding this time to me.

I rise in strong support of the Quinn-Pomeroy amendment. I think this makes a whole lot of sense, and, as the gentleman from Florida just said, this amendment really is not going to affect any of us as long as we do not do unsolicited mass mailings. I say to my colleagues, "If you do unsolicited mass mailings, you will be affected by this, but that's what your constituents don't want to hear from you anymore. They don't want to hear from Members of this body that we need to be able to mail to them at their expense, you know, one of those reports from Washington. It may as well have emblazoned across it, 'I'm running for reelection, vote for me, we have already got public financing of campaigns.'"

Madam Chairman, this is an 11-percent cut in the franking privilege. It is certainly something that is reasonable. I would love to see a 75-percent cut, and so I have proposed a 75-percent cut, and, as the gentleman from Florida just indicated, even that cut would not affect me because we returned 95 percent of the franking budget allocated to my office.

Reason:

We did not do any unsolicited mass mailings. We cut those out, we save a lot of money.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

As I said earlier, I returned about 35 percent of my account. I want to clarify that in the mailing account I actually return maybe 90 percent of my main account and still maintained a very good mail communication with the people in my district.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the last minute of my time.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, this amendment strikes $4 million from the official mail account.

We have brought our mail costs down significantly since 1990—because the Members have cut back.

In fiscal year 1993, the House spent $24 million on franked mail. This year, the current estimate is that the mail cost will be about $41.5 million. So this will be $10 million, or 25 percent below fiscal 1994.

Even with the announced 10.2 percent increase in postal rates, $31 million should be enough for fiscal year 1994.

The current allowance for Members' franked mail is about $72 million. So the $31 million left in the bill is $41 million below the potential expenditure.

And current law authorizes over $92 million. This would be $61 million below that. We would be funding one-third of the statutory limit.

With this amendment, the House will be saving $41 million under the authorized allowance.

Madam Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds of the 1 minute that I have remaining to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE].

Mr. BLUTE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Quinn-Pomeroy amendment and believe it is very important that we reform the franking privilege in the House. It is a privilege that has been abused over the years, and we could save millions of taxpayer dollars by adopting this commonsense amendment.

Madam Chairman, earlier today we heard how more than 30 amendments that would have brought needed reforms to the way this House does business were rejected by the gridlock committee, I mean the Rules Committee. These were 30 reasonable ideas aimed at making this body truly representative. And we continue to wonder why this body's public perception is at historic lows.

However, in one bright moment, the Rules Committee saw fit to make the Quinn-Pomeroy amendment in order. This cut of $4 million in the House franking budget is long overdue. Last year the House spent more than $38 million sending out franked mail and only a fraction of this was in response to direct constituent inquiries.

Such a large franking budget has become an anachronism in light of today's technology. Telephones, faxes, computers, and other methods of communication have made many uses of the frank unnecessary. Instead of informing constituents, Members now use the free mailing privilege as a campaign tool.

Statistical proof of this abuse is seen in the large spike in expenditures during election years. Visual proof can be found in the connecting halls between the Longworth and Rayburn buildings at the end of the year and just prior to the 60-day cutoff in September when the newsletters stack up 7 feet high.

In responding to all of the letters I received from constituents I spent slightly more than $12,000 and returned more than $153,000. The amount I returned is more than 4 percent to the amount Mr. QUINN and Mr. POMEROY are seeking to cut. Only 25 other Members would have to return a similar amount and we could easily save the $4 million. Clearly, this amendment does not represent too drastic a reduction in the ability of Members of Congress to inform the American public.

I would like the opportunity to vote on deeper cuts in franking but the Rules Committee said "no." I strongly support this amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

Voting for this cut will show your support for fiscal responsibility and your desire to see the electoral playing field leveled somewhat.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield my last 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Madam Chairman, a number of us have been supporting these types of amendments before they were popular. Last year I returned over $100,000 again for the third year in a row, and yet I spent less than 25 percent of my allotment. It is time for all of us to tighten our belts. As we looked at limited resources for health care, for welfare reform, to fight crime, it is about time that we in this Chamber look at our own budgets so that the sacrifice can be equal and fair, and I urge my colleagues to support this fine amendment offered by my good friends.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, I commend my cosponsor on this amendment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN] and all who has spoken in its favor. I urge its adoption, and I will request a recorded vote.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 444, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] will be postponed until after the debate on amendment No. 2.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 103–532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. THURMAN

Mrs. THURMAN. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. THURMAN: Page 5, line 24 strike "$59,296,000" and insert "$56,354,000".

Page 6, line 1, strike "$14,936,000" and insert "$14,158,000".

Page 6, line 6, strike "$12,621,000" and insert "$11,506,000".

Page 6, line 8, strike "$17,267,000" and insert "$16,360,000".

Page 6, line 14, strike "$359,000" and insert "$337,000".

Page 6, line 16, strike "$1,730,000" and insert "$1,630,000".

Page 6, line 17, strike "$4,420,000" and insert "$4,400,000".

Conform the aggregate amount set forth on page 2, line 10, accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Madam Chairman, the amendment I am offering to H.R. 4454 is straightforward: It reduces the salaries, officers, and employees appropriation by $2,942,000. The funds I am seeking to reduce were intended for equipment and software purchases for various administrative offices of the House. The offices affected are: the Clerk's, the Doorkeeper, the Director of Non-Legislative Services, the Office of Law Revision Counsel, and Legislative Counsel.

The figure of $2,942,000 was chosen because, in testimony before the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, the requesting offices did not provide clear justification for purchases they requested.

In its report, the subcommittee stated:

> * * * equipment purchases and upgrades to existing systems are sometimes necessary. However, it is essential that appropriate review be made of the justification and potential costs and savings associated with these acquisitions and that appropriate authorization be acquired.

To me, this is a question of accountability. The American public demands accountability from its Government and we need to respond to those demands.

I strongly endorse the subcommittee's position that these new purchases should not be made until the requesting offices provide proper cost-benefit information on these products.

The subcommittee report further states:

> The committee directs that the Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services, as defacto budget officer, assure in the future that review and authorization of equipment items is given prior to including these items in budget request.

The equipment requested by these offices may indeed prove necessary in helping the House carry out its duties and once sufficient need is demonstrated, then the purchases can be

made. That money would have to come from reprogrammed savings identified by the Director of Non-Legislative Services. Once the Director finds the money, then these equipment purchases can be made.

We are facing a significant budget deficit in the House's budget this fiscal year. It certainly seems to me that we should be more prudent in allocating every dollar that goes into the operation of the House for the year ahead. Without clear reasons for the necessity for this equipment, we simply cannot afford any questionable outlays at this time.

However, as soon as these offices can provide proper justification and the House Administration Committee approves the purchases, then, if any savings in other areas of the House budget can be found by the Director, the equipment can be purchased.

The bill simply "fences in" these funds and that is not right. If the reasons for the spending had been provided earlier, the money would have probably been provided. However, justification was not given and I cannot see allowing this money to be appropriated, even within a fence. That is why I offer this amendment: to make our own House more accountable.

Madam Chairman, I urge passage of my amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, will my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida, yield?

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise to say I am happy to advise her that on our side we are very happy to accept her amendment.

Mrs. THURMAN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Chairman, let me ask the gentlewoman, will she yield time to me?

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

We are dealing here with the Clerk's Office and the Doorkeeper, among other institutions, including the Legislative Counsel. I have seen a pattern develop here in which we eviscerate ourselves and our employees from the institutional assistance we get here in the House of Representatives.

If someone can show me how we are better able to serve our constituencies by constantly chipping away at the financial underpinnings of those who are here to aid us and assist us in our work, I would like to see it. In this particular instance, I have had nothing but the best of cooperation, particularly from the Clerk's Office and from the Doorkeeper, and most especially from Legislative Counsel.

Madam Chairman, I think this is exactly the wrong way to go. If they need equipment to serve us better, we should be with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member rise in opposition to the amendment? If not, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] is recognized for the balance of her time, 1 minute.

Mrs. THURMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, I take the time just to point out to my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii, that I suggest that maybe he look at the report where the subcommittee stated that they believed maybe some of these were necessary. However, it was not demonstrated through the testimony before the committee, and that is why we have looked at this. But we have also allowed the flexibility so they can go back into some of their other office expenses, or whatever, if they can justify these expenses.

I totally agree with the gentleman. I think we have fine staffs, and I do not want to take tools away from them, but I also think we have to be accountable to the American public and make sure that our hired folks around here are also accountable and can justify what their expenses are.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. THURMAN. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 444, the Chair announces that she will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which any vote by electronic device may be taken on the amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings. This is a 15-minute vote on the Thurman amendment.

Members will record their vote by electronic device.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 46, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

AYES—383

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)

Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watt
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—46

Abercrombie
Berman
Bonior
Clay
Clayton
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Dellums
Dingell
Edwards (CA)
Flake
Foglietta
Hastings
Johnson, E. B.
Kopetski
Martinez
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Mollohan
Murtha
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pickle
Rangel
Reynolds
Rostenkowski
Sabo
Serrano
Stokes
Swift
Synar
Thompson
Torres
Towns
Unsoeld
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Blackwell
Clement
Cox
de Lugo (VI)
Dicks
Grandy
Horn
Slattery
Whitten
Wilson

□ 1405

Ms. PELOSI and Messrs. MARTINEZ, TOWNS, PAYNE of New Jersey, and YATES changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. HILLIARD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMEROY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the "ayes" prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] has demanded a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 375, noes 48, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—375

Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—48

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Applegate
Berman
Bonior
Clay
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Dellums
Dingell
Engel
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Hastings
Johnson, E. B.
King
Kopetski
Martinez
McKinney
Meek
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Oxley
Payne (NJ)
Rangel
Reynolds
Rush
Sabo
Serrano
Stokes
Swift
Synar
Towns
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Washington
Waters
Yates

NOT VOTING—16

Bachus (AL)
Blackwell
Clement
Cox
de Lugo (VI)
Dornan
Grandy
Hoke
Horn
Johnston
McDermott
Rowland
Slattery
Underwood (GU)
Whitten
Wilson

□ 1415

Mr. BERMAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. LANCASTER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 212 on H.R. 4454, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 26, 1994, I was incorrectly recorded as a "nay" vote on rollcall vote No. 212. It was my intention to vote "aye" on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] to H.R. 4454.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House report 103–532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRICKLAND

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRICKLAND: Page 15, line 1, strike out "$41,364,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$34,784,000".

Page 15, line 1, strike out "$10,260,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,680,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr.

STRICKLAND] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND].

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer a very simple and straightforward amendment. It would eliminate from the bill $6,580,000 for the installation of six additional elevators in the Longworth Building.

Madam Chairman, there is absolutely no question that the Longworth elevators are the slowest of all the House office buildings and are in dire need of improvement. There is $700,000 in this bill that would continue the elevator modernization project on the eight existing elevators in the building which when complete will improve their efficiency. I support the modernization project. My amendment leaves those funds in the bill. However, I do not support the $6.58 million in the bill to build six additional elevators in the Longworth Building. This money is unnecessary at this time. Let us wait until the modernization project on the eight existing elevators is complete. That will be done by the end of 1995. Let us do that before we determine that we need to spend over $6 million for six additional elevators.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chairman, I would just like to say that we have been trying to replace and repair these elevators in the Longworth Building for a long time. During the discussion on the rule earlier, I said that every Member that wanted to offer an amendment should have that right, and I agree with that strongly, but I also pointed out that I did not think I was going to support all of them, and I cannot support this.

Madam Chairman, the Members who are normally freshman Members in the Longworth Building ought to have elevators that work and not only the Members, themselves, but their constituents. A lot of people come to visit Members who reside in the Longworth Building, and those elevators ought to be safe, they ought to operate efficiently. Members should not have to miss votes or have visitation with constituents delayed because the elevators are old, antiquated, and need to be replaced.

Madam Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. While hopefully we can find many other ways to reduce this bill, this particular amendment I think is not a good amendment.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

□ 1420

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Strickland amendment. I rise in support of the Strickland amendment that would eliminate $6.5 million for the installation of six additional elevators in Longworth. This is a reasonable cost-cutting measure. It leaves in the bill $700,000 to complete the modernization of all existing elevators in Longworth.

The time to decide whether Longworth needs an additional six elevators is after modernization of the existing eight is complete, not now. After completing the modernization project, we will be able to evaluate the results of this project in terms of improved movement in the building.

Why spend $6.5 million on new elevators before the existing ones have been modernized?

As an occupant of the Longworth Building, I support the Strickland amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I hope the rumble you hear is the rumble of discontent. I hope none of you that occupy buildings other than Longworth will be voting for this. If you are in the Longworth Building, you know we need at least six elevators.

Modernization? How about modernization of function? One of the things that both sides said they were not going to do here today is grandstand, and this is a grandstand amendment.

Now, your own constituents are being stuck out there, and we cannot do proper business in the Longworth Building.

I also reside in the Longworth Building. I like the Longworth Building. I enjoy being in the Longworth Building.

What I do not enjoy is seeing people who are trying to do their work—and there has been criticism of the efficiency of the people working here in the Congress right straight along—being held up minute after minute, hour after hour, trying to get the mail in, trying to do the ordinary business in the Longworth Building, everybody being jammed up and stuck.

We cannot get the $6.5 million to get the additional elevators that we need to do the proper business we need to today. If you want to modernize, do not worry about the elevators we already have. Put in the six that we need.

Vote down this amendment and vote to modernize Longworth.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Chairman, grandstanding is a matter of value judgment.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA], an individual who is eminently qualified to speak about the Longworth Building because he has an office on the seventh floor of the Longworth Building.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, Members, I am in the Longworth Building. I am on the seventh floor.

Currently two elevators are inoperable, and that has produced delays, and it is a problem. But it is my understanding that this amendment would allow those elevators not only to be fixed but would allow them to be modernized so we could speed up that process.

Would it be nice to have six new elevators? Sure, it would be very nice. It is not essential.

We have to make some cutbacks. I wish there were more amendments perhaps, but this is a good amendment. It is an amendment we can all live with.

I hope it passes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. Madam Chairman, I am a reformer. I believe in term limits. I believe in cutting the expenditures of government.

But we found out on the Los Angeles Freeway you can only put off retrofitting so long.

Two elevators today are down in Longworth, two of them are down, one for the reform, which will only take about 1½ years to get that one back in service because we are doing it in-house, and the second just quit.

Do we want to modernize? Do we want to put some people to work working on elevators? Do we want to spend $6 million so our constituents can come here and visit us and lobby us and participate in government?

I am a freshman. I am on the seventh floor. I have got a conflict of interest, because there is no fire pole, there is no way I can get up there 10 times a day, because you run such a crummy schedule here. I have got to run back and forth, back and forth, to the seventh floor and down.

Vote no.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, let me say that I am not a Congress-basher and I am not for term limits. And I think we can mix up apples and oranges in this debate.

What we are talking about is the matter of priorities.

Now, I hear a lot of people stand at that podium and talk about saving money, and yet when it comes to a matter of having some personal inconvenience, suddenly they change their tune.

What we are talking about is whether or not it is wise to spend this amount of money at this point in time to build

six new elevators in the Longworth building. We are not talking about retrofitting existing elevators.

The Longworth building needs work done on its existing elevators. Everybody agrees with that.

But the question is, at this point in time when we are asking a lot of people to make a lot of sacrifices, should we be spending $6.58 million to build six additional elevators? The building has eight elevators. Does it need 14 elevators? I think not.

This is a commonsense legislation. It is something that we ought to do simply because it makes sense.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I, too, am in the Longworth Building. I have always been in the Longworth Building, and anyone who has ever gone to the Longworth Building knows that it is a disaster.

Ladies and gentlemen, what are we talking about here? This is the Capital of the United States. The Longworth Building is a disgrace. It is an embarrassment when constituents come, when people come from all over the country.

We have elevators, "Members only" elevators. We do not have difficulty getting up and down those stairways or up and down the different floors. It is our constituents who come here to visit the Capital of the United States, and they have to wait, 10, 15, and 20 minutes to get outside from the Longworth Building.

Do we not have any pride? This is a showplace for the country. This is where the seat of government is. When our constituents come into this building, they cannot even get in or out.

I know this is election year. Everybody is looking to show the folks back home we are tightening our belts, but this is not the place to do it.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I simply want to say I am a freshmen on the seventh floor of the Longworth Building. I think you can be penny-wise and pound-foolish, and this is the amendment that proves it.

Vote no on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time, 30 seconds, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON].

□ 1430

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my colleague from Dallas, who is on the seventh floor. I do not want to slide down a fire rail with her, but I think the point has to be made that the largest disparity is in the number of elevators in each House building per number of Members. The Rayburn has 30 elevators for 168 Members, the Cannon has 14 elevators for 140 Members, and for nearly 140 Members in the Longworth Building there are 10 elevators.

I think that is a good case for voting against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 103–532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANCASTER

Mr. LANCASTER. Madam Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANCASTER. Page 17, line 16, strike "$95,158,000" and insert "$90,717,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER].

Mr. LANCASTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman and Members of the House, the amendment that is offered before you now would strike $4,441,000 from the appropriation for the Government Printing Office for congressional printing. The bill reported provides for $95,158,000 for printing, which is an increase of more than $6 million over the current year. $4,441,000 is in fact an increase that was included in the bill to cover a rate increase for printing. However, the Joint Committee on Printing refused to approve that rate increase, and these funds represent those dollars.

Since that rate increase was not approved, these dollars are not needed and may be removed from the bill without doing any jeopardy to the printing needs of our Members.

Madam Chairman, I do rise in support of the amendment and would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I ask that I may be allowed to control the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Chairman, in this body I think we face a dilemma over the next several years that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER] and I recognize, and that is the reason we offer this amendment; that is, the fact that the Government Printing Office continues to lose money. In fact, this year, the Government Printing Office is projected to lose $29 million and next year will lose more than $30 million. And here is the fundamental dilemma: Fewer and fewer people are using the presses of the Government Printing Office, in part because they are extraordinarily unproductive and in part because more and more Government agencies are choosing to contract out for their services.

Finally, as we see a technological revolution which has made desktop publishing possible, it is clear that GPO's client base will shrink increasingly over the next several years.

Now, GPO itself projects a workload decline in fiscal 1995, and to make up for these revenue shortfalls they have come back and, instead, asked Congress to approve a 5-percent increase. Essentially, while business is going down, they are making the intriguing move to raise prices. I think anybody who has taken any economics course will tell you if you raise prices while your business is going down, your business is only going to go down further.

So I think what this will do is, instead, send a strong message to GPO that what they should do is concentrate on reducing their overhead costs, contracting out work which is more cost-effective. In fact, in the near future, I would like to see us debate the idea of totally forcing GPO to contract all of its services and moving to privatization.

Finally, send a signal to GPO that if they reduce costs, they can cut overhead by 50 cents on every dollar and that will bring them more business instead of paradoxically raising their rates on the idea that it will bring in more business.

I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, in offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to strike $4.41 million in price increases which are clearly not justified.

Mr. LANCASTER. Madam Chairman, I had intended to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, but since he had already spoken, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5, printed in House Report 103-532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia: Page 17, line 16, strike the pending dollar figure and insert an amount equal to that dollar figure less $3,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHNSON] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, the House in the previous amendment was to cut more than $4.4 million from the Government Printing Office budget for fiscal 1995. This is a worthwhile effort, but I believe it does not go far enough in cutting the size of the GPO budget during these times of dwindling resources. This amendment provides for an additional $3 million reduction. The GPO budget has asked for $3 million to pay down a shortfall which they claim is owed because of printing done in prior years. This so-called shortfall appears to be a subsidy to cover the losses incurred on executive branch printing which they are passing on to the congressional printing charge.

Madam Chairman, the GPO must become more efficient. The GPO needs to downsize and employ only the appropriate number of workers to do the printing of the three branches of Government in the most cost-effective manner possible. Perhaps more of the work of the legislative branch could be done by the private sector. I understand the work done at GPO usually runs twice the cost to produce the same job printed by the private sector under contract to GPO. We simply have to control costs at GPO.

Just 2 weeks ago the Joint Committee on Printing and Oversight for the GPO directed the agency to take immediate and forceful steps to find cost savings within the agency. This action comes in anticipation of a $22 million shortfall projected for the GPO. This amendment supports the goals of the joint committee and reduces the appropriation for the agency an additional $3 million.

I understand the Legislative Branch Appropriations Committee desire to fund the GPO at a reasonable level. Government Printing Office projects a workload decline in fact for fiscal year 1995, which is the typical pattern during the first year of a new Congress. Therefore, this amendment is to bring in line the expected costs for congressional products for fiscal year 1995 with the experience that we have had in fiscal year 1993.

□ 1440

In that year the new Congress only utilized 90 percent of the appropriation of $89 million for the GPO and binding accounting. I believe that the funds in the congressional printing and binding account for fiscal year 1995 will be more than adequate to do the work of Congress but will take away the funds that might be used to subsidize the executive branch.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Madam Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHNSON] for yielding time. I would also like to thank both the ranking member and chairman of the Rules Committee for allowing this important amendment to be made in order.

We must cut spending to reduce the deficit. To restore some credibility with Congress, we must begin by cutting our own budget. Only when taxpayers see that Members of Congress are willing to spend less on their own appropriations will they believe Congress is serious about cutting spending.

This amendment seeks to strike $3 million from the appropriation for congressional printing at the Government Printing Office. As reported, the bill provides an increase of $6.8 million over the current year—an increase of 7.6 percent over the previous year.

I am particularly concerned with GPO's funding request for $3 million to pay down a shortfall which they claim is owed because of printing done in prior years. This so-called shortfall looks like a bailout of the losses incurred on executive branch printing that GPO is trying to pass on as a congressional printing charge.

It is worth noting that Congress declined to fund a GPO request last year to make up for a similar shortfall problem. This move was done to reduce management and overhead costs at GPO. Moreover, it remains unclear whether the executive branch is paying their fair share of GPO's overhead costs.

No private business can rely on such a bailout to remedy inadequate management. Holding GPO accountable to identify the proper offsets is entirely reasonable given the fiscal constraints placed on our Federal Government. High overhead costs and pricing policies may need to be reevaluated as part of this effort to responsibly bring GPO's budget on track. This is in the best interest of all taxpayers.

Furthermore, previous congressional refusal to fund similar shortfalls at GPO has actually shown positive results. In fiscal year 1993, GPO had an estimated $21.4 million shortfall that Congress would not cover. The next year, the shortfall was $11.9 million less.

This amendment is simply a responsible effort to help bring fiscal accountability to the legislative branch. For that reason, I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this initiative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I urge an aye vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 103-532.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TORKILDSEN

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TORKILDSEN: Page 18, line 11, strike "$10,182,000" and all that follows through line 12 and insert "$3,182,000.".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Madam Chairman, I rise today with the gentlewoman from Virginia [Ms. BRYNE] to offer an amendment to H.R. 4454. I would like to thank Mr. YOUNG, the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, for his assistance on this important matter.

My amendment seeks to reduce the $10.2 million appropriation for the Botanic Garden by $7 million. This $7 million is intended for design and construction plans for renovation of the garden's conservatory. This funding would begin a prospective $28 million project whose costs have only been estimated by the Architect of the Capitol. I strongly believe that we need detailed design and construction plans of the project in advance of this substantial appropriation.

I am not saying the Botanic Garden should never initiate this important renovation. I am concerned, however, that this public expenditure be made prudently, given the huge Federal deficit, and in a way that provides the

greatest return for the taxpayers. As Members of this institution we are obliged to preserve the historic nature of the Capitol but within fiscally responsible limits. It is my understanding that House conferees removed similar funding in a previous legislative branch appropriations conference committee because of concerns with the project's costs and schedule. The same concerns about the project exist today.

I would also note that other options may be exercised with regard to the funding for the Botanic Garden renovation. The outstanding efforts of the Capitol Preservation Commission to obtain private funding for their undertakings should serve as a model of a way to fund renovations of other projects. I believe this should be considered for the Botanic Gardens, and we should have realistic estimates of private support before committing these funds.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to strike this unnecessary appropriation.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia [Mrs. BYRNE].

Mrs. BYRNE. Madam Chairman, the Byrne-Torkildsen amendment will eliminate $7 million in appropriations for the renovation of the U.S. Botanic Garden conservatory. It is an era that we have to belt-tighten, and it is clear these funds are not going to be used because there is no design. Yesterday in our Committee on Rules' meeting the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] called this a pig in a poke, and indeed that about nails it. It is a pig in a poke, only unfortunately for us it is a $7 million pig.

Madam Chairman, I join with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] in asking that this appropriation be cut.

Madam Chairman, my amendment will eliminate the $7 million appropriation for the renovation of the U.S. Botanic Garden Conservatory.

The Botanic Garden serves a very important educational function in our Nation's Capital. But in this era of fiscal belt-tightening, we cannot allocate funds to projects whose costs and benefits have not been fully evaluated. Unfortunately, that is the case with the conservatory.

The Architect of the Capitol first proposed large-scale renovations to the conservatory in 1990, estimating a cost of $21 million based upon preliminary design plans.

In fiscal 1993, Congress appropriated $2 million to the garden to develop a final design plan for the project. To date, this final design has not been completed. In the meantime, the delays have driven the estimated cost of this project up to $28 million.

This year's legislative branch appropriations bill allocated the first of four $7 million installations for the renovations—even though none of us have seen a final design.

When we are trying to make the most out of scarce Federal dollars, it just doesn't make sense to spend millions on a project which has not been completely designed and which has already seen a 33-percent projected increase in costs. We are being asked to pay now and inspect later.

Without a final project design, there is absolutely no guarantee that the cost won't rise again. While we need to provide the Botanic Garden with the funds necessary to maintain its facilities, we should not commit ourselves to funding a project that has not been finalized.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to keep the legislative branch appropriations bill fiscally responsible.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 103-532.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARCA OF WISCONSIN

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN, The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. barca of Wisconsin: Page 24, line 2, strike out "$32,100,000: Provided," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$30,600,000: *Provided*, That the objectives of chapter 41 of title 44, United States Code, as enacted by the Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993, shall be carried out through cost savings: *Provided* further,".

The CHAIRMAN, Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA].

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, the Barca-Kleczka-Thomas amendment, which would save $1.5 million from GPO. Last year at about this time; in fact, I think a year to the date, we had passed a bill called the Electronic Information Access Act of 1993, and in the committee report it was stated that we could go forward and this would be an efficient way to get documents out to people in a cost-effective manner that would either be cost neutral or save money. That was stated in the committee report. It was also stated by the floor manager, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] who will also be speaking on this, and by the minority leader of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Madam Chairman, we believe that we should be able to do this on a cost-neutral or a cost-savings basis, and that is what this amendment would accomplish.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which would reduce funding for the Government Printing Office by $1.5 million dollars. This reduction in funds is not an arbitrary cut, but is rather a necessary adjustment so that this bill conforms with current law.

Last year, this House passed Public Law 103-40, the Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act. When I came to the floor with this bill, I made very clear that the Government Printing Office is to achieve the objective of this law through cost savings elsewhere in its appropriated funds. It was very clear in the bill, the committee report, and statements on this floor that no additional funds be appropriated to carry out this legislation.

This is why I was very concerned when my colleague, Mr. BARCA, told me about the $1.5 million that was being added to cover the basic costs for libraries to have initial electronic access. I certainly want the electronic access program to continue, with the depository libraries having free access, but it was quite clear that GPO must fund this through cost savings, not new spending.

I congratulate Representative BARCA on this wise, cost-saving amendment, and I am glad to see that it is cosponsored by a Member on the other side of the aisle. Although he has only been here a short time, Representative BARCA has proven himself today as someone who is concerned with the use of taxpayers dollars.

I encourage all Members to support the Barca-Kleczka-Thomas amendment.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1450

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 103-532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBERTS

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS: Page 25, line 13, strike "4,493" and insert "4,193".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, I rise to join my colleague from Wisconsin, Congressman SCOTT KLUG, in offering this amendment to reduce the number of full-time equivalent positions [FTE's], at the Government Printing Office. The proposed authorization level of 4,493 would be reduced to 4,193. A reduction of 300 FTE's would save an estimated annual savings of $15 million.

For those of us who are not accountants, let me explain what an FTE is. One FTE is equal to one employee working full-time for a full year. The FTE authorization level is equal to the total number of hours all agency employees work. The FTE authorization level does not cap the number of employees, but rather the number of work hours all employees can be paid for in a year.

As the ranking Republican member serving on the House-Senate Joint Committee on Printing, the congressional entity with oversight of GPO's operation, I have been alarmed with the dramatic financial losses being incurred by the GPO. This year the GPO estimates its losses to be nearly $27 million and for fiscal year 1995 to increase to $29 million.

Over the last 3 years, the Joint Committee on Printing has requested four different studies to be conducted by the General Accounting Office, Arthur Andersen Accounting, and the Public Printer to determine the cause and options to reduce and end these losses. Every report concluded that GPO was outdated and overstuffed for the amount of work being done. Every report encouraged major reorganization of personnel and elimination of positions. In addition, the reports found personnel costs to account for 80 percent of all GPO costs and that administrative or overhead reductions would not offset financial losses.

Even GPO's financial documents show that its procurement operations continue to make a profit for the agency of $107 per print job, in comparison to a loss of $1,027 per job for work printed in-house. Yet, nearly 2,000 GPO employees continue to do in-house print work and only 725 hold position to contract out work—one-third. Simply put, we need to reduce in-house printing and increase procurement to cut losses.

Why is the GPO losing money? It is not the fault of the employees or the work that they do. Rather, it is technology, itself. In the age of advanced technology and electronic printing, the GPO has become outdated. The way in which GPO work is done is simply more expensive and slower than the way it can now be done with new technologies. For that reason, traditional customers are turning to alternatives and the GPO, like any other business, must cut costs and can no longer afford to keep its entire work force.

On May 12, the JCP met to discuss this situation and the growing financial loss at the GPO. The JCP determined quick action was necessary to slow the alarming financial trend. The committee directed the Public Printer to take actions to cut losses—by reducing overhead and personnel. In addition, I supported efforts to hire a consultant to assist the GPO in this endeavor.

In light of these efforts, it is important to note that this bill freezes the fiscal year 1994 FTE authorization level of 4,493 for fiscal year 1995—despite the JCP's insistence for personnel reductions. To freeze personnel levels would be contrary to an 11-year effort by the JCP and several other members to slowly reduce the FTE authorization to prevent financial losses at GPO

Freezing the FTE level would only encourage the GPO's losses to increase. This amendment would cut those losses.

A 300 FTE reduction would result in savings of roughly $15 million—a cut that would enable the GPO to reduce its estimated losses in half. While Congressman KLUG and I originally drafted our amendment to reduce FTE's by 600, a number equal to the estimated losses at GPO, in conversations with other Members concerns were raised over such a dramatic cut. The amendment has been drafted to address those concerns and turn GPO back on a course to financial stability.

In addition, this amendment does not mandate reductions in specific areas. Instead, it would allow the GPO's own Public Printer to review, with the professional assistance of the JCP, its structure and incrementally reduce employees in money-losing operations.

My colleagues, the world has changed and the GPO has to be changed to fit in it. It is more humane and sensitive to employees to gradually reduce the work force than in a future date be forced to totally eliminate the entire agency—and that is what will happen if true corrective action isn't taken.

My colleagues, we have reached a crossroads at the GPO. If we do not take these steps, the situation will only worsen.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for 5 minutes to control time in opposition.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. There is no reason to have a different set of rules for the GPO than we have for the rest of the Government.

There are rigorous caps in place, and unlike the rest of the Government, the GPO is already 193 positions below their full-time equivalents.

The last thing we need to do at a time when we are buying out the rest of the Government is to precipitate layoffs in a single agency. Moreover, in reinventing government, there is a move to, in fact, encourage agencies to contract out certain kinds of work.

Well, the GPO is the leader in contracting out work. Ninety-three percent of the work of the executive is already contracted out by GPO. Eighty percent of all of its work is contracted out. Virtually the only work done at GPO is the overnight work that you have to do for the Congress itself, work such as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If GPO were not on a steep decline already, one could understand these amendments that would push them further. There is no reason to push this agency into a layoff position. These are working families. These are people who have to support themselves the way everybody else does. These are jobs that are being systematically eliminated. To force the elimination of jobs in a precipitous fashion would single out the GPO from other agencies.

We have not opposed, I certainly have not opposed, some of the other amendments, amendments which would reduce congressional printing, but when we got to this amendment, I sought specific information about its impact. When I learned that its impact is not simply savings, but the elimination of actual people faster than those people are already being eliminated, I could not find a reason why anybody would want to precipitate that kind of result.

So I am asking my colleagues to oppose the amendment, the Roberts amendment, and allow the efficiencies already under way at GPO, efficiencies that are far in advance of what other agencies are now about, to work their way and work their will.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, might I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has the right to close.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding.

If I may, let me show the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] why I think this action is necessary today. The green you see here is when the Government Printing Office actually operated at a profitable basis. Since 1990, as you can see, once

we saw the advent of desktop publishing and moves to greater efficiency in the Federal Government, and a move, again, which I think should be accelerated, to contracting out work, the GPO has lost money. In fact, as you heard, the predictions are that the GPO will lose $29 million in fiscal year 1995 if we do not do something.

The blue trend line is the number of employees. As you can see, its slope is much different than the slope which indicates GPO's increasing losses, which will soon approach $30 million, if we do not act quickly.

Now, every major group that has looked at this, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has said, from the General Accounting Office, to the Arthur Andersen consulting firm, to the Public Printers, GPO 2000, has indicated that GPO has to begin seriously downsizing. It is overstaffed for the amount of work being done, and it is overstaffed for the amount of work that is being done because Federal agencies realize it is not doing a very good job any longer. The technology cannot keep up.

As we have seen from the Vice President's own report on privatization, to the kind of things happening now in New York City and Massachusetts, where more privatization is taking place, to the former Soviet Union, where still more work is moving from the public sector, I think this is long overdue.

This amendment will cut the FTE ceiling from 4,493 positions by 300 persons, to a level of 4,193, equal to $15 million. So the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and I will tell you, 300 employees was not our firsts choice, 600 employees was our first choice.

This savings will represent $15 million, or roughly half of GPO's projected losses in the first year. If GPO can prove to us in the future that their wok is increasing and more Government clients are coming back, then we are willing to think about adding back positions. But for the time being, every job that GPO does, the Federal Government loses 50 cents on the dollar, from what they could have done had it been privatized out.

I respect the feelings of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] as I do her colleague from Prince George's County, about what it means to their workers. But our job is to look after the greater good of the American taxpayer.

At this point in history, GPO is a loser, and I urge my colleagues to support the Roberts-Klug amendment, which will go at least halfway to cutting GPO losses in the current year.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Madam Chairman, I would like to join my colleague from the District of Columbia in opposing the Roberts-Klug amendment. If the threshold question is does GPO get it, I think clearly they do. If the issue is contracting out, they have responded. Eighty percent of congressional work is now being contracted out. Ninety-three percent of executive level business is being contracted out. But the important fact remains that there is rapid turnover work that must be done on an overnight short-term basis, that cannot be contracted out. That is the area where GPO has extensive expertise. That is the area that we wanted to maintain and make sure runs in an efficient manner.

□ 1500

I believe that meat ax approach that is being suggested is not the way to respond to the current situation. They are already cutting out weak areas of these concerns in a better fashion. Already, if we look to the chart that is presented, the trend is downward in terms of personnel allocations. Right now GPO is 193 positions below its full time, FTE, authorization, but if we take a meat ax approach we will precipitate layoffs, and that will in fact be counterproductive to the goal of reducing costs, because layoffs, as we have demonstrated in extensive debate on this floor, causes increased costs with lost productivity, plus additional payments for unemployment compensation and the like.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, there is no doubt we are going to have to look at the management of the Government Printing Office, which I would say is excellent. Mr. DiMario is doing an outstanding job. The fact of the matter is, they are confronted with a new environment.

The fact of the matter is, they are confronted with constraints that other agencies may not be confronted with. The fact of the matter is, we have allowed printing to be done in other areas, rather than in centralized, perhaps more efficient areas. There is no doubt we need to look at and make sure that the Government Printing Office is giving to the taxpayers and to the Congress full service for the dollars spent.

However, Madam Chairman, I would hope this amendment is rejected. I have talked to my friends who are the proponents of this. They say they started with 600 and came down to 300. The fact is, if we are at 200, and we are not going to change this, but the fact is, as the gentleman from Prince George's County, Mr. WYNN, and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. NORTON, have pointed out, we would preclude RIF's. RIF's are not good management policy.

If we plan, if we have a goal to get there from here, we can do it in a sound management manner, and I would urge the rejection of this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, might I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Chairman, this is not a meat axe approach. This is not even a scalpel. This is not even a pinprick. We started with 600 and we went down to 300. We have been meeting and meeting and meeting. We have studied and we have studied and we have studied to reduce the personnel costs. If we contract it out at the GPO, we make $107. If it is an in-house job, we lose $1,027. Two thousand GPO employees continue to do in-house print work, and 725 are involved in contracting out. We can afford a 300 FTE cut.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 103-532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MANTON

Mr. MANTON. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANTON: Page 30, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 307. (a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—The first sentence of section 8335(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "55" and inserting "57".

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—(1) Section 8425 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the first sentence of subsection (b) by striking "member of the Capitol Police or" and "member of";

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(C) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) A member of the Capitol Police who is otherwise eligible for immediate retirement under section 8412(d) shall be separated from the service on the last day of the month in which such member becomes 57 years of age or completes 20 years of service if then over that age. The Capitol Police Board, when in its judgment the public interest so requires, may exempt such a member from automatic separation under this subsection until that member becomes 60 years of age. The Board shall notify the member in writing of the date of separation at least 60 days before that date. Action to separate the member is not effective, without the consent of the member, until the last day of the month in which the 60-day notice expires.".

(2) Section 8415(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "(a) or (b)" and inserting "(a), (b), or (c)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Chairman, I ask to control the 5 minutes in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

Mr. MANTON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, the amendment Ms. JENNIFER DUNN and I are offering today would change the mandatory separation age for a U.S. Capitol Police officer from its current 55 years to 57 years.

As my colleagues may recall, in 1990, Congress enacted the Capitol Police Retirement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-428) which placed the U.S. Capitol Police Force on a more level playing field with surrounding Federal law enforcement agencies.

A key provision in this legislation made mandatory separation at age 55, which was identical to the retirement provisions of similarly situated law enforcement entities. This legislation had widespread support because it ensured parity, equity, and comparability among Federal law enforcement agencies.

However, in the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991, language was adopted that increased the mandatory separation age for these surrounding Federal law enforcement agencies from 55 to 57. This change was not included for the U.S. Capitol Police.

Madam Chairman, the amendment we are offering today is necessary in order to restore parity. The Capitol Police and the Capitol Police Board strongly support this change, and it is my understanding they have the sufficient resources to accommodate this increase in mandatory retirement age.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for his support and assistance on this important matter, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I wish to confirm what my good friend and colleague on the House Subcommittee on Police and Personnel, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON], has just told us.

As the chairman and ranking member of the Personnel and Police Subcommittee we are today offering an amendment to bring our Capitol Hill Police Force's retirement policy in line with similar Federal law enforcement agencies.

As my colleague just stated, these other agencies had their mandatory retirement age increased to 57 4 years ago in the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991. We in this body have not yet done the same for our own law enforcement personnel.

Madam Chairman, this amendment is in keeping with the sense of parity that this body first embraced with the Capitol Police Retirement Act of 1990. It will restore the even playing fields that were initially created between our local Federal law enforcement agencies.

We have conferred closely with the chief of police, Gary Albrecht, on the issue of cost and he said, and I quote "that this is a wash." Any cost increases that would result from retaining older, more experienced officers on our police force will be covered in the savings realized by not having to hire and train new personnel.

I especially wish to thank Mr. YOUNG for his support and to again compliment Chairman MANTON on his efforts. As the ranking member of the Personnel and Police Subcommittee, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this amendment and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 103-532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 30, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 307. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE TO GRANTEES AND CONTRACTORS.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I was not quite sure whether Congress was going to retrofit the existing elevators in the Longworth, or if they were going to build new ones, but one thing I was concerned about is when they got done with those elevators, the American workers did not get the shaft.

I would like to see American products, wherever possible, used in these construction projects. These American products are made by American workers who pay American taxes, who keep the trucks coming down the track and the train coming down the track.

Mr. FAZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I just want to tell my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], that we support the amendment and we think his concerns about American workers are well-placed.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Chairman, I just want to say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] does a fine job in making sure American workers are protected to the best of our ability. We thank him for that. We support the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 103-532.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER: Page 26, line 24, strike "$439,525,000" and insert "$408,656,750".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, this Member rises to offer an amendment to H.R. 4454, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995.

This Member's amendment would reduce the funding level included in H.R. 4454 for the General Accounting Office [GAO] to 5 percent below the fiscal year 1994 level.

GAO received a funding level of $430.2 million in fiscal year 1994, and H.R.

4454 recommends a fiscal year 1995 funding level of $439.5 million—an increase of $9.4 million. This Member's amendment would reduce the fiscal year 1995 funding level of GAO to $408.7 million, a reduction of $30.9 million from the committee approved bill, and $21.5 million below fiscal year 1994's funding level.

Mr. Chairman, GAO is an agency where growth is out of control. GAO is an agency which is not responsive to individual Members. In addition, this Member strongly believes that the quality of work produced by the GAO is increasingly shoddy. The work produced by GAO varies dramatically, yet all products are given the same kind of credibility simply because they are GAO products. The level of resources provided to produce these products is excessive and has grown disproportionately when compared with other congressional support agencies.

In addition, GAO resources are also used for consultants, training, and other unnecessary expenses. Concern has also been expressed that GAO is more interested in getting headlines than in supporting the Congress with the required information.

While the original mission of GAO was to monitor congressional spending and reduce waste, the agency has grown to the point where it is now a major contributor itself to deficit spending.

From 1985 to 1993, GAO investigations doubled from 457 per year to 915. In addition, GAO's budget has jumped from $46.9 million in 1965 to our current spending level of $430.2 million, a nearly 1000 percent increase in unadjusted dollars.

This Member would like to point out that in fiscal year 1994, the number of full-time equivalent positions at GAO were reduced from the fiscal year 1993 amount by approximately $6 million and 100 positions. However, additional costs are still needed to account for the past growth at this agency.

This Member would like to outline some of the increase in GAO funding. In 1980, funding for GAO staff cost $204 million. By 1985 that had grown to $299 million. In 1988 it was $330 million, and in 1989, $346 million. The average increase between 1980 and 1990 was 8 percent per year. Then, in 1991, GAO was increased by 14 percent, to a total of $409 million. In 1992, GAO received another 8-percent increase to $443 million.

GAO is currently the largest support agency for Congress, and its budget represents more than one-quarter of the total proposed fiscal year 1995 legislative branch appropriations. GAO's budget is 7½ times the size of the Congressional Research Service, 19 times the size of the Congressional Budget Office, and 20 times the size of the Office of Technology Assessment.

According to a Democratic Study Group Special Report issued on May 24, 1994, January personnel totals for GAO were 4,597. This level is nearly as large as the staffing level of 4,617 for the entire Library of Congress—the largest library in the world—which also includes the staff of the Congressional Research Service.

According to this same study, GAO's staffing level is nearly 2½ times as large as the 1,849 House committee staff members, and more than half as large as the 7,340 individuals employed by Members of the House.

The DSG study also compares funding levels for the legislative branch from 1979 to 1994, in inflation-adjusted dollars. According to DSG, the General Accounting Office has received one of the largest increases in funding for the entire legislative branch at 13.5 percent during this time period.

Other areas of the legislative branch have actually declined since 1979, according to this study. For example, the Library of Congress received a 17.6 percent reduction, CBO was reduced by 3.8 percent, and, Members staff has even been reduced by 6.4 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars since 1979.

Why then, if other areas have experienced these reductions, has GAO been allowed to balloon over the years? Why has it been protected in this manner?

Mr. Chairman, the time to act is now. This Member would like to urge his colleagues to reject the $9.4 million increase for GAO included in H.R. 4454 by supporting this Members amendment. A modest 5-percent cut from the current year is entirely justified. Growth in GAO's budget must not continue.

□ 1510

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I ask that I be granted the 5 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO], respected fiscally conservative member of our caucus.

Mr. HUTTO. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the subcommittee chairman's yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the General Accounting Office. If there is any one agency in this town that deserves the support of the Congress and the American taxpayer, it is the GAO.

In my capacity as chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, whenever there is a difficult issue that I need an objective evaluation of, I do not hesitate to call on the GAO. Over the past year, GAO has provided my subcommittee with numerous reports, testimonies, and analyses that have proved invaluable in our decision making process that has saved the taxpayers billions of dollars and, at the same time, improved the operational effectiveness and efficiency of the Department of Defense. I would like to take just a moment to mention a few areas where GAO has made a significant contribution.

Depot maintenance—GAO testimony on this very complex and sensitive issue greatly assisted in our understanding of an operation for which DOD spends about $15 billion annually. GAO's insight into such areas as public-private competition and the impact of closing certain maintenance depots was of great assistance to us as we had to make some difficult decisions.

Defense business operating fund—the work that GAO has accomplished in this area has greatly improved the operations of this multibillion dollar entity. Their work has also resulted in recommendations to the DOD which will save the Department and the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Streamlining defense logistics systems—GAO's work in the services' inventory management systems has enabled DOD to reduce the amount of inventory that they do not need and saved hundreds of millions of dollars. At the same time, the GAO recommendations which have been largely adopted by DOD has made for more improved and efficient operations.

Budget reviews—GAO assistance to my committee in providing timely and objective analyses of the services' operation and maintenance [O&M] budget requests have been invaluable. Without GAO's assistance, we would have had a very difficult time meeting our deadlines for performing our authorization process. Furthermore, their work has enabled us to trim billions of dollars from the requests without impairing military capability and readiness.

I could go on and on in voicing the many attributes of GAO. In summary, I will conclude by saying that GAO is one of the few Federal agencies that has consistently demonstrated the willingness and ability to respond to the Congress with timely, objective information and analysis on a wide variety of issues. I know that my subcommittee relies heavily on the GAO and I have always found them to be completely objective and nonpartisan in their work approach and ethics. GAO is truly the best friend that the American taxpayer has in Government.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], who also offered a similar amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

This amendment is reasonable. Our friend, the gentleman who just spoke, said that we need the GAO. Of course we do, of course we do. We need an arm that provides information. This does

not take that away. It simply takes 5 percent away from the budget and $30 million out of over $400 million.

Madam Chairman, GAO is a massive bureaucracy. It has a staff of over 4,700 people. That represents one-quarter of the legislative branch staff. By the way, it represents equal to 1 percent of the population of my home State of Wyoming. Over the years this funding has grown up incrementally.

Madam Chairman, let me just talk about a couple of facts:

Twenty years ago since GAO initiated most of its own inquiries, today more than 80 percent come as a result of congressional requests from subcommittee and committee chairman. The GAO represents one-fifth of the total legislative budget; 4,700 people represents one-quarter of all the branch of the legislative staffers.

Finally, let me tell Members that we also have 31 detailees, less than we did have.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment which would simply trim down the cost and allow GAO to continue to carry out its function.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairman, this is the kind of amendment that should never even be considered in the House of Representatives. This is an amendment which is going to blind the Congress, which is going to take away our ability to gather facts, to analyze situations, to audit wrongdoers, to see to it that public money is properly spent.

This amendment is going to deny the committees and the Congress the ability to do the kinds of things we have done through the assistance and services of GAO. It is going to require the layoffs of large numbers of GAO agents and personnel. It is going to make it impossible for committees of Congress to get the kind of services that they want in terms of analyzing the behavior of Government contractors. It is going to prevent us from recovering monies improperly collected and to see to it that accounts of the Government are properly audited. It is going to set up a situation whereby Republican colleagues who are pushing this are all of a sudden not going to be able to get the kind of services that they need, and especially need in terms of seeing to it that the Government agencies now run by the Government are properly audited.

Madam Chairman, this is a bad amendment. It should be rejected overwhelmingly. It is irresponsible.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. CLINGER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER. As the ranking Republican on the Government Operations Committee, the committee that oversees GAO, I share with my colleagues a sense of frustration with certain aspects of GAO's performance. In fact, members of my staff are at this moment at GAO scrutinizing GAO workpapers on the travel office scandal.

However, cutting GAO's budget is not the solution to our frustration. GAO is already downsizing and has reduced its budget by $12 million and 500 workyears from fiscal year 1992 levels. Several field offices have already closed, including ones in Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and Oklahoma. GAO has reduced travel, training, contract services, and other program costs by about 40 percent and plans a total staff reduction of 12 percent by 1996.

If enacted, this amendment will potentially result in delays in audit and investigative work, and will stall the implementation of a computer network intended to increase agency efficiency.

From a strictly partisan perspective, I am concerned about the impact this amendment may have on Republican oversight efforts. Now, more than ever, Republicans need an effective, efficient, and aggressive GAO to assist in overseeing the operations of executive branch agencies and departments.

We are all in agreement that GAO can, should, and must do better. That is one of the reasons why I have regular discussions with the Computer General. He has been responsive to many of my concerns and I am confident that the Computer General will continue working with the minority to ensure a fair and objective GAO.

I understand and appreciate the position of the gentleman from Nebraska, but I must urge a "no" vote on the Bereuter amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my aim.

Madam Chairman, this is not a draconian amendment.

No partisanship was injected into the discussion in support of this amendment. This is not an irresponsible amendment in any way. This is an agency that has grown faster since 1979 than practically any other aspect of the legislative branch appropriations. During the period of time from 1979 to 1994 the increase has been about 13.5 percent.

I remind my colleagues the number of employees in the GAO is 4,597. What this gentleman is offering is not a 10 percent or 11 percent or a 15 percent reduction. I am offering a very modest amendment. This is an amendment that ought to be adopted by a wide margin. It shows the public we are responsible about our own budget.

I urge my colleagues to approve the Bereuter amendment for a 5 percent reduction.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, before I close the debate, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to both the Bereuter and Boehner amendments to H.R. 4454.

The effect of both of these ill-conceived amendments would be to deprive Congress of the investigative and oversight services provided by the General Accounting Office. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] would reduce the GAO budget by 5 percent, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], would—among other cuts—reduce the GAO budget by 11 percent.

The General Accounting Office provides this body with an invaluable service in conducting detailed audits and investigations of Cabinet agencies, independent regulatory bodies, and critically important regulatory matters. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, I can personally attest to the value of GAO's reports in informing our deliberations regarding complex and difficult issues affecting the structure of our national telecommunications infrastructure, the regulation of our Nation's securities markets and stock exchanges, and future course of our financial system.

Just last week, for example, the GAO submitted to the subcommittee a comprehensive report on financial derivatives. Derivatives are financial products developed by Wall Street whose value is related to—or derived from—the value of an underlying asset, such as a stock, bond, commodity, or an index representing the values of stocks, bonds, or commodities. The use of these products has exploded 145 percent in size over the last 5 years, transforming it into a $12 trillion marketplace.

GAO's report, which resulted from an intensive 2-year investigation into the derivatives market, has identified a number of potentially very serious gaps in the regulatory structure governing dealers and end-users of these products. If not corrected, these gaps could potentially endanger the very fabric of the U.S. and global financial system. Our committee, along with other House and Senate subcommittees, are using this report as the roadmap to tightening up the regulations relating to the derivatives market and crafting appropriate remedial legislation to fill in the regulatory "black holes" which GAO has identified.

This is just one example of how the work that the GAO performs for this institution allows us to do a better job

of oversight and legislating on the critical issues facing our Nation. Derivatives may sound like an exotic or esoteric issue, but if they contribute to crash in the stock market, or the failure of major banks, then it is this body which will be left with the unenviable task of cleaning up the financial mess. I would suggest to my colleagues that the value in terms of financial crises averted, market crashes avoided is well worth the cost of maintaining the investigative and auditing infrastructure in place at GAO that enables us to nip these potential problems in the bud.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote against efforts to cut the GAO budget, and to approve the level of funding provided for in the Appropriations Committee reported bill.

□ 1520

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The GAO has already implemented a plan that will reduce its staff by 700 employees, or 12 percent, by 1996.

This budget has been reduced $12 million below what it was in 1992. We have made savings in this GAO account with the cooperation, I might add, of the Comptroller General and his staff.

They understand the need to streamline, and they have certainly done so using buyout authority, attrition, realigning field offices, and reducing travel, contract services, and other areas and by about 40 percent.

But the most important thing here is that if we were to engage in this cut, we would really do much damage to Government. We would delay the processing of bid protests. We would be, therefore, unable to enforce many of the laws which are currently on the books. Decisions that really, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] said go to the very core of the most expensive programs in the Government would be delayed.

This is a penny-wise and pound-foolish amendment, as has been said.

I urge its defeat.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE IMPACT OF REDUCING COMMITTEE MARK OF $439,525,000 TO $408,656,750

GAO's 1994 budget has already been reduced $12 million below the fiscal year 1992 level. To absorb these reductions, GAO has already:

First, implemented a plan that will reduce its staff by 700 employees or 12 percent by the end of fiscal year 1996, including: using buyout authority to reduce over 400 staff; using attrition to reduce over 200 staff; and realigning Washington and field staff offices to reduce about 100 staff.

Second, reduced travel, training, contract services, and other audit support programs by about 40 percent.

An additional cut of over $30 million could only be achieved through:

First, a reduction-in-force. Approximately 12 percent of GAO staff would need to be RIF'd—close 3 regional offices, 300 employees, and RIF about 300 employees in Washington, DC.

Second, termination of two critical projects: Stop asbestos removal from the GAO building, increasing health risk, and creating unnecessary contract termination costs of over $2 million, subsequent startup costs, and prolonged rent costs of about $12 million a year for peopled currently housed outside the GAO building; and stop networking computers throughout the agency, leaving about 650 employees without computer support essential to the performance of their jobs.

Due to its disruptive nature, a RIF of this magnitude—12 percent—would result in the following:

First, there would be a significant delay in processing bid protests. GAO currently processes about 3,500 bid protests each year. This would drop by about 15 percent creating large backlogs and delays of up to 4 months in awarding many Government contracts.

Second, GAO currently settles an average of approximately 6,100 claims again the Government per year totaling about $550 million. This would also drop by about 15 percent creating backlogs and estimated delays in processing of 6 to 9 months.

Third, under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, GAO collects over $2 million a year for payment to over 18,000 employees who have been paid less than minimum wage by their employers. The number of payments processed would drop by over 14 percent creating serious backlogs and delays in making payments of up to 4 months.

Fourth, GAO renders about 700 Comptroller General decisions each year. This would result in reducing the number of decisions by about 15 percent and delays of up to 6 months, impacting on a wide variety of Government operations.

HISTORY OF GAO'S APPROPRIATION AND STAFFING

[Appropriations in thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Base	Mandatory pay and inflation increases	Other charges	Appropriation	Average positions
1984	.....	.....	.....	271,710	5,000
1985	271,710	15,449	12,545	299,704	5,050
1986	299,704	8,547	(20,200)	288,051	5,042
1987	288,051	22,922	0	310,973	5,042
1988	310,973	24,858	(5,984)	329,847	5,052
1989	329,847	12,303	5,189	347,339	5,062
1990	347,339	16,534	(212)	363,661	5,062
1991	363,661	33,253	12,328	409,242	5,062
1992	409,242	25,464	7,941	442,647	5,062
1993	442,647	7,698	(15,178)	435,167	4,900
1994	435,167	9,913	(14,915)	430,165	4,581
1995 [1]	430,165	925	8,435	439,525	[2] 4,581

[1] House reported bill.
[2] Authorized FTE's 4707.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]. The amendment proposes substantial budget cuts on the General Accounting Office. To say that such cuts are penny wise and pound foolish is to state the obvious. The General Accounting Office provides crucial information and services to the Congress that are unlikely to be available from any other source. As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I can personally attest to the value of this work. The General Accounting Office, for example, has been instrumental in identifying the increasing, potentially terminal problems faced by the Postal Service. The best information that the Congress has received regarding the loss of markets, the increasing threat posed by the electronic superhighway, or the problems with the Postal Service's automation efforts has not come from the Postal Service, its customers, or its employees, but has been provided by the General Accounting Office. Committee investigators have been greatly assisted by GAO staff and investigators from the Office of Special Investigations in reviewing grossly negligent operations of the Postal Inspection Service and in investigations of questionable activities at the Christopher Columbus Jubilee Commission.

The General Accounting Office has been equally valuable to the Congress in the development of Civil Service policy. To date, the General Accounting Office has provided the foremost and best independent assessment of Vice President GORE's National Performance Review recommendations. Those recommendations contemplate what amounts to a complete revision of Government personnel policy. Particularly as those recommendations are translated into legislative proposals, the ability of my committee and the Congress to implement legislation that will enhance productivity will depend heavily on information that can only be provided by the General Accounting Office. Enactment of this amendment practically guarantees that such information will not be available.

The General Accounting Office was established to provide Congress independent, nonpartisan, detailed information that Congress could not otherwise obtain. That information has been as invaluable to congressional efforts to identify waste, fraud, and abuse as it has in our efforts to develop policies that address the long and short-term needs of the country. Gutting the General Accounting Office will not save a dime of taxpayer's money. It will simply place the Congress at the further mercy of the executive branch and special interest groups. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the effort to decimate the General Accounting Office.

The GAO is essential to helping us make intelligent budget cuts and program improvements.

As chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, that has been responsible for the largest part of budget reconciliation cuts during the past 8 years, I can testify that the GAO has been the key to helping us separate the fat from the muscle of the Medicare Program. We have been able to make tens of billions of dollars in cuts in the growth of Medicare without crippling the program, in large part because of the many Medicare and Medicaid projects of the GAO. To give just one quick example, the GAO's work on abuses by physicians in the referral of patients to facilities in which they have an ownership interest has resulted in legislation that will save the public and private sectors hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

As chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, the GAO is currently playing a key role in deciphering the problem of the finances of the District of Columbia and pointing to areas where we need to make improvements

in the Federal payment. The one study they are doing for Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman DIXON and myself is likely to lead to savings worth many times the amount of the proposed budget cut in front of us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this shortsighted amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 232, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

AYES—193

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lloyd
Lucas
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Valentine
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Michel
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—14

Clay
Clement
Cox
Franks (CT)
Grandy
Gunderson
Horn
Lewis (FL)
Miller (CA)
Schumer
Slattery
Tauzin
Washington
Wilson

□ 1541

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Slattery against.

Mr. Grandy for, with Mr. Wilson against.

Messrs. STRICKLAND, ACKERMAN, PETERSON of Minnesota, and MEEHAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi and Mr. SHAYS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, because of a family health emergency, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote 213. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 213, the Bereuter amendment to H.R 4454, the bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1995.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 103-532.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHNER:

Page 30, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 307. The amounts otherwise provided in this Act for the following accounts and activities are hereby reduced by the following amounts:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Total, $103,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

Total, $103,000.

Miscellaneous items, $103,000.

JOINT ITEMS

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

$4,090,000.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

$1,370,000.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

$6,019,000.

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

$21,931,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

SALARIES

$474,000.

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

$9,077,000.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

$565,000.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

$6,754,000.

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

$7,080,000.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

$3,018,000.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

$47,318,150.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I would appreciate the 5 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chairman, my colleagues, today I am offering this amendment for my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] who is at the hospital with his wife who is giving birth to their second child.

Madam Chairman, the amendment that I have before us simply freezes spending in this bill at fiscal year 1994 levels. It does not do an across the board; it does it in this way:

Members clerk hire is funded at the committee recommendation. The General Accounting Office is cut by $47 million. The Botanic Garden has already been cut. The Architect of the Capitol would lose $8.3 million. The Office of Technology Assessment is eliminated, a $21 million savings. The Government Printing Office is frozen at 1994 levels. The congressional printing and binding levels are frozen again at 1994 levels. It also eliminates the Joint Economic Committee, the Joint Committee on Taxation, the Joint Committee on Printing, but it also, my colleagues, continues to have increases for the leadership offices, committee employees, the Budget Committee studies. The committee funding is still in here. HIS increases are still in here. Allowances, expenses are still increased, and salaries for officers and employees, those are increases that were in the committee mark and continue to be in this bill.

Madam Chairman, the American people believe the Government is too big and it spends too much. If we are going to provide an example for the American people and the rest of Government, we need to do it here, and living at 1994 levels I think is reasonable and certainly within what this Congress ought to be doing.

Before my minute is up, Madam Chairman, let me just say I heard from one of my colleagues that Mr. and Mrs. COX are the proud parents of a new baby girl.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would eliminate most of the independent information gathering capacity of the Congress.

This is really a rather odd approach to reform at a time when a primary criticism of the Congress is that we are too beholden to PAC's and special interest groups. And the timing could not be worse. Congress would be denying itself access to independent information and advice as an unprecedented number of new Members arrive in this body and as we face some of the most complex issues ever to come before a legislative body.

Is this really a wise way to save money? To deny ourselves access to independent evaluations of information at such a critical moment? To force ourselves to be more dependent on information from those with an ax to grind? To make ourselves less able to counter the claims of the administration? To reverse a century-old trend of trying to develop more objective sources of information for the Congress? It's hard to see how the answers to these questions could be "yes."

The novelist Kurt Vonnegut once defined the information revolution as something like "the remarkable ability of people to know what they are talking about, if they really want to." I side with those who want to know what they are talking about—that's the service groups like OTA and the Joint Committee on Taxation provide.

OTA has provided an important tool in our policymaking for more than 20 years, helping us reach decisions that have kept the Nation at the forefront of applied science, reinvigorated our industry, protected our environment, made us safer, and indeed, improved our overall quality of life. The agency has kept us at the forefront of the information revolution not only by providing important insight on emerging issues under its purview, but also by mapping out and interpreting the very pathways—the information superhighway, for instance—that will carry us into the next century.

Through cooperation between its multidisciplinary staff and the technical and professional resources of universities, industry and public interest groups, OTA marshals together for us in Congress indispensable resources that provide expertise we could not otherwise duplicate. The office has agreed to undertake a study for me, assessing methods to reduce earthquake damage that I fully expect will make important contributions to our efforts to save lives and money.

OTA is a Government agency that does serious work and does it well, an asset we would be ill-advised to squander. I urge my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, to join me in opposing Mr. BOEHNER's amendment that would eliminate the 1995 appropriation for OTA.

OTA provides big bang for not much buck. Since 1982, its budget, adjusted for inflation, has increased less than 20 percent from approximately $12 million to today's $22 million. At the same time, budgets for NASA and the National Science Foundation each have increased more than 80 percent and involve much higher levels of expenditures.

More significantly, OTA's mission has undergone a fundamental transformation since its inception in 1972 as the Federal Government has become an increasingly technical enterprise. Much of the future success of economy is riding on initiatives such as the national information infrastructure bill. Our effort to reinvent Government will depend on our ability to utilize technology. OTA provides us with the vision to choose the wisest course on these and other issues with large and complex technological components.

Our constituents may indeed want us to do more with less. But I doubt they want us to do more knowing less. I urge the defeat of this amendment. Let's nip this information counterrevolution in the bud.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Chairman, opponents to the Boehner amendment claim it is easy to criticize congressional spending levels, to cut legislative appropriations, and, as they put it, to demagogue against the institution. Well, I am not demagoguing against the institution, but if we are serious about cutting, it needs to start at home. I assure my colleagues there is nothing easy about saying no. On the other hand, it is very easy to say yes, which is why we have had 25 straight years of budget deficits. But there is no one out there lobbying for an increase in this particular bill. I am not saying that there has not been progress made. Earlier today the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] made an aggressive demonstration of how tightfisted Congress has been compared to the rest of Government. I do not argue with his numbers, but I find myself wondering about his standards.

Madam Chairman, I am thinner than John Goodman, but I am not skinny. It depends on where you start from in evaluating whether we are making progress or not.

Madam Chairman, when I see how higher taxes, regulations, and the other costs mandated by this body affect my constituents, I have little sympathy for the concerns raised here today.

We ask them to tighten their belts—we should tighten our own. I urge my colleagues to say "no" to irresponsible spending by saying "yes" to the Boehner amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], chairman of the

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

□ 1550

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I am going to focus particularly on its effort to eliminate the Office of Technology Assessment.

Now, I gather that the proponent of the amendment just decided to put all joint House-Senate organizations on the chopping block here. But OTA is a truly-unique organization, not like the other joint committees, in essence that it was set up to be absolutely bipartisan, equal Republican, equal Democrats, equal House, equal Senate. It has not had any growth in budget, and it performs a service that all who have had any experience with it will recognize is of immense value.

The former director of the OTA is now the President's science adviser and is doing a marvelous job there based on his experience serving the House for a dozen or so years before then.

Any committee chairman, any Member, can request reports and studies from the OTA. Their reputation is impeccable for being unbiased, and it is internationally copied around the world as an excellent way of serving parliamentary parties.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Ohio, Mr. BOEHNER.

Madam Chairman, we have been sent to Congress by our constituents to put our Nation's budget in order. They have grown weary of the strain of ever increasing tax burdens as our $4.5 trillion national debt grows out of control. I say to my colleagues that the first place we ought to start trimming the fat from the budget is the spending of the legislative branch.

This amendment will cut some very unnecessary spending. For example, it will eliminate over $100,000 for automobiles for the House leadership. Madam Chairman, I, like most of my colleagues, drive myself to work. Why do Members of the House leadership have to be driven here at taxpayers' expense?

The President has asked the American people to sacrifice in order that we may get America's budget in order. Let the sacrifice start here. This amendment will freeze the spending of the legislature in fiscal year 1995 at fiscal year 1994 levels. Families all over America must keep their spending levels consistent with their income. I am not prepared to go back to my constituents and ask for more of their hard-earned money so that the Botanic Garden can install an $80,000 security gate as they reconstruct the conservatory, also at taxpayer expense.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that we may demonstrate serious fiscal responsibility to the American people. I believe that it is the least we can do considering what we ask of them every April 15.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, this is an incredible amendment. It has not been mentioned that while there are many freezes for agencies, there is an 11 percent cut for the General Accounting Office, and we just previously rejected a 5-percent cut. I would suggest to you that this would be a repudiation of the debate that we have just concluded on the immediately preceding amendment.

In addition, it would force the elimination of 600 more positions. Please do not do this to the General Accounting Office, your investigating arm.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Boehner amendment to freeze funding at 1994 levels.

I offered a similar amendment, which called for a 5.7-percent across-the-board cut, but my amendment was rejected by the Committee on Rules.

As one who has long called for greater fiscal restraint, I think it is important that we be honest with the American taxpayers and admit that this bill will increase the amount of money Congress spends on itself by over $100 million—to nearly $2 billion next year.

Each member of this body should go home this Memorial Day recess and ask his or her constituents if they believe Congress deserves a $100 million raise for the coming year.

We all know what the answer would be.

Until this body begins to adequately address the budget deficit crisis, it is highly inappropriate to increase our funding one dime.

Let us lead by example. Let us freeze our own budget. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Boehner amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Chairman, this amendment, whether you understand it or not, you ought to think about it. It eliminates the Joint Tax Committee. That is the committee of the Congress that looks at what the revenue impacts are that the Committee on Ways and Means designs all the tax bills on the basis of. You are simply taking away all of the technical capability to look at the complexity of our tax system. We will not have any idea what any of the tax bills are if you wipe this committee out. It is simply irresponsible not to leave that committee in place.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], a member of the OTA board.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Madam Chairman, I think this is a bad amendment.

There is a concept called return on investment. We do not score things properly. You can get a $100 return on a $1 investment, and they only talk about the dollar of cost invested. That is wrong.

This involves something called the Office of Technology Assessment. If war is going to be economic, not military, it is going to be involved with something we have to do in technology. This is a very important area. The people in OTA control their budget well. They are terrific. They do a service for us. It is a one of a kind agency, and I think we ought to keep it.

Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, in my capacity as chair of the Subcommittee on Aviation, I can say to all of you who fly, the GAO has made aviation safer, quieter, and kept costs in control, and made it more secure.

Their work on aviation security at national airports and overseas, their work on staffing standards for air traffic controllers, their oversight of the multi-billion-dollar advanced automation system, and their review of airport investment funding and construction of airports, has made an enormous contribution to aviation at very little cost.

Do not vote for this cut.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chairman, I know this amendment before us is going to cause a little grief, because we are actually going to say we are not going to spend more next year than what we spent this year.

Now, the gentleman from the State of Washington said that we needed the Joint Committee on Taxation to score different tax issues that come before this body. The Joint Committee on Taxation does not do that. We have the Congressional Budget Office to do that.

Beyond the amount of money that is cut in my amendment, this House today on this bill has already cut an additional $12 million. If in fact we want to set aside money for the Office of Technology Assessment, or some more money to minimize the GAO cut, that additional $12 million of cuts is there to do that, and still meet the levels we were at last year.

My colleagues, if we are going to lead by example, this is the place to do it, this is the time to do it, and I urge the adoption of this important amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, let me close by saying this is the most draconian amendment that has been offered in a number of years on this bill. First of all, it cuts the GAO $47.3 million, more than the $30 million that was offered a while back by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and defeated.

□ 1600

It cuts out the Office of Technology Assessment totally, which, as we all know, is one of the few entities we can look to to handle the very complex and technical issues that our committees deal with.

Most importantly, it eliminates the Joint Committee on Taxation, which is the one place all of us, in both Houses, in both parties, go to determine the cost of revenue measures. It has been stated that CBO does that. CBO does not cost revenue measures. It looks at entitlements, and it looks at discretionary spending. There is no replacement for the Joint Committee on Taxation.

In addition, Madam Chairman, it guts other programs. The GPO is cut $9.8 million. We have just taken up the GPO on three occasions here today and reduced their appropriation. Please vote "no" on this very, very ill-conceived amendment.

To summarize, this amendment eliminates the fiscal year 1995 funding for: the Joint Economic Committee, $4.1 million; the Joint Committee on Printing, $1.4 million; Joint Committee on Taxation, $6 million; Office of Technology Assessment, $21.9; and, makes very drastic reductions in: Architect of the Capitol and Botanic Garden, $17.2 million; GPO, $9.8 million; and GAO, $47.3 million, for a total reduction of $107.7 million.

The reductions will cripple several legislative branch duties:

We will not have the expertise of a Joint Economic Committee which is our only organized, professionally based expertise that studies our national economy.

We will lose the board of directors that oversees Federal printing policy—the Joint Printing Committee. We need that expertise now more than we ever have. Printing technology is exploding—and agencies need oversight or we will lose control of our ability to control costs and to provide the U.S. public free access to Federal documents.

Eliminating the Joint Tax staff is almost a ludicrous idea. We are doing health care reform, welfare reform, major trade legislation. The Congress cannot afford to be without their expertise.

Eliminating OTA is shortsighted. They are our liaison with the scientific community. OTA keeps the Congress informed—nuclear waste; the national information infrastructure; defense conversion; medical technology; and so forth. Do we want to just wait for the executive branch to advise us on these issues?

The GAO has already eliminated almost 10 percent of their staff in the past 3 years. Do we want to just give up on finding fraud, waste, and abuse? Do we want to give up on the studies we are starting to make in financial auditing—through the Chief Financial Officers Act?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 238, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—187

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Rush
Santorum
Schaefer
Schenk
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Swett
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—238

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—14

Clay
Clement
Cox
Franks (CT)
Grandy
Horn
Neal (NC)
Pickett
Schumer
Skelton
Slattery
Stark
Washington
Wilson

□ 1619

The Clerk announced the following pairs on this vote:

On this vote:

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Slattery against.

Mr. Grandy for, with Mr. Wilson against.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DE LA GARZA) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MINK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4454) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 444, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendments thereto.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them engross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4454 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 3 line 23, strike "$16,017,000" and insert "$3,017,000". Conform the aggregate amount set forth on page 2, line 10, accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I think most of our Members read with interest the story in Roll Call where the chairman of the Committee on House Administration this week pledged to collect $13 million in unpaid bills that congressional offices owed to the House Computer Center.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit, we think, helps him do just that. The motion to recommit reduces the HIS budget by $13 million, which is the amount that is in question here.

Rather than just take the word of the Roll Call story, I sent out for the CRS documentation, and sure enough, the CRS documents the debt at $13,409,974. They can collect this money, and then they will be back at the level that was appropriated in the bill originally.

After all of the excitement that we had today in the enactment of a lot of good amendments, we have done a tremendous job. We reduced this bill by $22.8 million; that is all. We are still $78.7 million over last year, or a 4.4-percent increase.

If we adopt this motion to recommit, again, a minor amount, we will be at a 3.7-percent increase, and maybe we all could live with that.

This is a very simple, straightforward motion; there is no rhetoric involved. There are no cheap shots involved. There is no political interest involved. There is just simply a way to get down to that 3.7, reduce the HIS budget by $13 million and help the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], collect that $13 million from the other offices that owe that money to them and not have those due bills out there floating around.

Mr. Speaker, this still does not reduce this bill to where I think it ought to be, but the Committee on Rules did not let us have those amendments that would have done that. I say again, as I did earlier in the debate, this is a very small amount. The amount in this bill is a small amount compared to the rest of the Federal Government.

But still, this is where we work, and we are the ones that ought to set the example, and we ought to set the example on the appropriation that deals with each of us in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we ought to agree to this motion to recommit and then move on to final passage.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. You know, in poker, a legitimate part of the game is bluffing. It is an integral part of the game. However, when you bluff, you also leave yourself open to somebody calling your bluff.

Now, there are an awful lot of provisions in the legislative branch cuts plan that are bluffs.

When you talked about cutting full-time positions, it was cuts off of investigating committees that have already been reduced. When you counted reducing staff, it was staff on leave without pay. Those people are on leave without pay because they intend to come back to work.

When you talk about contracting out the restaurant, you are moving those employees from one payroll to another. You are not really cutting staff.

It seems to me if we can find $13 million, the only thing this House can do, as the ranking member has indicated, is to give a little more incentive to the pledge that was already made in Roll Call; we can make sure that this $13 million is collected by reducing the appropriation by that same amount. In other words, we can call the gentleman's bluff.

I congratulate the gentleman on his motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I will just simply say we are legitimately trying to help the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], collect this $13 million.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] rise in opposition?

Mr. FAZIO. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have the need to clarify some things with the minority. Apparently this is a cut in the House Information Systems budget? Is that correct? Is that correct? And it is premised on an article which I have not read. I mean, we are making legislation based on rollcall articles.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, you know, I did not want to go by the Roll Call article either, so I went to CRS. I got the documentation on their figures, what they say is owed to HIS from the various offices.

Mr. FAZIO. And their figures are that much? The CRS indicates that?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes. This is a CRS study dated May 23, 1994.

Mr. FAZIO. I just wanted to say that the documents which I have, which are the legislative branch appropriations hearings, indicate there is an arrearage, failure to reimburse, of $645,000 in one of the House offices. Is that correct? Unpaid reimbursements? The official document here says $6,420,000 will be reimbursed in fiscal 1995.

So I am hoping we can clarify this issue, Mr. Speaker. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, which has jurisdiction over HIS.

Mr. ROSE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You all have heard about the shortfall that we have for 1994. All of you in this body know about the shortfall that we have all got to work to solve for fiscal year 1994.

We have come up with a suggestion that we believe will work, and we will collect that money to pay off the shortfall for 1994.

What this amendment does is to cut out the money to pay for the employees that work at the House Computer

Center. HIS is what makes this place as productive as it is. It gives you the computer support that enables the staff that you have to do more than you have ever been able to do before.

If you want to cut off the legs of the people who improve your productivity at the committee level, at the administrative level, at your personal office level, that is what this amendment will do.

Ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues, I beg you, please, do not vote for this motion to recommit. It will take away from the House the ability to continue to improve the productivity of this place.

We cannot add more staff. We cannot add more offices. We have to make the staff that we have now more productive. We do that through modern technology at the House Information Systems.

This is a very mischievous amendment.

□ 1630

This is a very mischievous amendment. I hope you will vote against it and that we can move onto passage and, hopefully, go home.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DE LA GARZA). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 177, nays 241, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—177

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—241

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—16

Bachus (AL)
Clay
Clement
Cox
DeFazio
Franks (CT)
Grandy
Horn
Machtley
Manton
Neal (NC)
Schumer
Skelton
Slattery
Washington
Wilson

□ 1647

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Wilson against.

Mr. Grandy for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

Mr. Machtley for, with Mr. Slattery against.

Mr. LAUGHLIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DE LA GARZA). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 205, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

AYES—210

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Byrne
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes

Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—205

Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lambert
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Mann
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—19

Clay
Clement
Cox
de la Garza
DeFazio
Fish
Ford (MI)
Franks (CT)
Grandy
Horn
Machtley
Manton
Nadler
Neal (NC)
Schumer
Skelton
Slattery
Washington
Wilson

□ 1706

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Skelton for, with Mr. Cox against.
Mr. DeFazio for, with Mr. Grandy against.
Mr. Wilson for, with Mr. Machtley against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1994, I missed four rollcall votes. It was due, Mr. Speaker, to my early departure to my district to witness the birth of my son, Gary Alvin Franks, Jr. Gary, Jr., his mother, Dona, and his two sisters, Azia and Jessica, are all doing very well.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall votes 213, 214, 215, and nay for rollcall vote 216.

REPORT ON H.R. 4506, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1995

Mr. BEVILL, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-533) on the bill (H.R. 4506) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, which was referred to Union Calendar No. 294, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLO reserved all points of order on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON TREASURY, U.S. POSTAL SERVICE, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1995

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight, May 26, 1994, to file a privileged report to accompany a bill providing appropriations for the Treasury Department, the US Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I have checked this out with the Minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINGERHUT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 8 ON FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 1994

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to file its report on H.R. 8, the Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act on Friday, June 3, 1994.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR TODAY FOR MEMBERS TO EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATTER IN EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS SECTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for today, May 26, 1994, all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Wednesday, June 8, 1994, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, June 8, 1994.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 407

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 407.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF REVISION OF DATE FOR INTRODUCTION OF PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION REGARDING INVESTIGATION OF HOUSE POST OFFICE

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday we filed a privileged resolution regarding an ethics investigation into the House Post Office. It was my original intention to call up that resolution either this afternoon or this evening.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule IX of the rules of the House, I wish to give formal notice of calling up that privileged resolution No. 436 instead after we return from Memorial Day on either Wednesday, June 8, or Thursday, June 9, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD as if read at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 436

Whereas allegations reported in public and made in official Department of Justice court documents that personnel of the House Post Office provided illegal cash to certain Members in three ways: (1) cash instead of stamps for official vouchers, (2) cash for postage stamps which had earlier been purchased with official vouchers, and (3) cash for campaign checks;

Whereas the Department of Justice has secured admissions of criminal guilt regarding past activities in the House Post Office;

Whereas multiple concerns and allegations of possible wrongdoing by House employees, a House officer, and Members had been raised within the report of the House Administration Committee Task Force to Investigate the Operation and Management of the House Post Office;

Whereas all these allegations directly affect the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings, and the rights, reputation, and conduct of its Members;

Whereas Article I, Section 5, of the Constitution gives each House of Congress responsibility over disorderly behavior of its Members; and

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has jurisdiction over the conduct and behavior of current House Members, officers, and employees, including investigatory authority, and is the appropriate body of this House to conduct any inquiry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is instructed to immediately investigate any alleged violation, by any Member, officer, or employee of the House, of the Code of Official Conduct or of any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct that is related to activities, described by or referred to in, documents that it received on July 22, 1992, from the Committee on House Administration pertaining to the House Administration Committee Task Force to Investigate the Operation and Management of the House Post Office investigation. Not later than 60 days after this resolution is agreed to and periodically thereafter, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House the status of this investigation. Not later than September 30, 1994, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House its findings of fact and recommendations on possible disciplinary actions.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Ethics Committee from Eric H. Holder, U.S. attorney at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINGERHUT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, DC, May 26, 1994.

Hon. JIM McDERMOTT,
Chairman, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN McDERMOTT: This is in response to your letter of May 25, 1994, inviting the views of this Office on the pendency of House Resolution 436. The Resolution would direct the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to commence immediately an investigation of matters associated with the House Post Office.

This Office's views on such a measure are unequivocal: a parallel investigation by a congressional committee, at this juncture, would interfere directly with the federal grand jury's final considerations of possible criminal charges based on the same factual circumstances.

I and my predecessors in this Office have repeatedly asked the House of Representatives not to take similar action on similar measures. We have appreciated the consistent courtesy shown by your Committee, and by the leadership of both parties in the House, in requesting our views on such matters. We have also appreciated the restraint shown by the House as a whole in resisting calls for internal House inquiries that could have crippled the criminal investigation. Most recently, in a letter to the Speaker and the Minority Leader dated February 23 of this year, I explained that this lengthy investigation was in its final stages and would be concluded in the near future. The House prudently concluded at that time, as it had done before, that any inquiry by the Ethics Committee should at least await the conclusion of the grand jury's investigation.

House Resolution 436 is squarely at odds with the care so far shown by the House to respect the integrity of the criminal process. The grand jury's investigation of the matters discussed in my letter of February 23 is virtually concluded. If that investigation results in further criminal charges, then I assume that the House will take the only conceivably responsible course, and will refrain from any inquiry of its own until the criminal case is concluded. Particularly in that light, the action contemplated by House Resolution 436, coming as it does at the very culmination of the grand jury's investigation, seems both inappropriate and almost irresponsible, since it could not be better timed to complicate a criminal investigation that is in its final days.

I urge the House of Representatives not to take an action that would be so heedless of the processes of criminal justice.

Thank you again for the opportunity to express these views.

Sincerely,

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr.,
U.S. Attorney.

□ 1710

DESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE STENY H. HOYER TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JUNE 8, 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 26, 1994.

I hereby designate the Honorable STENY H. HOYER to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through June 8, 1994.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

DEMANDING AN APOLOGY FROM THE FOUR SEASONS HOTEL IN BOSTON

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a story reported in the Washington Post. The Four Seasons Hotel in Boston, a fancy, expensive hotel, directed supervisors to allow only whites to serve the prime minister of India on his recent visit to Boston. The Indian Prime Minister had spoken just days earlier in this body to a joint session of Congress.

The action by the Four Seasons Hotel is an outrage. The Four Seasons may be a five-star hotel chain, but they showed zero character in this incident. They have thrown their vaunted reputation for service in the trash.

The hotel issued an apology to two waiters, one African-American, and one Hispanic, for their gross bigotry. That apology, however, is not enough. They need to apologize to America for this disgusting behavior.

Mr. Speaker, the Four Seasons Hotel gave the Indian Prime Minister a glimpse of the worst instincts of some Americans, instead of displaying our greatest strength—the ability to work together in a multiracial society.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a Washington Post article describing the incident of discrimination by the Four Seasons Hotel:

BOSTON HOTEL APOLOGIZES FOR INCIDENT

BOSTON, May 24.—A human rights commission said today it will press ahead with a bias probe against a Boston hotel where Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao stayed last week.

The hotel, which directed supervisors to allow only whites to serve Rao during a visit last week, issued an apology for the incident Monday and said it reimbursed two black employees the $179 they would have earned by serving Rao's entourage.

The two employees, Harrison Lilly, 28, and Jose Abad, 26, said they would not pursue the formal complaint of discrimination against the Four Seasons Hotel that they made to the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination.

"This is an MCAD-filed complaint against the Four Seasons Hotel," spokeswoman Jane Brayton said. "That is not over."

In New Delhi, an Indian government spokesman Monday denied that any racial or ethnic discrimination request was made.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and May 23, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RESTORE TAX FAIRNESS—CLOSE THE LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clear a glaring tax loophole. My legislation will require mutual life insurance companies to pay their fair share of taxes. This legislation would only affect the 18 largest mutual life insurance companies that are now legally depriving this country of $1.5 to $2 billion every single year. Furthermore, my legislation will have no impact on small business as it purposely exempts small life insurance companies from this requirement. Mr. Speaker, I will include the full text of this bill, entitled the Insurance Tax Fairness Act of 1994, in the RECORD.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, to announce that I am joined in this important legislation by my distinguished colleague from California, HOWARD L. BERMAN, MAXINE WATERS, XAVIER BECERRA, and GEORGE BROWN; JOLENE UNSOELD of Washington; ELIZABETH FURSE of Oregon; CYNTHIA MCKINNEY of Georgia; ALCEE HASTINGS of Florida; ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON of Washington, DC; MEL WATT of North Carolina; NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ of New York; and PATSY MINK of Hawaii.

It is an honor be joined by this distinguished group, and I know as more Members, on both sides of the aisle, have an opportunity to become familiar with this issue, they will want to join us in this effort. I welcome future cosponsors, and will be happy to provide any background material.

I enjoyed the privilege to be associated during the early stages of my political career with the legendary Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. Many of the programs which play such an important role in American life today, such as the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program, can be traced to this great American folk hero. As one example, the WIC Program has literally saved the lives of millions of infants, and has saved billions of dollars by reducing future health care costs. But there are estimates that the program fails to reach nearly 3 million pregnant women, infants and children who would be eligible for the program but are not served because of budget restraints. We can go anywhere in America today and find praise for the WIC Program; we have the opportunity in this and subsequent sessions of Congress to provide the adequate funding necessary without raising a penny of taxes.

How can I possibly explain to my constituents—and to the memory of Hubert Humphrey—that we cannot feed hungry children, provide the complete level of school breakfasts, fully fund a program such as WIC or help our cities provide emergency services while some companies are not paying their fair share of taxes?

My legislation will bring $1.5 to $2 billion in additional revenue each year by replacing an existing section of a tax code that every expert who has looked at it—including expert witnesses before Congress—says is not working.

My constituents did not send me to the 103d Congress to be a "potted plant." In fact, we were sent here to make a difference, and not do things in the same old ways. That was our pledge, and this legislation is precisely about restoring tax fairness, closing a loophole, and not conducting business as usual.

This legislation is about the ability of this Nation to tax all citizens and corporations equally, and making sure that Federal dollars are spent on programs that are truly in the national interest. The Ways and Means Committee asked the insurance industry to propose a replacement for Section 809 of the Internal Revenue Code in 1989, when it became obvious that the section was not generating the revenues intended when it was enacted in 1984. The mutual companies were supposed to come forward with recommendations. They have not done so. So the matter before us today is one of fairness and equity.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this legislation, I am reminded of the famous words of Hubert Humphrey: "The moral test of government," he said, "is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, those who are in the twilight of life, and those who are in the shadows of life."

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, that is what this legislation is all about—to raise the congressional score on this moral test. I urge its careful consideration through the congressional process.

When I circulated by "Dear Colleague" letter, Mr. Speaker, I included a page entitled "Close the Loophole: A Brief Explanation." I include the full text in the RECORD.

CLOSE THE LOOPHOLE: A BRIEF EXPLANATION

Congress is preparing to give $2 billion to the mutual life insurance industry in year 1995, even while proposing cutbacks for some programs and considering tax increases to fund other programs. Pleas for funds to feed hungry children, protect children in poverty and provide services for others are ignored.

This "gift" is based on the failure of federal tax code Section 809, first passed in 1984. The purpose of 809 was, and is, to tax mutual life insurance companies as if they were stock companies. Both corporate forms sell the same often, identical products, and differ only in how they return profits to their owners. Stock companies pay profits to stockholders, mutual companies to their policy holders. Section 809 proposes to impute a profit on mutual company earnings similar to the earnings of stock companies.

According to experts (including those used by the IRS), if Section 809 had performed as expected, mutual life insurance companies would now be paying $2 billion a year more in federal taxes. The fact that 809 is not working was acknowledged as long ago as 1988 when both the Treasury Department and the General Accounting Office (GAO) began studies of the problem in search of remedies. Both the Treasury and the GAO reports in 1989 agree on these conclusions: Section 809 has failed to generate the revenues expected by Congress in 1984 and Congress should take corrective action. Both reports suggested several options to remedy the problem, but did not agree on a common solution. Hearings were held in 1989, but no legislation emerged. Instead, the life insurance industry was asked to develop a proposal and bring it to Congress.

That was five years ago. The failure of Section 809 could be considered a technical matter in 1989. Five years later the matter has become a moral and ethical issue. The refusal of the insurance industry to suggest a remedy has to be considered an affront to Congress, a matter of contempt, conveying a belief that the industry can block legislative action to protect the mutual life insurance industry annual $2 billion loophole.

Congress has many difficult, hard choices to make. The loss of $2 billion in annual revenues makes the choices between military

spending, welfare reform, health care, social services, veterans programs and hunger even more difficult than need be. Closing the 809 loophole is an easy choice—but a difficult political decision. The legislation to close the loophole is a message to the insurance industry that the special interest gravy train has run out of tracks, and a commitment to hungry children that Congress has its priorities straight. When nearly one of every four children live in poverty households today, Congress has an easy choice to make, and can do no less.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Insurance Tax Fairness Act of 1994".

SEC. 2. REVISION OF LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION OF POLICYHOLDER DIVIDENDS BY MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 808(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to reduction in case of mutual companies) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) LIMITATION IN CASE OF MUTUAL COMPANIES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a mutual life insurance company, the amount allowed as a deduction under paragraph (1) for any taxable year shall not exceed the lesser of—

"(i) 90 percent of the policyholder dividends paid or accrued by such company during such taxable year, or

"(ii) 30 percent of the life insurance company taxable income of such company for such taxable year (determined without regard to any deduction for policyholder dividends).

In no event shall the limitation under this subparagraph for any taxable year be less than $35,000,000.

"(B) TREATMENT OF STOCK COMPANIES OWNED BY MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES.—Solely for purposes of this paragraph, a stock life insurance company shall be treated as a mutual life insurance company if stock possessing—

"(i) at least 80 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of such stock life insurance company entitled to vote, or

"(ii) at least 80 percent of the total value of shares of all classes of stock of such stock life insurance company,

is owned at any time during the calendar year directly (or through the application of section 318) by one or more mutual life insurance companies)."

(b) REPEAL OF SECTION 809.—

(1) Section 809 of such Code is hereby repealed.

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 807(a)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the amount of the policyholders' share of tax-exempt interest,".

(3) Subparagraph (B) of section 807(b)(1) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the amount of the policyholders' share of tax-exempt interest,".

(4) Subparagraph (A) of section 812(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking "sections 808 and 809" and inserting "section 808".

(5) Subsection (c) of section 817 of such Code is amended by striking "(other than section 809)".

(6) Subsection (c) of section 842 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL..—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1993.

(2) RECOMPUTATION UNDER SECTION 809 (f) NOT AFFECTED.—The amendments made by this section shall not affect the application of section 809(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect before its repeal by subsection (b)) in respect of any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1994.

(3) LIMITATION ON LOSS CARRYBACKS.—In the case of a life insurance company subject to the limitation under section 808(b)(2) of such Code, no capital loss arising in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1993, may be carried to a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1994.

SEC. 3. SMALL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES EXEMPT FROM REQUIRED CAPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN POLICY ACQUISITION EXPENSES.

Section 848 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to capitalization of certain policy acquisition expenses) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(k) EXEMPTION FOR SMALL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES.—This section shall not require any small life insurance company (as defined in section 806) to capitalize any specified policy acquisition expenses for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1993."

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO USE OF INCREASED REVENUES.

It is the sense of the Congress that any increase in revenues to the Treasury resulting from the amendments made by this Act shall be dedicated to the funding of programs benefiting the nutrition, early education, housing, and family support of the Nation's children.

STRICKLAND ELEVATOR AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a few minutes to talk about an experience that I had in this Chamber today. I am a freshman Member of Congress and I offered my first amendment. It was an amendment that I thought was reasonable, simple, easy to understand, and very straightforward. It was an amendment that would have saved $6.58 million by deleting plans to construct six new elevators for the Longworth Building.

I talk about this issue not because I think it is an earth-shattering issue but because I think it is illustrative of a problem that we sometimes face in this Chamber. The Longworth Building has eight elevators and they are terrible, they are in disrepair, they are slow, and they cause unacceptable inconvenience. Yet we are spending well over a million dollars to refurbish those elevators, to bring them up to speed, so to speak.

It seemed reasonable to me that we ought to give this modernization attempt a chance to prove itself before we would spend $6.5 million to construct six new elevators.

But the reason I am talking about it tonight is because I learned something.

□ 1720

I learned that those who use rhetoric about saving tax dollars are very selective in how they do that. I particularly refer to my friends on the other side of the aisle who stand here day after day and talk about wasteful spending, and yet when it came to an issue, a simple issue of eliminating six new elevators and saving $6.5 million, they did not stand to allow me to have a recorded vote.

As I said at the beginning of this statement, I learned something today. It is easy to talk about cutting when you are talking about cutting programs that do not affect you personally or do not cause you personal inconvenience. But I would appeal to my brethren and my sisters on the other side of the aisle to start putting their vote where their rhetoric is.

RENEWING MOST-FAVORED-NATION TRADING STATUS WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, just moments ago, President Clinton made a significant policy statement with respect to renewing most-favored-nation trading status with the People's Republic of China. In his statement he said that he has made the decision to delink the human rights issue with the MFN accord.

I rise this evening to praise the President for this very, very difficult policy decision and tough, tough political decision. He has once again decided to lead based on fact, based on good policy.

This is a bold step in advancing United States relations with China beyond the stalemate of recent years. And with this announcement, President Clinton acknowledges the shortcomings, yes, of recent United States-China policy but also takes the opportunity not to retreat from our values of human rights in the United States and our commitment to human rights throughout the world.

It fits in with the new policy begun last year to engage the People's Republic not just on trade, not just on the human right issue, but across the board. The United States has sent many delegations and exchanges to China to engage them comprehensively, whether it is in commerce, whether it is in human rights, whether it is in education. It is on many fronts that we must do this.

Mr. Speaker, all of these meetings stressed though, as part of those meetings, the importance of human rights

with this administration and with the American people. There are many avenues to pressure human rights, the human rights issues on China, and the President announced this evening that we will move forward by establishing a United States Commission on Human Rights to focus on China, to allow people in government and business leaders to come forward and present ideas, further ideas to move China in a more positive direction.

We also need to work multilaterally to pressure China to improve the human rights situation, whether it is through the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and other U.N. development programs. All of these programs offer an opportunity for the United States, working with the international community, to pressure China for human rights improvements and democratic reform.

Contact with the United States interests and advances in the cause of human rights and democratic reform in China is paramount, and businesses such as Hewlett-Packard and, Mr. Speaker, I am including in this point in the RECORD their statement of their code of conduct for their companies, Chinese employees doing business in China and working in China.

The President is calling upon the American business community doing business in China to adopt a code of conduct that they will adhere to, and this code of conduct, as Hewlett-Packard has already implemented, says they will treat their workers the same way that they treat American workers.

I want to take just a few moments to recognize two great champions in the United States on human rights, and that is Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI and Senator GEORGE MITCHELL. Because of their work, I think the President has made a decision that is going to help China move toward human rights, to do that by taking a new approach, and it is through their continuous hard-fought advocacy that this will occur.

Finally, let me commend the President on this tough political decision, but one that I am certain is in the best interests of the people of China and the people of the United States.

CHINA HEWLETT-PACKARD AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Hewlett-Packard in 1985 formed a joint venture in China which has grown to employ approximately 550 employees located throughout the country. Through the contacts created by this business, HP is transferring the Western values and HP values which are helping to transform China at a grassroots level. Ultimately, it is the development of our people which promotes the human rights values which are the focus of the current debate. The HP programs which enhance—directly and indirectly—human rights in China include:

Overseas Training Trips: 309 trips in 1993, 1,214 in the last four years create eye-opening exposure the CHP employees to the outside world.

Foreign Assignments and Extended Travel: enable key employees and future leaders to obtain comprehensive outside exposure.

House Purchasing Programs: permits employees to personally enjoy the benefits of private ownership, extended credit, and profit. The program was publicly announced Monday, April 25, and 47 employees signed purchase agreements and mortgage agreements on the first day.

HP Profit Sharing Program: all employees learn to benefit from company growth and productivity.

HP Stock Appreciation Program: rewards top performers for special efforts/results.

HP Electronic Mail: enables employees to communicate with peers around the world on business issues.

HP personnel policies also focus particularly on the importance of the individual and individual contributions and initiative:

HP Way: individual goal setting, responsibility, accountability.

Management Training: career growth and promotion, emphasis on delegation of authority, management by objective.

HP practices in China are consistent with HP policies worldwide as established in Palo Alto, CA at corporate headquarters.

Labor Standards: general working conditions, worker safety, and office equipment are world-class.

Pay: HP salaries are several times the comparable local salary levels.

Environmental Standards: identical to those in U.S. and elsewhere.

Facilities: likewise first class, and inspected frequently by international management teams.

Donations: HP makes contributions to local universities consistent with our worldwide practices and guidelines.

Other comments from the local China Hewlett-Packard perspective:

The U.S. image in the Far East has been tarnished significantly by the MFN debate. Many countries in the region consider the U.S. MFN policy foolish, short-sighted, and neo-colonialist, and several are publicly critical of it.

Our competitors—Seimens, Alcatel, NEC Fujitsu—are firmly entrenched in the China marketplace, and would benefit immensely from a disruption of U.S.-China trade, at a time when large infrastructure projects are being bid which will determine supplier relationships for the next 10-20 years.

China has been historically receptive to outsiders (often for good cause), as evidenced by the Great Wall, Boxer Rebellion, and Cultural Revolution. We have a unique historical opportunity to integrate China into the rest of the world, and U.S. policy should therefore emphasize the broadcast possible engagement, and not cut off contacts by revoking MFN.

Since the British agreed to cede Hong Kong to China, the major question mark in the Far East has been whether Beijing (with its control, non-market economy) would transform Hong Kong (with its free enterprise economy), or Hong Kong transform Beijing. The odds on Hong Kong were not good. But miraculously, there is growing hope that through the back door of trade and engagement, Hong Kong's values will yet prevail. We should do what we can to help Hong Kong preserve and extend its free enterprise values into the rest of China.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS WILLIAM TOMASIC

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

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a moment to remember Francis William Tomasic, a young man from Bloomington, IN, who was the most recent fatality on a long list of journalists who have died in the combat zones of disintegrating Yugoslavia.

In 3 years, 44 journalists have died in the line of duty in the conflicts in Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia according to the Committee to Protect Journalists. What that means is that the 3 years of this Balkan war have proven to be the deadliest in history for reporters—deadlier for reporters than even our 10 years in Vietnam.

Combat zones are unpredictable places, and the combat zones in the new Republics of former Yugoslavia may be more unpredictable than most, but it has been the world's press corps that has taken the risks to bring us a far better view of the horrible realities of this new Balkan war. If the members of the press corps had not daily risked their lives in places like Vukovar, Mostar, Sarajevo, and Gorazde, the tragedy would have passed unnoticed and countless thousands more innocent civilians would have been murdered.

On May 1, Francis Tomasic, freelance photographer Brian Brinton, and reporter William Vollman were riding in a jeep which struck mines planted on a road north of Mostar in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The United Nations had denied the three assistance in trying to get to Sarajevo so they were trying to drive there by road and simply took a wrong turn.

Francis Tomasic grew up in Bloomington and went to high school there. His father was on the faculty at Indiana University. A friend of mine who knew Francis well says that he was a person of "inexhaustible sweetness," and that he was not someone who understood malice. That is significant because Francis was of Croatian ancestry in a place where hatred along ethnic lines regularly moves armies.

In the last piece that Fran Tomasic wrote for the Bloomington Voice was titled "Where Are All the Graves." In that 9,000 words he made reference to time that he spent traveling in Serbian occupied Croatia he wrote:

I sensed that they were mostly trying especially hard to be nice to me. I was in turn trying to be especially nice, although I was partially motivated by a sense of self preservation. You can't go to Vukovar, you're Croatian. If you go there, the Chetniks will kill you, a friend in Zagreb had said to me.

Francis Tomasic, aged 36, was buried on May 13 next to his father on the island of Hvar off the Dalmatian Coast. He is survived by his mother Carol Tomasic and his brother Anthony Tomasic of Bloomington, IN.

It seems to me profoundly important to note that Francis Tomasic was where he wanted to be—in Bosnia—

doing what he wanted to do which was witnessing one of the great tragedies of our decade.

CLARIFICATION OF NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the statement issued last week by the British Government responding to questions posed by Sinn Fein. Those questions related to the Downing Street Declaration jointly issued by the Irish and British Governments. The declaration set out the principles for a political process aimed at achieving a lasting political solution that could be embraced by both traditions in Northern Ireland.

Since the declaration was issued on December 15, 1993, the I.R.A. and its political arm, Sinn Fein, have clamored for clarification. Only recently did Sinn Fein set out its actual questions. Those questions and the responses of the British Government have now been made public. The Irish Government has made clear that it supports and agrees with the British responses.

I believe that it could not be plainer that the British Government, indeed both Governments, seek genuine peace and reconciliation in the North. They believe—and who in this House would gainsay this principle—that such ends can only be achieved through the expressed will of an uncoerced majority of the people of the North, freely expressed at the ballot box.

Both Governments have pledged unequivocally to honor that expression through any necessary legislative or constitutional changes. Such a process would allow for a range of possible relationships with the rest of Ireland, including unification, which would likewise require the democratic consent of a majority of the people in the Republic of Ireland.

What the declaration, and now its clarification, state and restate is that the process they envisage will embrace the totality of relationships in the island of Ireland and between the British and Irish Governments, that there are no subjects which cannot be brought to the table, but that only democratic parties devoted to exclusively peaceful change can sit at that table.

Thus, the I.R.A. need not surrender. Sinn Fein need not accept the declaration. Conversely, however, no party can expect to participate in political dialog unless it can demonstrate it has laid aside the gun and the bomb.

Just as important, the declaration is indeed a way forward. It cannot be vetoed by parties which will not participate in the process it invites. Just as it would be wrong to predetermine what that process can achieve, it would be equally wrong to allow it to be stymied by those who refuse to renounce terror.

Mr. Speaker, the way forward is now clear. There can be no legitimate claim that the two Governments have not laid all their cards on the table. Only one question remains unanswered today, but it must be directed to the men of violence, to both the republican and loyalist paramilitaries. It is simple but profound, and it is asked by the vast majority of people in Ireland, both North and South.

"Will you now end the killing and transform your armed struggle to peaceful debate and democratic decision?" The answer to that question will provide the real clarification for the future of peace in Northern Ireland.

□ 1730

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINGERHUT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and May 23, 1994, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, we are going on a district work break, what is called the Memorial recess. During the upcoming week, the largest congressional contingent that I can recall will be commemorating and honoring an important day in history, that day being June 6, 1944, D-day. This large delegation is going to Europe and will visit Utah Beach, Omaha Beach. Some of America's World War II veterans who saw the fire of combat during that amazing period of history are going to speak as are Canadian and British veterans.

I would like to share the following with C-SPAN's audience of 1.5 million.

I would like to use my imagination here for a minute and tell you, Mr. Speaker pro tempore, what I would have done today were I the Speaker. I would have set the scene for this Memorial Day recess. Most of our Members from both sides of the aisle have been invited to Memorial Day ceremonies at graveyards all over the country, particularly to beautiful Federal graveyards like Sautelle in west Los Angeles or Arlington. They have been invited to speak, to pause again for the men and women who have given the full measure of devotion, to use Lincoln's beautiful, poetic expression, "dying for your friends and your country." I would like to tell you what I would have done were I the Speaker.

I think I would have taken an hour from today's proceedings to commemorate D-day. We did this once on Flag Day, led by Congressman Risenhoover of Oklahoma. We filled this Chamber with potted plants. I mean potted plants all over the place. Probably the Speaker would not remember this, but we had June Carter and Johnny Cash, her handsome husband, come to the well. Full Chamber, we invited all the staff on the floor and some of the Senate staff came over. We did a tribute to the American flag. This must have been 1978 or 1979, Jimmy Carter was President.

I thought, well, this is probably what we are going to do in the '90s as we go through the 50th anniversaries of all of these great momentous days that I remember vividly even though I was only 8 to 12 years of age. I thought we would do it for Pearl Harbor, obviously Victory in Europe day, Harry Truman's birthday, May 8, that we would do it for Victory in Japan Day and we would do it on September 2, the signing of the Japanese unconditional surrender on the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri*. I thought we would go through all these days.

Then we came to the 75th anniversary of World War I's ending, on that day in 1918 my father, Harry Joseph Dornan, was in the trenches of France somewhere between Argonne and Chateau Thierry. When the 75th anniversary of that 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month of 1918 passed here on Capitol Hill in 1993, nothing happened. And of course, the 75th anniversary is the last one that most veterans celebrate. Nobody is around for the 100th.

Here we were not memorializing or commemorating in this Chamber any of the 50th anniversaries of the days of World War II and the 75th anniversary of World War I. And I thought, what are we going to do for D-day? Here we are, we have done nothing.

If we had shut this House down, we would not have needed a great singer like Johnny Cash, we could have had our own heroes here, TOM BEVILL, SAM GIBBONS, we could have invited STROM THURMOND from the other body to commemorate this great day, which will be passing while we are in recess. We would have done this to remind our pages and every other young boy or girl, young man or woman across this country why it is important to remember great historical days. We must remember in order to pass on that legacy, and that torch off to the next generation. When we ask young people to dare to do great things—to do an extra bit of homework, not to sleep with that fellow classmate, not to drink that car of beer and then smash head-on into some van filled with a family, not to cheat on that exam—we must have exemples of greatness for them to follow. We should ask young men and women to make this a stronger country than we gave to them or that our parents and grandparents gave to us. We have to be able to talk about uplifting moments in history when people died for freedom, died for their country.

BOB MICHEL was just telling me—he hit the beach on D-day plus 4—that it moved him when he read Eisenhower's words. I told him I was going to reread the order of the day from the supreme headquarters allied expeditionary force, Eisenhower's stunning words to the invasion force. Our Republican leader said, "I just reread them yesterday, BOB, and it struck me that he used the term 'United Nations,' not 'the United Nations,' but 'United Nations.'" Even then the term had come into

usage. We had not formally organized the body, which happened at San Francisco a year and some months later, but the term was in usage. It was the Axis Powers versus the United Nations of the allies.

I stand here stunned today that we are going to take this break with no mention of the breakout at Anzio 50 years ago this week, no mention of the liberation of one of the most beautiful cities ever on the face of the Earth. It had seen in its ugly pagan days the slaughtering of Christians and now the headquarters of one of the world's great Christian faiths, my Catholic faith, Vatican City, Rome. Eternal Rome, I believe it is the most romantic city on the face of the Earth.

We liberated it from the heel of Mussolini's blackshirt Fascists on June 4, 50 years ago, 2 days before D-day. As I have often said, all the men who died on the road from Salerno and Anzio fighting for the liberation of Rome, they were eclipsed by the cataclysmic events on D-day, June 6. But these two great days in history—the liberation of Rome and the establishment of a beachhead at Normandy—and not a word is spoken in this House except a few 1-minutes. I thought maybe I would be able to organize a special 1 hour when we get back to tell of some of our experiences, walking—again, to quote Lincoln speaking of the Gettysburg battlefield—"this hallowed ground." There is nothing we can do to pay it any more respect or devotion than was done by the blood of the young men that died there.

Maybe we will bring back some hallowed memories of those beaches along that gorgeous Normandy French area.

I took one of my daughters, Kathleen, to Ste. Mère-Église. Kathy loves history. She says I passed on my wanderlust to her. She wants to visit every country in the world, which is the dream of anybody who loves all the diverse countries in the world.

I took her to Ste. Mère-Église back in 1982, and we went looking of course for the church steeple where private 1st class airborne paratrooper John Steel had come down, his chute caught on the very spire of the church. He hung there pretending he was dead. The trees surrounding the church were filled with bodies of young Americans who were truly dead.

We found a lady, still young, younger than I am now, who had been a young girl in 1944. Her father owned a butcher's shop, and she was still in that building. She spoke beautiful English with a wonderful French accent. She took us out on the street and showed us where the body of a handsome young paratrooper was lying dead. She begins to cry, making my daughter cry, making me cry. She said, "I looked at this handsome young American boy come to liberate us, dead at the very doorstep of my father's shop right here."

□ 1740

I thought, "How wonderful, and yet how sad, that Americans have to come back twice inside of one generation, sons coming back to do what their father did, die for French freedom." Then she showed me where young men were hanging in the trees.

I saw that great moment when John Wayne is playing Gen. Maxwell Taylor. Wayne says in that classic style of his, "Cut 'em down" meaning all the young paratroopers hanging in the trees. It struck me then that the first American flags flown over France were the ones stitched on the shoulders of the field jackets of the paratroopers who died hanging in those trees.

That was the occasion of the first flying of the American flags, heroes' bodies turning in that morning breeze of June 6. That was the beginning of the liberation of France.

There were all sorts of flags from World War I, from the South Pacific, flags that had come up from the landing at Salerno in Italy the year before. All sorts of flags, including flags hidden by the French, burst out all over Normandy during the month of that titanic struggle.

As I said yesterday, it was Rommel himself, Erwin Rommel, the field marshal, the Desert Fox, that said this would be the longest day of the war because the Americans, the British, the small French units, and the Canadians established a beachhead. That was the end of the war.

That landing, because it was successful, caused the assassination plot against Hitler; tyrannicide is the way I think to think about it, the justifiable Judeo-Christian murder of a tyrant to save lives. That plot, Operation Valkyrie of Klaus van Stoffenberg, was thwarted just 44 days later, on July 20. Five thousand German officers who—too late, far too late, but still in a just way—tried to take out the tyrant. They paid for it with their lives, hung by piano wire from butcher hooks. Hitler has it all photographed, the 16 millimeter film sent up to Berchtesgaden or to the bunker in Berlin where like a pervert he would sit for hours and hours and watch over and over the film of these 5,000 German officers and high ranking civilians executed. Some of them were innocent; they should have been in on the Valkyrie assassination plot, but they were not.

What an amazing thing that we established that beachhead.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will come back. I will see if there are some stories to bring home to motivate the next generations of Americans. To tell them that the United States of America for all of her faults, is a superior attempt at culture; that this truly is a nation of immigrants, a polyglot country of many cultures, every culture from everywhere in the world. There are even aboriginal people from Australia that have come to America and became American citizens.

We are a different country than any one that has ever existed. We have fought in wars around the world with no strings attached, bled our treasure and the blood of young men. There are also women who have died, eight died for their country as combat nurses in Vietnam. We have really done something in this century that no country has ever done before, die fighting for freedom with no strings attached and nothing asked of the countries that we liberate or the countries that we conquered like Japan, Germany, or Italy other than: "Get your political scene together in a coherent way, and let your people share in your process of government."

So, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do before I put in the RECORD President Ronald Reagan's good-bye speech to this Nation on 11 January 1989, 9 days before the inauguration of his then Vice President, George Bush, to become the 41st President; our 40th President, Ronald Reagan, at the end of about an eight-page address to television saying good-bye paused and said:

"There is something else I'd like to say to my fellow Americans by way of good-bye," and again I paraphrase him badly, but it will be in the RECORD. He told his Nation of the importance of remembering our history, the men and women who came to a frontier and tried to create a new and a different type of democracy. And, in the main, we have succeeded amazingly well. He told young children something to the effect: "I give you kids permission to get on your parents' case at the kitchen table and demand of your parents that they make sure you are educated in the history of this Nation."

That probably will go down as one of the finest and constructive good-byes of any American President.

Three weeks ago I had the opportunity as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a fading, aging peacetime fighter pilot to strap into the back seat of a Navy F-14 Tomcat and fly out to the U.S.S. *Eisenhower*, one of our big nuclear supercarriers. We shot five landings, cable-arrested landings, on the deck. Navy jocks call those traps. And, when we landed, I thought we were going to go below and meet the admiral and the skipper of the ship, and I always wanted to meet some of the women that were assigned. This is going to be the first man-of-war, the first U.S. Navy line ship, with women on board. I thought we were going to taxi over, and I could see there was no guard there, no people to greet us. It was raining, and all of a sudden we taxied, and then took a left turn, and suddenly we were locked into catapult No. 4, and they go through that amazing process. It is almost like a dance of the macabre with all these young Navy

people in different colored uniforms, armorers, fuelers, cat men, catapult men.

By the way, that is the most dangerous industrial or military work environment in peacetime anywhere on the planet Earth, the deck of a carrier during recoveries and launches, and suddenly we are lined up, and this was my first catapult launch in a fighter. I had done it on board delivery aircraft in the Persian Gulf after visiting with my nephew, Don Dornan, Jr., Navy officer. But you are sitting backward in the back of a small transport plane. This is my first time in a cat launch, facing forward, in the radar intercept officer's position, and it was one of the better flying experiences of my life, right up there with flying three times the speed of sound at 84,000 feet in an SR-71 Black Bird. That still maybe is a notch more impressive. But, when we launched off that cat, I planned to take a picture from the back seat with my Nikon. I was shoved back so hard, I did not get it, so the next launch we catapulted—five times in a row, and, when I finally got out in a pouring rainstorm and went into the island of the big sail, the island of the carrier, to meet with the admiral and the captain, the skipper of the ship, I kept thinking to myself, over and over:

"What an honor it is for Nixon's grandkids and Eisenhower's grandkids to have this big beautiful Navy man of war aircraft carrier named after Eisenhower." I thought, "What a special President he was," and, "How lucky our country was to have somebody as the Commander in Chief during the peacetime years that I flew as a fighter pilot."

I think a key reason why I was never called upon to kill some other mother's child, or be killed and shot down myself is, when you have a five-star general, and we only have had eight five-star admirals and generals, sitting in the White House, we have a man of character to look up to. The whole military establishment says that, "If this man gives me orders, if this man talks to me about Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti, Guadalcanal, the beaches in France, this is a man I'll obey willingly and lay my life on the line."

So, thinking about that beautiful carrier, thinking about General and then-President Eisenhower, this humble man from Abilene, KS, who graduated in the class of West Point of 1915, I stopped one of our great chairmen here, Democrat TOM BEVILL, and asked him where he was when Ike read these words. TOM went into the beach a few days after he was training people, he was an officer training people in England, and he said, "Those of us in England didn't hear it read. We saw it in the paper the next day, Stars and Stripes or British papers."

□ 1750

He said, he reminded me it was piped over the PA system of every one of those 5,000 invasion ships.

Before I do it, Mr. Speaker, let me find that key paragraph in Reagan's January 11 farewell address to the Nation. Let me read the opening and then I will go looking for it.

Ronald Reagan.

My Fellow Americans: This is the 34th time I'll speak to you from the Oval Office and the last. We've been together 8 years now, and soon it will be time for me to go.

Mr. Speaker, in my lifetime there have only been three 8-year Presidents: President Roosevelt who died into his 13th year by 89 days; and then Eisenhower's 8 years, and Ronald Reagan, our only other 8-year President since Woodrow Wilson. He says:

Before I do, I wanted to share some thoughts, some of which I've been saving for a long time. It's been the honor of my life to be your President.

He goes on telling about how he and Nancy have been so honored to receive so many letters. He says:

You know, down the hall and up the stairs from this office is the part of the White House where the President and his family live. There are a few favorite windows I have up there that I like to stand and look out of early in the morning. The view is over the grounds here to the Washington Monument and then the Mall and the Jefferson Memorial. But on mornings when the humidity is low, you can see past Jefferson to the river, the Potomac, and the Virginia shore. Someone said that's the view Lincoln had when he saw the smoke rising from the Battle of Bull Run. I see more prosaic things, the grass on the banks, the morning traffic as people make their way to work, and now and then a sailboat on the river.

I've been thinking a bit at that window. I've been reflecting on what the past 8 years have meant and mean. And the image that comes to mind like a refrain is a nautical one. A small story about a big ship and a refugee and a sailor. It was back in the early 1980's at the height of the boat people. And a U.S. sailor was hard at work on the carrier *Midway* which was patrolling the South China Sea. The sailor like most American servicemen was young, smart, and fiercely observant. The crew spied on the horizon a leaky little boat. And crammed inside were refugees from Indochina hoping to get to America.

Refugees caused by the Strobe Talbotts, the Sam Browns, the Derrick Shearers and the Bill Clintons of the world. That is my BOB DORNAN footnote.

The *Midway* sent a small launch to bring them to the ship and safety. As the refugees made their way through the choppy seas, one refugee spied the sailor on deck and stood up and called out to him. He yelled up, "Hello, American sailor. Hello, freedom man." A small moment with a big meaning, a moment the sailor who wrote it in a letter couldn't get out of his mind. And, when I saw it, neither could I. Because that's what it was to be an American in the 1980's. We stood again for freedom. I know we always have. But in the past few years, the world again and in a way we ourselves rediscovered it.

He goes on to talk about Grenada, the Washington and the Moscow summits. This will all be in the record, Mr. Speaker.

And then he comes to this, talks about we the people. We the people tell the government what to do, it does not tell us—not often. We the people are the driver, the government is the car.

He goes through a more and more beautiful paragraph talking about Gorbachev and some of the Reagan regiments that will have to become the Bush brigades.

He comes down to the end, and here is that part that I want to use as a prologue to D-Day.

He says, and I'm quoting President Reagan's final address, last paragraph, the President says:

An informed patriotism is what we want. And are we doing a good enough job teaching our children what America is and what she represents in the long history of the world? Those of us who are over 35 or so years of age grew up in a different America. We were taught very directly what it means to be an American. And we absorbed almost in the air a love of country and an appreciation of its institutions. If you didn't get these things from your family, you got them from the neighborhood, from the father down the street who fought in Korea or the family who lost someone at Anzio. Or you could get a sense of patriotism from school. And if all else failed, you could get a sense of patriotism from the popular culture. The movies celebrated democratic values and implicitly reinforced the idea that America was special. Television was like that, too, through the mid-1960's.

But now we're about to enter the 90's and some things have changed. Younger parents aren't sure that an unambivalent appreciation of America is the right thing to teach modern children. And as for those who create the popular culture, well-grounded patriotism is no longer the style. Our spirit is back

he is talking now in January 1989

but we haven't reinstitutionalized it. We've got to do a better job of getting across that American is freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of enterprise, and freedom is special and rare. It is fragile. It needs protection.

So we have got to teach history, based not on what's in fashion but what is important. Why the Pilgrims came here. Who Jimmy Doolittle was and what those 30 seconds over Tokyo meant.

You know 4 years ago on the 40th anniversary of D-Day

next week's it's a 50

I read a letter from a young woman writing to her late father who had fought on Omaha Beach.

What a moment that was.

Her name was Lisa Zanatta Henn. And she said: "We will always remember. We will never forget what the boys of Normandy did." Well, let's help her keep her word,

President Reagan said to us in his goodbye.

If we forget what we did, we won't know who we are. I'm warning of an eradication of the American memory that could result ultimately in an erosion of the American spirit.

Let's start with some basics: More attention to American history and a greater emphasis on civil ritual. And let me offer lesson

number one about America. All great change in America begins at the kitchen table. So tomorrow night, in the kitchen, I hope the talking begins. And, children, if your parents haven't been teaching you what it means to be an American, let'em know and nail'em on it. That would be a very American thing to do.

□ 1800

That is about all I have to say tonight, except for one thing: The past few days when I have been at that window upstairs, I have thought a bit of the shining city on a hill. That phrase comes from John Winthrop, who by the way, his statue is right downstairs, first Governor of Massachusetts, and his son, first Governor of Connecticut. What he imagined was important, because he was an early pilgrim, an early freedom man. He journeyed here on what today we would call a little wooden boat. And like the other pilgrims, he was looking for a home that would be free.

I have spoken of the shining city all my political life, but I don't know if I ever quite communicated what I saw when I said it. But in my mind it was a tall, proud city, built on rocks stronger than oceans, wind-swept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds, living in harmony and peace. A city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity. And if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors, and the doors were open to anyone with the will and the heart to get here. That is how I saw it and see it still. And out stands that city on a hill this winter night, more prosperous, more secure, and happier than it was 8 years ago. But more than that, after 200 years, two centuries, she still stands strong and true on the granite ridge, and her glow is held steady no matter what the storm. And she is still a beacon, still a magnet, for all who must have freedom. For all the pilgrims, from all the lost places, who are hurdling through the darkness toward home. We have done our part. And as I walk off into the city streets, a final word to the men and women of the Reagan revolution, the men and women across America who for 8 years did the work that brought America back. My friends, we did it. We were not just marking time. We made a difference. We made the city stronger, freer, and left it in good hands. All in all, not bad. Not bad at all.

So good-bye, God Bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

The big event in my life as a kid was dreaming about being in a Thunderbolt or a Mustang or a Lightning over the decks of Normandy. Like most kids with an imagination, you wanted it all.

I dreamed about shooting down a Messerschmidt, and then getting shot down myself, joining the paratroopers on the ground, fighting on the beach, joining the 4th Division, the 1st, the 29th. Kids wanted it all. Today girls can have those dreams of glory fighting for freedom, and having the mayor of a French town bring out a hidden bottle of champagne, and with the fire still going on over your head. It is beautifully written in Cornelius Ryan's book, "The Longest Day. "This mayor putting on his medallions of office, those chains with all the crests of the city, and his champagne bottle, dead cows around him, Saying: "Welcome, American, welcome."

Twenty-two sets of twins now rest in the beautiful cemetary at Deauville, in the hills overlooking Omaha Beach. One father and son rest there as well. A father who fought in World War I buried next to his son who had come back to liberate France again.

Unbelievable, that graveyard.

Let me take the center lectern as I close here, Mr. Speaker, to read Dwight D. Eisenhower's words on the evening of June 5th, to the men who were going to draw their last breath the next day.

Ike had what is called the midwestern American, non-accented, standard American voice, and I can hear it in my head as I read this from the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force:

Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Force: You are about to embark on a great crusade toward which we have striven these many months. The eyes of the world are upon you. The hopes and prayers of liberty loving people everywhere march with you. In company with our brave allies and brothers in arms on other fronts, you will bring about the destruction of the German war machine, the elimination of Nazi tyranny over the oppressed peoples of Europe, and security for ourselves in a free world.

Your task will not be an easy one. Your enemy is well-trained, well-equipped, and battle-hardened. He will fight savagely.

But this is the year, 1944. Much has happened since the Nazi triumphs of 1940–41. The united nations have inflicted upon the Germans great defeats in open battle, man-to-man. Our air offensive has seriously reduced their strength in the air and their capacity to wage war on the ground. Our home fronts have given us an overwhelming superiority in weapons and munitions of war and placed at our disposal great reserves of trained fighting men. The tide has turned. The free men of the world are marching to victory. I have full confidence in your courage, devotion to duty, and skill in battle. We will accept nothing less than full victory.

Good luck. And let us all beseech the blessing of all-mighty God upon this great and noble undertaking.

And there is his signature.

He then ordered that the "Our Father" would be recited by a chaplain over the public address system of every ship in that 5,000 invasion force. Young men seasick because it was very stormy, throwing up all night long, weak, exhausted, on the ships hours longer than they planned. The last words they heard, other than the din of battle and the screams of fellow soldiers: Over here. I am hit. Medic. The last words they heard in silent contemplation were: "Our Father, who are in heaven, hollowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven."

Those words of the "Our Father," and its final line, would be deemed politically incorrect and insulting to a tiny minority in that invasion force.

It is too bad that we leave some of this history behind, and that we didn't have that hour ceremony that I dreamed about on the House floor today, without my participation, with just my sitting out there, listening to Republican STROM THURMOND, Democrat TOM BEVILL, hero paratrooper SAM GIBBONS, and all the others like BOB MICHAEL that poured onto that beachhead day after day until we were rolling across northern France behind George Patton, gallantly letting the French unit under General LeClerci go into Paris on August 25. What amazing historical events to follow as an 8-, 9-, 10-, 11-year-old-boy.

□ 1810

It made me want to come to Congress. It made me want to fly supersonic fighters in the Air Force. It makes me want to dream about other, higher office than serving as a Congressman in this great legislative Chamber.

I wish everybody, every American, could be with us 40 Congressmen and women and the veterans of this Chamber and the other Chamber that lead us back to the beautiful beaches and the tough hedge rows of northern France, the Normandy coastline, and to Anzio, the forgotten struggle in Italy.

A final word, Mr. Speaker, I wear around my neck a small St. Christopher given to me by Lt. Walter Krell, a veterinarian from northern California who is still a healthy, vigorous man in practice today. He wore this little medal around his neck on 20 missions in the South Pacific.

He led President Johnson's aircraft when President Johnson was in the back, won the Silver Star for merely huddling, as I would have done, because he was not at a gun station, was not a pilot or crew member, just observing as a Navy lieutenant commander for Sam Rayburn, Speaker of this Chamber. Walter Krell was at this time in New Guinea.

We were fighting across the northern part of New Guinea at this point 50 years ago. George Bush's carrier, last Monday, 50 years ago, the *San Jacinto*, with *Wasp* and *Essex*, had hit Marcus Island.

Another task force had shelled Wake Island, where 200 American prisoners were in the last year of their life. They would be executed, every one of them shot in the back of the head, civilian construction workers, because we bypassed Wake Island.

Men were dying in the jungle still in Bougainville, the Solomon Islands were not secure, the Admiralty Islands, men were dying over the skies of Rabaul. I don't want to forget what was happening 50 years ago throughout the whole Pacific.

And our Russian allies, under the cruel dictator Stalin who killed more people than Hitler, were still fighting magnificently, giving up three or four lives for every German they captured as they pushed the Nazi forces back to the six death camps in Poland, where they would soon find a demonic nightmare of piles of bodies, all the result of

politics, politics gone wrong in Germany and Italy and in Tokyo in the Diet. And it still continued to go wrong in the Soviet Union, even after their great victories over another form of tyranny.

These are 50th anniversaries of momentous days, Mr. Speaker, and I am just sorry that we do not have some time in our legislative schedule to pause and take President Reagan's advice and contemplate the unique, special, and noble history of our great country. God bless America.

SUPREME HEADQUARTERS ALLIED EXPEDITIONARY FORCE

Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Force!

You are about to embark upon the Great Crusade, toward which we have striven these many months. The eyes of the world are upon you. The hopes and prayers of liberty-loving people everywhere march with you. In company with our brave Allies and brothers-in-arms on other Fronts, you will bring about the destruction of the German war machine, the elimination of Nazi tyranny over the oppressed peoples of Europe, and security for ourselves in a free world.

Your task will not be an easy one. Your enemy is well trained, well equipped and battle-hardened. He will fight savagely.

But this is the year 1944! Much has happened since the Nazi triumphs of 1940–41. The United Nations have inflicted upon the Germans great defeats, in open battle, man-to-man. Our air offensive has seriously reduced their strength in the air and their capacity to wage war on the ground. Our Home Fronts have given us an overwhelming superiority in weapons and munitions of war, and placed at our disposal great reserves of trained fighting men. The tide has turned! The free men of the world are marching together to Victory!

I have full confidence in your courage, devotion to duty and skill in battle. We will accept nothing less than full Victory!

Good Luck! And let us all beseech the blessing of Almighty God upon this great and noble undertaking.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

RONALD REAGAN'S FAREWELL ADDRESS TO THE NATION

(January 11, 1989)

MY FELLOW AMERICANS: This is the 34th time I'll speak to you from the Oval Office and the last. We've been together 8 years now, and soon it'll be time for me to go. But before I do, I wanted to share some thoughts, some of which I've been saving for a long time.

It's been the honor of my life to be your President. So many of you have written the past few weeks to say thanks, but I could say as much to you. Nancy and I are grateful for the opportunity you gave us to serve.

One of the things about the Presidency is that you're always somewhat apart. You spent a lot of time going by too fast in a car someone else is driving, and seeing the people through tinted glass—the parents holding up a child, and the wave you saw too late and couldn't return. And so many times I wanted to stop and reach out from behind the glass, and connect. Well, maybe I can do a little of that tonight.

People ask how I feel about leaving. And the fact is, "parting is such sweet sorrow." The sweet part is California and the ranch and freedom. The sorrow—the goodbyes, of course, and leaving this beautiful place.

You know, down the hall and up the stairs from this office is the part of the White House where the President and his family live. There are a few favorite windows I have up there that I like to stand and look out of early in the morning. The view is over the grounds here to the Washington Monument, and then the Mall and the Jefferson Memorial. But on mornings when the humidity is low, you can see past the Jefferson to the river, the Potomac, and the Virginia shore. Someone said that's the view Lincoln had when he saw the smoke rising from the Battle of Bull Run. I see more prosaic things: the grass on the banks, the morning traffic as people make their way to work, now and then a sailboat on the river.

I've been thinking a bit at that window. I've been reflecting on what the past 8 years have meant and mean. And the image that comes to mind like a refrain is a nautical one—a small story about a big ship, and a refugee, and a sailor. It was back in the early eighties, at the height of the boat people. And the sailor was hard at work on the carrier *Midway*, which was patrolling the South China Sea. The sailor, like most American servicemen, was young, smart, and fiercely observant. The crew spied on the horizon a leaky little boat. And crammed inside were refugees from Indochina hoping to get to America. The *Midway* sent a small launch to bring them to the ship and safety. As the refugees made their way through the choppy seas, one spied the sailor on deck, and stood up, and called out to him. He yelled, "Hello, American sailor. Hello, freedom man."

A small moment with a big meaning, a moment the sailor, who wrote it in a letter, couldn't get out of his mind. And, when I saw it, neither could I. Because that's what it was to be an American in the 1980's. We stood, again, for freedom. I know we always have, but in the past few years the world again—and in a way, we ourselves—rediscovered it.

It's been quite a journey this decade, and we held together through some stormy seas. And at the end, together, we are reaching our destination.

The fact is, from Grenada to the Washington and Moscow summits, from the recession of '81 to '82, to the expansion that began in late '82 and continues to this day, we've made a difference. The way I see it, there were two great triumphs, two things that I'm proudest of. One is the economic recovery, in which the people of America created—and filled—19 million new jobs. The other is the recovery of our morale. America is respected again in the world and looked to for leadership.

Something that happened to me a few years ago reflects some of this. It was back in 1981, and I was attending my first big economic summit, which was held that year in Canada. The meeting place rotates among the member countries. The opening meeting was a formal dinner for the heads of government of the seven industrialized nations. Now, I sat there like the new kid in school and listened, and it was all Francois this and Helmut that. They dropped titles and spoke to one another on a first-name basis. Well, at one point I sort of learned in and said, "My name's Ron." Well, in that same year, we began the actions we felt would ignite an economic comeback—cut taxes and regulation, started to cut spending. And soon the recovery began.

Two years later, another economic summit with pretty much the same cast. At the big opening meeting we all got together, and all of sudden, just for a moment, I saw that everyone was just sitting there looking at me. And then one of them broke the silence. "Tell us about the American miracle," he said.

Well, back in 1980, when I was running for President, it was all so different. Some pundits said our programs would result in catastrophe. Our views on foreign affairs would cause war. Our plans for the economy would cause inflation to soar and bring about economic collapse. I even remember one highly respected economist saying, back in 1982, that "The engines of economic growth have shut down here, and they're likely to stay that way for years to come." Well, he and the other opinion leaders were wrong. The fact is what they call "radical" was really "right." What they called "dangerous" was just "desperately needed."

And in all of that time I won a nickname, "The Great Communicator." But I never though it was my style or the words I used that made a difference: it was the content. I wasn't a great communicator, but I communicated great things, and they didn't spring full bloom from my brow, they came from the heart of a great nation—from our experience, our wisdom, and our belief in the principles that have guided us for two centuries. They called it the Reagan revolution. Well, I'll accept that, but for me it always seemed more like the great rediscovery, a rediscovery of our values and our common sense.

Common sense told us that when you put a big tax on something, the people will produce less of it. So, we cut the people's tax rates, and the people produced more than ever before. The economy bloomed like a plant that had been cut back and could now grow quicker and stronger. Our economic program brought about the longest peacetime expansion in our history: real family income up, the poverty rate down, entrepreneurship booming, and an explosion in research and new technology. We're exporting more than ever because American industry became more competitive and at the same time, we summoned the national will to knock down protectionist walls abroad instead of erecting them at home.

Common sense also told us that to preserve the peace, we'd have to become strong again after years of weakness and confusion. So, we rebuilt our defenses, and this New Year we toasted the new peacefulness around the globe. Not only have the superpowers actually begun to reduce their stockpiles of nuclear weapons—and hope for even more progress is bright—but the regional conflicts that rack the globe are also beginning to cease. The Persian Gulf is no longer a war zone. The Soviets are leaving Afghanistan. The Vietnamese are preparing to pull out of Cambodia, and an American-mediated accord will soon send 50,000 Cuban troops home from Angola.

The lesson of all this was, of course, that because we're a great nation, our challenges seem complex. It will always be this way. But as long as we remember our first principles and believe in ourselves, the future will always be ours. And something else we learned: Once you begin a great movement, there's no telling where it will end. We meant to change a nation, and instead, we changed a world.

Countries across the globe are turning to free markets and free speech and turning away from the ideologies of the past. For them, the great rediscovery of the 1980's has been that, lo and behold, the moral way of government is the practical way of government: Democracy, the profoundly good, is also the profoundly productive.

When you've got to the point when you can celebrate the anniversaries of your 39th birthday you can sit back sometimes, review your life, and see it flowing before you. For me there was a fork in the river, and it was right in the middle of my life. I never meant to go into politics. It wasn't my intention when I was young. But I was raised to believe you had to pay your way for the blessings bestowed on you. I was happy with my career in the entertainment world, but I ultimately went into politics because I wanted to protect something precious.

Ours was the first revolution in the history of mankind that truly reversed the course of government, and with three little words: "We the People." "We the People" tell the government what to do; it doesn't tell us. "We the People" are the driver; the government is the car. And we decide where it should go, and by what route, and how fast. Almost all the world's constitutions are documents in which governments tell the people what their privileges are. Our Constitution is a document in which "We the People" tell the government what it is allowed to do. "We the People" are free. This belief has been the underlying basis for everything I've tried to do these past 8 years.

But back in the 1960's, when I began, it seemed to me that we'd begun reversing the order of things—that through more and more rules and regulations and confiscatory taxes, the government was taking more of our money, more of our options, and more of our freedom. I went into politics in part to put up my hand and say, "Stop." I was a citizen politician, and it seemed the right thing for a citizen to do.

I think we have stopped a lot of what needed stopping. And I hope we have once again reminded people that man is not free unless government is limited. There's a clear cause and effect here that is as neat and predictable as a law of physics: As government expands, liberty contracts.

Nothing is less free than pure communism—and yet we have, the past few years, forged a satisfying new closeness with the Soviet Union. I've been asked if this isn't a gamble, and my answer is no because we're basing our actions not on words but deeds. The détente of the 1970's was based not on actions but promises. They'd promise to treat their own people and the people of the world better. But the *gulag* was still the *gulag*, and the state was still expansionist, and they still waged proxy wars in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Well, this time, so far, it's different. President Gorbachev has brought about some internal democratic reforms and begun the withdrawal from Afghanistan. He has also freed prisoners whose names I've given him every time we've met.

But life has a way of reminding you of big things through small incidents. Once, during the heady days of the Moscow summit, Nancy and I decided to break off from the entourage one afternoon to visit the shops on Arbat Street—that's a little street just off Moscow's main shopping area. Even though our visit was a surprise, every Russian there immediately recognized us and called out our names and reached for our hands. We were just about swept away by the warmth. You could almost feel the possibilities in all that joy. But within seconds, a KGB detail pushed their way toward us and began pushing and shoving the people in the crowd. It was an interesting moment. It reminded me that while the man on the street in the Soviet Union yearns for peace, the government is Communist. And those who run it are Communists, and that means we and they view such issues as freedom and human rights very differently.

We must keep up our guard, but we must also continue to work together to lessen and eliminate tension and mistrust. My view is that President Gorbachev is different from previous Soviet leaders. I think he knows some of the things wrong with his society and is trying to fix them. We wish him well. And we'll continue to work to make sure that the Soviet Union that eventually emerges from this process is a less threatening one. What it all boils down to is this: I want the new closeness to continue. And it will, as long as we make it clear that we will continue to act in a certain way as long as they continue to act in a helpful manner. If and when they don't, at first pull your punches. If they persist, pull the plug. It's still trust by verify. It's still play, but cut the cards. It's still watch closely. And don't be afraid to see what you see.

I've been asked if I have any regrets. Well, I do. The deficit is one. I've been talking a great deal about that lately, but tonight isn't for arguments, and I'm going to hold my tongue. But an observation: I've had my share of victories in the Congress, but what few people noticed is that I never won anything you didn't win for me. They never saw my troops, they never saw Reagan's regiments, the American people. You won every battle with every call you made and letter you wrote demanding action. Well, action is still needed. If we're to finish the job. Reagan's regiments will have to become the Bush brigades. Soon he'll be the chief, and he'll need you every bit as much as I did.

Finally, there is a great tradition of warnings in Presidential farewells, and I've got one that's been on my mind for some time. But oddly enough it starts with one of the things I'm proudest of in the past 8 years: the resurgence of national pride that I called the new patriotism. This national feeling is good, but it won't count for much, and it won't last unless it's grounded in thoughtfulness and knowledge.

An informed patriotism is what we want. And are we doing a good enough job teaching our children what America is and what she represents in the long history of the world? Those of us who are over 35 or so years of age grew up in a different America. We were taught, very directly, what it means to be an American. And we absorbed, almost in the air, a love of country and an appreciation of its institutions. If you didn't get these things from your family you got them from the neighborhood, from the father down the street who fought in Korea or the family who lost someone at Anzio. Or you could get a sense of patriotism from school. And if all else failed you could get a sense of patriotism from the popular culture. The movies celebrated democratic values and implicitly reinforced the idea that America was special. TV was like that, too, through the mid-sixties.

But now, we're about to enter the nineties, and some things have changed. Younger parents aren't sure that an unambivalent appreciation of America is the right thing to teach modern children. And as for those who create the popular culture, well-grounded patriotism is no longer the style. Our spirit is back, but we haven't reinstitutionalized it. We've got to do a better job of getting across that America is freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of enterprise. And freedom is special and rare. It's fragile; it needs production [protection].

So, we've got to teach history based not on what's in fashion but what's important—why the Pilgrims came here, who Jimmy Doolittle was, and what those 30 seconds over Tokyo meant. You know, 4 years ago on the 40th anniversary of D-day, I read a letter from a young woman writing to her late father, who'd fought on Omaha Beach. Her name was Lisa Zanatta Henn, and she said, "we will always remember, we will never forget what the boys of Normandy did." Well, let's help her keep her word. If we forget what we did, we won't know who we are. I'm warning of an eradication of the American memory that could result, ultimately, in an erosion of the American spirit. Let's start with some basics: more attention to American history and a greater emphasis on civic ritual.

And let me offer lesson number one about America: All great change in America begins at the dinner table. So, tomorrow night in the kitchen I hope the talking begins. And children, if your parents haven't been teaching you what it means to be an American, let 'em know and nail 'em on it. That would be a very American thing to do.

And that's about all I have to say tonight, except for one thing. The past few days when I've been at that window upstairs, I've thought a bit of the "shining city upon a hill." The phrase comes from John Winthrop, who wrote it to describe the America he imagined. What he imagined was important because he was an early Pilgrim, an early freedom man. He journeyed here on what today we'd call a little wooden boat; and like the other Pilgrims, he was looking for a home that would be free.

I've spoken of the shining city all my political life, but I don't know if I ever quite communicated what I saw when I said it. But in my mind it was a tall, proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, windswept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace; a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity. And if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will and the heart to get here. That's how I saw it, and see it still.

And how stands the city on this winter night? More prosperous, more secure, and happier than it was 8 years ago. But more than that: After 200 years, two centuries, she still stands strong and true on the granite ridge, and her glow has held steady no matter what storm. And she's still a beacon, still a magnet for all who must have freedom, for all the pilgrims from all the lost places who are hurtling through the darkness, toward home.

We've done our part. And as I walk off into the city streets, a final word to the men and women of the Reagan revolution, the men and women across America who for 8 years did the work that brought America back. My friends: We did it. We weren't just marking time. We made a difference. We made the city stronger, we made the city freer, and we left her in good hands. All in all, not bad, not bad at all.

And so, goodbye, God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

Note: The President spoke at 9:02 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. The address was broadcast live on nationwide radio and television.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINGERHUT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994,

and May 23, 1994, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

UNITED STATES-CHINESE TOY INDUSTRY

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for being so kind as to yield this evening. I will not take a great deal of time.

In listening to the previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], I can't help be reminded, as many of our Members travel to the 50th anniversary commemoration in Europe, that through the end of June of this year the United States Mint is selling commemorative coins that this Congress authorized, the proceeds of which will be used to construct a World War II memorial here in our Nation's Capitol on the central mall.

This was a piece of legislation that moved through here not so many months ago. Over 7.5 million dollars' worth of coins have been purchased, and $3 million of that total to date has been used to build a memorial peace garden in Europe, in France, where many of our Members will travel.

So many veterans have called our office and asked where they could purchase the coins. They would purchase them through the U.S. Mint, the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. Both of those offices of the U.S. Government can provide them with information on purchasing those coins that will help pay for the construction of the memorial here in our Nation's Capitol, a memorial that is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, this evening, I know the speaker that was so kind to yield to me, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] is going to be speaking about the issue of health insurance for the American people.

This evening my topic is different. I'm going to be talking about the proposed most-favored-nation agreement with China that will be debated very shortly here in this Congress. However, it is very clear to me in the remarks that I will be making this evening that one of the reasons it has been so very difficult for all Americans to receive insurance coverage is because so many of our corporations have moved offshore, putting millions of Americans out of work, and employing people in other countries like China at such low labor rates that in fact those people cannot raise their standards of living. Then those products are sent back here to the United States for our workers to buy, but the prices of those products do not go down.

In fact, we watch over the last 20 years the wages of average Americans keep going down and down and down. Even as jobs are created, wages are not going up. It makes it very difficult to provide such important national needs as health insurance for all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate whether or not to renew China's MFN status, it is often said that the United States can no longer afford to link our trade policy with broader concerns about political freedom and human liberty. It is said that the traditional U.S. policy of supporting human rights and caring how other countries treat their workers is an obsolete policy. It is said that U.S. workers will only benefit from a trade policy based on exports even while those same U.S. workers remain unemployed. It is said and said and said that the only way to change the way China treats its people is for the United States to wink and look the other way.

I say, though, that this type of argument is not only spurious but dangerous. America was not founded on the narrow principles of economics as some would have you believe today. America was founded on the democratic principles that each individual had the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In turn, these democratic principles have always been embodied in U.S. foreign policy. The force of American leadership in the world has always been grounded in the example that our country has set in keeping to these very same democratic principles.

Now though, it would seem that our nation's democratic principles are slowly being replaced by an "economics is king" mentality. But I ask, who exactly is saying that America can no longer afford to hold by its principles? The current debate over the renewal of China MFN status is telling. Overwhelmingly, the pressure to delink our nation's trade policy with our concerns over how China treats its people is being pushed by a few U.S. corporations with huge investments in China. Investments in China which have expended by more than 1,000 percent since 1990 to reach $5.5 billion dollars in 1993. It is interesting to note that as United States investment in China has increased so has the United States trade deficit with China—reaching $23 billion last year alone.

One of the most ardent supporters of delinkage and renewal of China MFN is the toy industry in the United States and China. Why? Mainly because of the United States toy industry's own ties—or link—to China by way of sales and investment.

China is the single largest toy producing nation, making approximately 20 percent of the world's toys. Out of a world production value of $26 billion, China represents over 20 percent of world production. In 1990, China shipped approximately half of their production—2.2 billion dollars' worth of toys—to the United States. Conversely, the United States is the world's single largest toy market valued at $19 billion or 35 percent of all sales worldwide. We buy 55 percent of our dolls and 40 percent of all other toys from the People's Republic of China. The United States toy industry is the link between the markets of China and the United States.

There is a universal delight taken in toys. But the toys that we delight in are often produced under horrific working conditions for the Chinese toiling in United States-owned sweatshops. In a recent edition of Business Week, I found the sad story of Hong Biu Yun to be illustrative.

> Hunched over a school desk, Hong Biu Yun is clearly exhausted as she sticks Mickey Mouse heads onto motorized toys at a factory in Shekou, China. One of 12,000 mainland Chinese employed by Hong Kong's largest toymaker, Kader Enterprises Ltd. Hong typically works 14 hours a day, 7 days a week to rush out toys for American kids.
>
> Recently, her hours grew even more oppressive. In order to meet the holiday demand for Ghostbusters, Big Hauler Trains, and Mickey Mouse dolls, the girls at the Kader plant were ordered to put in one or two 24-hour shifts, with only two meal breaks, each month.
>
> Hong looks about 12 years old but claims in a frightened whisper that she's 17. That's the minimum legal working age in Shekou, the best-managed of four special economic zones set up by China to attract foreign investment. But to the dismay of Chinese Communist leaders, the zones have spawned twin horrors associated with old-style capitalism—child labor and illegal working hours.

Kader Enterprises Ltd., the factory that Hong works for, is one of the major subcontractors for such U.S. toy companies as Walt Disney, Coleco, Mattel, Tonka, and Hasbro. While these United States companies state that they have little control over the working conditions of the Chinese, millions of dollars are spent by major United States toy companies to invest in the continuation and expansion of the sweatshops in China.

In turn, the Chinese workers are paid $10 to $30 dollars a month. In turn, the Chinese workers, like Hong, are forced to work under highly unsanitary and dangerous conditions. Factory fires alone have killed more than 170 people in the low-cost manufacturing base in Pearl River delta over the past 2½ years. In 1993, Beijing disclosed that work-related deaths nationwide last year rose 3 percent from 1991 to more than 15,000 people.

While the toy industry and other United States corporations with huge investments in China argue for delinkage of trade policy from broader issues such as human rights and labor standards, the true link often goes unmentioned. I would argue that the link which needs to be debated is the link between the labor practices of some United States corporations in this country/and the labor practices of those same United States corporations manufacturing in China. In other words, the true link is the U.S. corporations themselves. And more, the

true link is the profits made by these United States corporations at the expense of Chinese and American workers.

To realize the existence of the true link, one only has to ask: Why else would these corporations spend millions of dollars to lobby Congress to renew China's MFN status? Why else would these same United States corporations fire their United States workers to set up shop in China? The answer is simple. They profit immensely from doing so.

Toys are fun. Toys are often given to exemplify the love one has for a child. But when buying a toy imported from China in the future, one must realize that the cute little teddy bear was made by a Chinese worker earning only a few cents an hour. One must realize that the teddy bear could actually be a product of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. That the cute little teddy bear may be unsafe. And finally, when buying that teddy bear for China, realize that there are many unemployed United States workers who used to make those very same teddy bears in our country but could never hope to purchase one now for their own children, because prices of teddy bears sure are not cheap.

□ 1820

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me this evening. I will be very interested in his remarks about the related issue of health insurance for all of our people, including those who are out of work in this Nation.

Mr. McDERMOTT. It is a pleasure to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio. She is a great advocate for the consumer and somebody who we have a lot of respect for.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I intended to talk with you and others about the whole issue of health care quality, and as I was thinking about this issue I had a discussion with one of my colleagues from Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, who suggested that he would like to come out and talk about some issues that he is very concerned about.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding. First I want to congratulate and commend the member from Washington for the valiant fight that he has been putting forward and is continuing to put forward to make certain that we end up this year with a comprehensive system of health care for every American, one that will provide affordable and quality health care for every American citizen. So I say to the gentleman I really want to thank him for that, and also to thank him for yielding and scheduling the time tonight to discuss what I think is a very important aspect of health care reform; namely, the involvement of health insurance plans in the determination of care.

The role of the insurance companies in health care goes straight to the heart of what people in my district are saying and writing to me. They are asking me to ensure quality and choice.

We talk about those words of quality and choice, but what do they really mean? There are so many aspects, so many ways you could define quality and choice. One major component of quality and choice depends on who controls our source of care, and who controls what kind of treatment we get.

Quality care means, to me at least, having a well-trained health care provider who delivers appropriate and thorough care, and health care providers must be allowed to deliver the care that they believe is necessary. That is what quality means to me.

Choice means not just being able to choose an insurance company, but to be able to choose a doctor, or a counselor, or a chiropractor, or a nurse, or other health professional. Choice should not be limited to a list of doctors who belong to an insurance plan, and I doubt many people realize how much insurance companies control both the quality and the choice we have in our current system. Insurance companies routinely restrict care by their refusal to cover some kinds of care.

The idea that an insurance company can alter the care that your physician recommends should send every American into the streets in outrage. But instead, we seem to be buying into that concept of restrictions on care.

What is the first thing we ask when we are in the hospital and we need to stay an extra day: Does the insurance company cover another day? When you are sick do you or your family really want to have to ask that question: Does the insurance company cover another day? This is not quality health care. This is cost containment based on the profits to the insurance companies.

Investors obviously want profit. Any for-profit insurance company has built-in incentives that contradict what I have just defined as quality and choice, and that is true for fee-for-service plans, PPO's and HMO's alike.

But I would like to spend just a minute talking about managed care in particular. About 40 million Americans belong to health maintenance organizations, HMOs. The majority of those HMO's are nonprofit, and I am sure most of the people in those HMO's and under those plans are receiving quality care. But what about the rest? Remember, the purpose of for-profit, managed care in our current financing structure is to control the amount of money spent on each member of the plan and, therefore, to make profit. The stronger the control, the larger the profit that is going to be made.

Mr. McDERMOTT. It is interesting the gentleman raised that question of how managed care works in the nonprofit sector. The original managed care started in the State of Washington when they were building the Grand Coulee Dam back in the 1930's, and Henry Kaiser saw that he had workers out there in the desert building this dam, and he needed to have doctors there so they had a healthy work force. So he got the original HMO together because he wanted to provide health care for his workers. He then took that idea and went to the shipyards during the Second World War, because he needed his shipyard workers to be healthy, so he provided doctors. That is really how Kaiser Permanente started. It was a way to deal with the needs of the workers in the most effective way, and it was a way done not for profit. It was simply that he saw that if he provided good health care to his workers it would be in the best interest of the workers and in the best interest of the company. And that idea has now been taken, as you are suggesting, by the insurance companies.

I think that is a good distinction for people to understand. A not-for-profit managed care operation versus one that is done by an insurance company where the bottom line is for them to make money out of it.

Mr. OLVER. It is interesting that you are going back and describing exactly that process, because that was to provide the broadest possible necessary care for a working population at a reasonable price. Now what we have instead is we have developed a problem. We have MBA's that are making decisions that M.D.'s or Ph.D.'s or nurses at least ought to be making as health providers. And the insurance profits that have been built out of this system now have built skyscrapers on the skylines of every major city in America.

□ 1830

The profits have launched multimillion-dollar ad campaigns to get our business, but none of this necessarily means better health care.

The health care debate would be better, it seems to me, if we could separate our discussion of health care financing from that about health care delivery.

I strongly support—as you do, and this is how we have come together—a single payer system for financing of our health care system, and the Congressional Budget Office, our CBO, has estimated that that would eliminate no less than $67 billion in administrative waste and require everybody to pay their fair share.

Now, I want to use this chart that we have here that describes in a composite kind of a way what the general private insurance system, and really it is our private insurance system and the whole of our public insurance system; I

think we could say all of the systems that we have in this country, how they operate, what portion is administration, what portion is health care spending, and what a single payer system would be. Now, this chart shows under the system as we function with it marked "private" administration spending of 20 percent and health care spending of 80 percent. That means essentially that in all the spending that we have in this country, in 1994 we will spend $1 trillion, $1,000 billion, but this chart is showing that $200 billion of that is broadly what could be called administrative spending. It is a combination in that 20 percent that becomes profits and marketing costs and lobbying and advertising and all of those things.

Mr. McDERMOTT. And all the paper shuffling.

Mr. OLVER. And all the paper shuffling, all the real administration that is necessary, and all the paper shuffling in the system. The other $800 billion is our actual health care spending.

What the chart shows by comparison is the kind of administrative expenditure that goes into the single-payer systems in the various countries that have single-payer systems, where there is only 3-percent administrative cost, because you eliminate the paper shuffling, you eliminate the profit, and you eliminate all the marketing costs.

I will have a little bit more to say about that in a few minutes.

But I think what we need to go back to to really drive this home is the fact that here in the $1 trillion we are spending $200 billion on these items, and under a true single-payer system we would be spending about $30 billion out of that $1 trillion on those administrative issues, which leaves us with this much. That is a difference of $170 billion that we now are spending in our system as it functions on all of those items that we could be spending on health care, on providing health care for American citizens who do not presently have health insurance, providing health care for elders who need long-term care, providing mental health care for people who have very poor systems, very poor programs of coverage for mental health and need a better coverage for mental health. All of those things that $170 billion could be used for.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Basically what you are saying, if I hear you, is that everybody, when they see a television commercial on television with Harry and Louise on it put on by an insurance company is basically coming out of that 20 percent?

Mr. OLVER. Right out of here.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Yes. It is wasted. When people pay their premium dollar, they do not realize that the first 20 percent, or first 20 cents, goes for all of this other stuff that is unrelated to health care; whereas, in Canada, actually the Canadian provinces are at 1 percent of the dollar goes for administration; 99 cents goes to pay for health care.

It is amazing, if people really understood and really came to really understand this, we would not have any question at all that single-payer would be the bill that everyone would want.

Mr. OLVER. I would think that would be the case.

I cannot imagine why we would want to expend the marketing costs, the sales costs, the advertising, the lobbying, and all of that along with all of the paper shuffling and all of the profits in the system as it functions when we could be using those dollars to provide health care for our citizens and do it in a manner such as that lower chart. No.

The CBO's, the Congressional Budget Office, estimate of a potential of $67 billion is really a very conservative estimate. These represent the numbers on average of what the whole of our plans, both private and public in this country, produce versus what single-payer systems produce in other places.

And all of that saving can be realized. However, creating that kind of single-payer system for financing should not be mistaken as creating a single way to deliver the care.

For example, your bill, the Health Security Act, H.R. 1200, specifically allows the formation of community-based nonprofit HMO's.

Organizing doctors into groups such as this gives a good delivery system. In fact, it should actually improve the quality of care. These organizations allow doctors to communicate and confer with each other. Incompetence is perhaps less likely when the peers are looking on. The single-payer system would eliminate the forprofit element of the current financing system and, therefore, it would eliminate the conflicts of interest built into the control mechanisms where the insurance companies decide what kind of care to give on the basis of how much profit they can make and put the control back in the hands of doctors and nurses.

Utilization review policies at forprofit HMO's are written by those who have a direct stake in the amount of those profits of those health care organizations, and they are written by the nonclinical managers of the forprofit plan.

It is this forprofit element of the current system that is absorbing billions of dollars that should be used to provide care. To illustrate this, I want to give one more example, and it actually both explains and elaborates on the upper line here, and it goes a little bit beyond that.

I want to read some pieces and make a couple of comments, from a press release that was issued by the Wellpoint Health Networks, a large California for-profit managed-care company, and I will quote two pieces from this. I could quote the whole thing, but the others really do not add much.

The press release starts out, and it is a press release on Wellpoint stationery with Wellpoint heading on the top. This one happens to be dated February 24, 1994. It gives the media contact for further information, and it is titled, "Wellpoint reports 1993 fourth quarter and annual results," and it opens from Woodland Hills in California.

> Wellpoint Health Networks, Inc., New York Stock Exchange letters WLP, one of the Nation's largest publicly traded managed health care companies, today announced results for the fourth quarter and the year ended December 31, 1993.

Now, the really, really telling paragraph, and I am going to quote, and I will quote,

> Premium revenue increased 9 percent to $603 million in the fourth quarter of 1993 compared with premium revenue of $553 million for the same period in 1992. The company's medical loss ratio was 71.8 percent in the 1993 fourth quarter compared with 73.5 percent for the same period in 1992.

Now, that tells the whole story, because here is the press release by this for-profit managed care company which goes out to show people what a good investment it is for the investors, because the profit is going to be good and worth their investing in the New York Stock Exchange in WLP as it goes across the Big Board.

□ 1840

And they came, and they proudly tout that their medical loss ratio has been reduced from 73.5 to 71.8 percent.

Now, for those who do not know what that means, that means, unlike this chart, that they have gotten this, what we would call the administrative part of it, up to 28.2 percent, meaning that of $1 of premiums paid, that they are actually only buying health care with 71.8 cents out of that dollar and they are using 28.2 cents in this broad area of administrative spending.

Now, the rest of this chart, the actual financial tables that they gave with their chart, shows precisely where that 28.2 percent goes. And if you look at the percentages of what would be their real administrative costs and their profits and their selling, marketing, advertising and lobbying costs, what you come down to is that the selling expense, their marketing expense, is a little bit more than 6 percent of the total and their general administrative expense they claim to be the real administrative expense, to be 12 percent and their profits to be about 14 percent.

That is where that 28.2 percent is coming from. And that compares with a single-payer system which the gentleman has so eloquently advocated for, and at least 90 Members have joined in advocating, that compares with the single-payer system in which there is no profit, that 14 percent is

saved, and in which there is no marketing, no selling, no advertising, no advertising costs and no lobbying costs, which is another 7 percent. So that goes back.

When you put those two together—the 14 percent profit that can be saved and the 6 percent of selling and marketing costs—that brings you to 20 percent of the premiums, and that comes very close to the difference here, just to bring this thing full circle. That comes very close within the margin of error in the 17 percent difference that we started out discussing by showing this chart.

By the way, it is not my chart. It is a chart that the gentleman from Washington had provided me today.

Mr. McDERMOTT. That chart actually we developed, and that is an average chart. The insurance companies range between 14 and 24 percent. The gentleman from Massachusetts has one here with 28, which is even beyond any range I was using.

But what is absolutely stunning is to realize this company took in 8 percent more money, but they increased their profits and clearly they are not giving it back. They are giving it back to the stockholders.

Mr. OLVER. They are certainly not providing better care. By the way, I want you to have a copy of this because this is an example of the company itself, one of the largest managed-care forprofit companies touting, in order to show what a good investment it is for the investors. What does that do for health care? It does nothing for the quality of health care, and it certainly does not improve our choice.

Mr. McDERMOTT. The gentleman is talking about the whole business of managed care. What do insurance companies add to the health care mix? Well, absolutely nothing. If we took insurance companies out of the mix, there would be nothing lost in the present health care system because every other country operates without insurance companies and delivers health care to everyone with no problem, good-quality health care. And yet we pay up to, as the gentleman says, 67. The CBO numbers that they gave us said up to $100 billion a year in administrative costs, and we get absolutely nothing for it.

Really, if we could save that $100 billion or the $67 billion, we could cover everybody who does not have health insurance. In our bill we give everybody long-term care. We take away copays and deductibles. We give a very generous benefit package with that $100 billion that people are already paying today.

It is, in my view, incredible that people will continue to tolerate this, that insurance companies are going to take 14 percent profit off sickness. The idea that you would make a profit off people's illnesses seems to me a pretty hard thing to accept when it is 14 percent. They should make something, but 14 percent is way more than anybody should be entitled to off sickness.

One of the things about this whole discussion, though—and usually when we talk about managed care I often wonder if people understand how they get that kind of profit—one of the interesting things about managed care is to understnad—and there was an article in Nation magazine this month called "Managed Care: The Denial of Care." They way it is done is that you hire a physician, someone like me, to be what is called the gatekeeper primary care physician, and he signs a contract with the managed care organization that he will see so many patients a day and he will get paid X amount, let us say $1,000, if he makes 50 referrals during the next month. But if he only makes 25 referrals to specialists, he will get $1,500. Or if he makes 10 referrals during the month he will get $2,000.

Now, you can understand, anybody can understand, that incentive that the primary care physician, when you come to see me and you have a problem, I am going to say to myself, "I am going to do anything I can to not refer Congressman OLVER to anybody else. I am going to keep him right in my office. I will make more money."

Now, if your problem gets worse and worse and worse, then I am going to say, "Well, now, this is a mess. I am going to have to refer this," and make a referral too late. That is why we have the report from the General Accounting Office talking about the bone marrow transplant as a treatment for chronic myelogenous leukemia in which they found that there are 6 single-payer countries in the world where you get better treatment for chronic myelogenous leukemia than you do in the United States simply because of our insurance practice in this country. We have the best technology. But the question is how do you get through me to get that technology? If the system is set up for me to deny care to make more money for the HMO, for the managed care operation, then you are going to have a hard time getting past me to get the care you really need in a timely fashion.

People do not understand how that works except they have the experience of going in and being held off from the physician whom they used to see. That is why on the question of choice, the gentleman raised the issue of choice and quality. Lots of times in this slogan era of health care—everything is in slogans on television—people say "you get more choice." What they mean is choice of health plans, not choice of all the physicians. Only in our plan do you get a card that you can hand to any doctor in any hospital any place in this society, if you want treatment, you can get it.

In a managed care operation, you go in and you come to me, and if you do not want to go to me but you want to go to somebody else, it is going to cost you 20 percent more. For a lot of people, that 20 percent more means they will be cut off from seeing their pediatrician or gynecologist or the cardiologist they are accustomed to seeing.

That is where the quality goes down and the profits go up. The profits go up in direct relationship to how much care you can squeeze out of the system. That is what that graph really says, is if you take 20 percent out for profit, you are going to get less health care. It is just that simple.

Mr. OLVER. It is just that simple.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Yes. But, you know, there is one thing the gentleman and I were talking about before we came into the well, and that is the question of when people talk about health care reform, they are talking about access, universal coverage, and they are talking about cost control. The gentleman raised the next issues, which is the issue of quality of care.

Now, I do not know if the gentleman has some other things, but there is one issue I want the gentleman to talk about at some point, and that is the business of the academic health centers. The managed care operation does not want to have anybody referred to an academic medical center.

□ 1850

They do not want to pay for people to go there because those are high cost hospitals, and so they are cutting off the patient base for all our academic health care centers, all the university medical schools, and, therefore, there is no patients for medical schools to teach the next crop of doctors, the next series of doctors, because medical centers are in serious problems because of the way managed care operates. They try everything they can, not to have anybody go into an academic health care center, and I know that the gentleman sat on some committee that dealth with this whole issue, and I would be interested in his feeling about it.

Mr. OLVER. Well, I had the honor to be on the First Lady's task force on quality assurance, and obviously this is what the gentleman has described as one of the issues of quality assurance because it is our medical health centers, our academic health centers, which have produced the great advances that have been the byline of American—of quality care in the American health system, and we should be concerned directly, as people, from myself coming from Massachusetts where several of the major academic health centers are, but also everywhere else those large teaching hospitals are that are producing the health advances for the future in technology, and in biotechnology and all the things that go

along with it, and what the gentleman describes as the process of reducing the patient base by under-managed care at least, which is so much the indications for proposals that are before the Congress, other than the single payer proposal, that ends up, as the gentleman put it quite correctly, reducing the patient base, and the academic health centers depend so much on taking the very ill in and dealing with them at those medical centers, and that is how they manage to do the teaching that is necessary now to produce the doctors that are going to be available for truly high quality care in the future.

Now actually the administration, the Clinton administration, the First Lady's task force, understood that there was a problem inherent in the way the incentives would be then given to strip away the kind of patient base that would be important to allow them, the academic health centers, to continue to function in the way that they have, and they tried for a considerable time at the very end of their deliberations. They did create, late in the game, at the 11th hour, a working group on the academic health centers, but they really did not come up with a very clear answer to how they were going to be able to keep the academic health centers up at very high quality, and I just would like to point out that this kind of problem disappears under the single payer system.

The single payer eliminates the problem. Our plan, the gentleman's plan, and that that is sponsored by 90 other Members of the House of Representatives——

Mr. McDERMOTT. I ask the gentleman, Why don't you say "our plan"?

Mr. OLVER. Well, our plan. I want to say our plan, all 90 of us, the gentleman and I, but also, recognizing the very solid leadership that the gentleman provided in this for months and months and months. Our plan recognizes that these centers of excellence are the jewels in the crown of our health care system, and our plan allows that patient choice to continue so that the people who will be the patients, that have a variety of different kinds of problems, that get into the academic health centers, can feed those centers and allows us to train, are truly high quality physicians for the future, that they will still be there.

And we certainly need to make certain that, whatever plan comes through this Congress, that the academic health centers are preserved. The ones that exist in Seattle, WA, with the great university there, and in Chicago, and Philadelphia, and Atlanta, and Dallas, TX, and Boston, and New York, and the other places where those large academic centers are that really produce the high quality physicians for the future——

Mr. McDERMOTT. As the gentleman knows, one of the ironies is that the people who attack the single payer system, they say "You're going to ration care, and you are going to reduce the quality," but in fact it is the single payer system that protects the academic health care centers that have provided the high quality of care that is in this country.

I had a discussion with Mrs. Clinton very early on about this whole issue because I said to her:

> I know the University of Washington and how it's financed, and if you take and change the way you finance it, and push everybody into managed care, and the managed care insurance companies don't want to send anybody to a medical school, they are not going to have any money.

That is why, I think, they probably put that task force together.

It is interesting to hear the gentleman say that they studied it, and struggled with it, and could not come up with an answer. The answer is single payer. Maybe we should go back and offer them a solution to the problem because I do not think it is their intention to do in the health care centers. But if we hand managed care, if we hand the whole of this country's health care to the insurance companies, and all they are interested in is taking 20 percent out, and have no concern about whether we maintain the academic research that goes on in this country, we are going to have a problem in terms of maintaining the quality that Americans expect out of our health care system. It is a real problem of managed care that they have really not solved.

Mr. OLVER. Well, there is that problem that is solved, and then we can go back and bring it again full circuit. It solves the problem of getting the choice, truly the most comprehensive plan of benefits available, but also the choice of medical providers, in a way that is not true of other systems that are being talked about because there is total choice for providers, whoever that person may happen to be, and it manages to get at this burden, this administrative burden, that is in our present system that is so dramatically shown on this chart, this average chart, but even more dramatically shown in the data that I had quoted from, the for-profit managed care company in California, one that has premiums of several billion dollars and entrants in their plan of several million people, the kind of level of overall administration taking into account—putting into administration profits, and the marketing costs, and the true required administration costs, and ending up with 28 percent of the premiums that are paid to that company going other than to provide health care. That is a most inefficient system.

Single payer-system retrieves most of that money and allows one to put it into health care, preserve the choice for individuals and their families of what kind of providers they want, and it manages to leave us with a system that will still keep our academic health centers there producing the quality physicians for the future.

Mr. McDERMOTT. As the gentleman knows, there is another phenomenon that managed care has created that my colleagues may not be aware of. It would be interesting to talk to the Members of the floor about this whole issue, and that is that in Washington, DC right now, as there was in Seattle—we have already had this phenomenon in Seattle: The Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan set up a health care proposal for sale that uses only 30 percent of the doctors in Seattle. They sort of selected 30 percent, said, "You people are in, and the other 70 percent, you're out," and suddenly 70 percent of the doctors are not in the plan being sold by the biggest insurer in Seattle.

One can imagine what they think when they know that their patients are going to go and say, "Well, my doctor isn't in there anymore. I guess I'll have to change doctors," or, "How am I going to pay for it if my insurance company doesn't pay my doctor?"

This is going on in Washington, DC right now. The Washington, DC Medical Association just got a proposal out of the Blues in this city, and again they have got a large number of doctors who are excluded from it.

□ 1900

So when patients who have a card from their insurance company, they used to be able to see any doctor in Washington DC, now they find that the panel they are limited to are the people that are on some list decided by the insurance company. Nobody knows what the criteria are except that probably they are the cheapest doctors or something. They do not put out a list and say, "This is how we selected those people." But you have to think that if they wanted to make more money, they probably have selected the doctors who have the lowest fee schedule so that they can gather up more money and save money.

So not only do they deny care but they go and select doctors, only the cheapest doctors. That process again takes away choice from people who have had a lifelong relationship with a doctor and a Blue Cross-Blue Shield card. Suddenly they look at their card and they cannot go and see Dr. Johnson that they have seen all these years because he is no longer on the panel.

That kind of think is happening in every city across the country. The American people are going to get angry about that. We are going to hear about it as are the other Members of the House on this issue as we move forward.

That is why the single payer is so good. It gives people a card and that card entitles them to see any doctor, go to any hospital they want to see.

Mr. OLVER. I think that the issue of choice there is just so critical that it ought to be the person making the choice on the basis of what their relationship is with their health provider and not something that is defined by the insurance companies.

Mr. McDERMOTT. It sort of reminds me of the old motto that started this country of taxation without representation. These people who have paid their insurance premium then do not have the right to choose who is going to treat them. To me, that is the seeds of real rebellion. If we put a bill out of here that in any way restricts people's rights to see whoever they want to see, we are going to hear from the people on that. That is why I try to discuss with my colleagues and, Mr. Speaker, with you the whole issue of why the single payer system is very important. I really appreciate your coming and having this discussion with us tonight, because not everybody talks about quality of care. It is very often people want to talk about access, and they want to talk about cost but they do not get down to talking about quality. That is what the American people are worried about, is the quality of what they get. It is not any good to just have access to something if there is no quality in it.

So I think it is very important that the gentleman raised this issue.

THE UNITED STATES AND ASIAN-PACIFIC AMERICANS: A BRIDGE FOR THE PACIFIC CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINGERHUT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as you may know, this month, the month of May, is National Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month.

I, along with the rest of my Asian-Pacific colleagues in Congress, have been giving speeches throughout the United States, honoring the deep and enduring legacy of those Americans whose roots extend from the soil of the nations of the Asia-Pacific. Certainly, the contributions of Asian-Pacific Americans have immeasurably enriched our great country, which has been blessed with a mosaic of cultural and ethnic diversity representing just about every country on this planet.

Americans of Asian-Pacific descent are the fastest growing demographic group in the United States today. Over the last decade, the Asian-Pacific American community has more than doubled and this rapid growth is projected to extend well into the next century.

In order to truly appreciate the 9 million Asian-Pacific Americans living in the United States today, however, I believe it is necessary to attain a perspective on the Asia-Pacific region and its importance to America.

Let me share with you some of the highlights of our current relationship with the Asia-Pacific Region, and why it is in our national interest to maintain strong economic, social and political ties with this dynamic area of the world.

A PACIFIC CENTURY PARTNERSHIP

As we prepare to leave the 20th century and enter what many have called the dawning of the "Pacific century," it is imperative for the United States to dramatically reassess her foreign policy toward the Asia-Pacific region. Having served as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for the past 6 years, I have argued that the United States has an unhealthy fixation with the affairs of Europe and the Middle East.

This is unfortunate, as it has resulted in America's indifference—some might even call it failure—to address the serious issues affecting our Nation's relationship with the countries of the Asia-Pacific region. Although President Clinton has placed a higher priority on Asia-Pacific policy than prior administrations—and this is encouraging—much more needs to be done.

Almost two-thirds of the world's population resides in Asia and the Pacific, and the region accounts for the production of two-thirds of the world's gross national product. In this decade and into the next century, the Asia-Pacific region will play an increasingly pivotal role in the economic, political, strategic and security needs of the world. It is evident that it is in our national interest to establish and maintain solid, healthy relations with this rapidly developing part of the world.

THE ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMY

Japan no longer stands alone as the model of economic excellence in the Asia-Pacific. Known as the Four Tigers for their astoundingly rapid economic growth—South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore have been joined by a new waive of "Little Dragons"—led by Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand—as the economic miracle has spread in the Asia-Pacific region. All of these countries have vigorously expanding economies, some up to 11 percent annually, placing them among the fastest growing in the world.

Joining this tidal wave of economic development has come the sleeping giant of Asia, the People's Republic of China [PRC]. By cultivating economic growth estimated at over 13 percent—the highest rate of economic expansion in the world in 1993—China may be the first example of a Communist system that will succeed in meeting the economic needs of her people. Feeding China's 1.3 billion hungry people—a population five times larger than America's—has by itself been a monumental accomplishment.

Establishing numerous financial links with Taiwan and Hong Kong, with cross-border investments exceeding $36.5 billion over the past 12 years, the PRC has emerged as a new economic entity termed "Greater China." The combined gross domestic product of Greater China last year totaled over $626 billion. Due to the rapid blossoming of Greater China's integrated economy, it is foreseen that this will increasingly act as a counterbalance to Japan's considerable economic clout in the region.

These facts paint a picture that has many analysts in international finance proposing that the Asia-Pacific Region has overtaken the North Atlantic as the center of world trade. I strongly concur with that view.

U.S. ECONOMIC INTERESTS IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

The United States has a substantial stake in the staggering growth of the Asia-Pacific economy.

According to the recent U.S. Department of Commerce figures, America conducted over $370 billion worth of total trade with the countries of the Asia-Pacific last year—easily matching, and nearly doubling, the trade we conducted with Western Europe.

Since 1981, U.S. trade with the Asia-Pacific region has expanded by 150 percent, and is expected to increase to $400 billion by the end of this decade.

Significantly, American exports to the region have increased by well over 130 percent in that same period. According to Commerce Department figures, Asia-Pacific countries purchased in excess of $135 billion worth of U.S. products in 1993, and over one-third of America's exports to the world were bought by nations of the Asia-Pacific.

By way of illustration, it is interesting to note that Singapore, a nation barely the size of the Washington, DC, metro area, purchases more United States goods than either Italy or Spain; while Malaysia, a little heard-of southeast Asian country, buys more United States products than the former superpower, Russia.

Today, over 2.6 million American jobs are dependent on trade with the region, and U.S. firms have over $62 billion invested there. These trade ties are rapidly escalating, and vividly point out that the future of America is inextricably linked to the Asia-Pacific.

REASSESSING U.S. ECONOMIC POLICY IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Due to the unprecedented pace of economic development in this part of the world that is fast becoming the center for global trade, the United States can no longer expect to have unchallenged economic supremacy in the Asia-Pacific region.

Neither can the United States afford a trade policy of protectionism. Erecting trade barriers, increasing tariffs and imposing more product quotas, as some have called for in Congress, will do little to revitalize and rebuild America's economy.

As America's balance of trade deficit grows, there is need for the United States to reassess her policy priorities, especially toward Japan and China, the two engines driving the economic future of the Asia-Pacific region. America's much publicized conflicts with Japan and China, moreover, threaten to derail the bright promise of APEC, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum, which met successfully in Seattle last year.

I join others in advocating that the first priority should be stopping the deterioration of the United States-Japan relationship. A solid and stable partnership between America and Japan is crucial. It is the centerpiece upon which the Asia-Pacific's continued peace and economic prosperity is built. New U.S. policy must be forged that will allow common ground to be reached on economic and political concerns with our longtime ally. Moreover, it is imperative that the United States start viewing Japan as an equal, rather than continue the little brother treatment.

It is my belief that America's trade conflicts with Japan have been emphasized too much, to the point where many in the United States have lost sight of the big picture. Although certainly the United States trade deficit with Japan is important, this issue should not be permitted to dominate—poisoning the trust, the confidence and the mutual respect that have bound our two democracies in friendship for nearly a half century.

However, if America is to increasingly view and treat Japan as an equal partner, Japan must also demonstrate willingness to shoulder greater responsibility for global affairs. With a surplus of over $130 billion from global trade, Japan has profitted handsomely from free trade.

To signal her good faith in assuming a position of world leadership, Japan could start by removing the country's multiple barriers to free trade. The recent lifting of Japan's protections over her rice markets was a noteworthy step. Additionally, the agreement reached on Motorola's expanded access to the Japanese cellular phone market was commendable. Japan's role in supporting GATT and conclusion of the Uruguay round of negotiations has also been encouraging.

I am confident these trade disputes will be transcended. The United States and Japan can then turn to the broad range of interests that our two nations share not only in the Asia-Pacific region but in addressing the needs of the global economy.

Another crucial priority for America involves the stabilization of relations with the People's Republic of China. Some Members in Congress have pointed accusing fingers at China, criticizing her for the lack of individual freedoms and democracy that we in the West take as God-given rights. Some have moved for economic punishment of China for alleged human rights shortfalls by withdrawing her most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to learn that President Clinton has given favorable consideration to granting MFN status to China. I applaud the President's decision and I hope our colleagues in both Houses will do likewise.

I join those Members of Congress that question the wisdom of a China policy linking trade with human rights. Restricting trade and access to the United States will not promote—but instead, undercut—efforts supporting democracy in China. It is of paramount importance that China's awe-inspiring progress toward a free market economy be supported by the United States. History has proven time and time again that economic success is a precursor to the growth of democratic reform, political pluralism and protection of individual rights. For proof, we need only look to the vibrant democracies flourishing today in South Korea and Taiwan; the wave of economic prosperity in those nations devoured the repressive regimes in power only yesterday.

Even Chinese dissidents and students hold that extensive trade and business ties with the West are the ultimate forces for democratic change in China. Understandably, many of them oppose the withdrawal of MFN. They know that free trade fosters the creation of a superhighway of information, ideas and communication—whereby western values shall inevitably replace Communist ideology.

There are many lessons to be learned from the failure of Secretary of State Warren Christopher's recent human rights crusade in Beijing. Most important, is that America must come to recognize and adjust to the fact that China is rapidly becoming a great and complete power—soon to become the most dominant country in the Asia-Pacific region. Given the nation's emerging stature, China can ill afford the perception that the United States continues to bully and dictate to her at will—often on totally internal, sovereign matters. This is neither appropriate nor a sound basis for forming a constructive relationship with a power of substance. As with Japan, America must exhibit greater diplomatic sensitivity and learn to negotiate with China as an equal.

Threats to revoke China's MFN can often be counterproductive. More importantly, if America chooses to unilaterally apply economic sanctions with the goal of isolating China, we are only kidding ourselves. Increasingly, events have shown that such action will not gain the multilateral support of the nations of the Asia-Pacific nor the world. The international community simply does not agree with our one-dimensional China policy. The net result is that America is the one isolated.

In the months after the Tiananmen Square tragedy, while the United States justifiably took the high moral ground and restricted contact with China, our European and Asian allies flocked to fill the vacuum of business interests. In America's absence, the ground for innumerable business ventures was broken by our competitors. As a practical consideration in this time of economic recovery in the United States, can we afford to further handcuff our access to the largest and most rapidly developing market on the planet.

While I certainly do not condone the infringement of human rights that have been and perhaps are being perpetrated by Beijing, this must be balanced against recognition of China's sovereign right to control her domestic matters in nurturing the transition from a poor agrarian state to a diversified free market economy—all the while providing for the welfare of the world's largest population.

Some have said that the right to subsistence—to have adequate food and shelter—is the most fundamental of human rights, and I certainly cannot argue against that in observing China's mission to feed, clothe, and shelter her masses. China is succeeding admirably; while Russia, with her premature rush of social and political reforms, has been reduced to an economic basketcase, who must rely upon international charity for survival.

In recognizing that China's task is a difficult one, the United States must demonstrate restraint and patience. And we must also show vision by not limiting our focus on humanitarian concerns to the detriment of the vast, broad range of interests that America shares with China.

It is imperative that the United States remain engaged with China. In addition to the sizable economic incentive, we need strong ties with China to address pressing global issues—including, protection of the environment, escalating arms sales and the spread of nuclear proliferation. On the last matter, controlling nuclear weapons, China can play a uniquely valuable role due to her influential relationship with the unstable regime in North Korea. It is no exaggeration to say that China's assistance could help avert a major war on the Korean Peninsula.

It is only when fundamental interests of the United States are at stake with China that we should consider use of the ultimate economic sanction—withdrawal of MFN. In my opinion, the time for that has not come and we should change our present China policy. Rather than continue to hold China hostage to threats of isolation, the United States should strive to form

a closer relationship based upon mutual respect and mutual benefit. Forging stronger, comprehensive ties between the West and China is in the best interests of the world community, and is the most effective way to promote democracy and protection of human rights in China.

U.S. SECURITY INTERESTS IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Despite the tremendous transformations taking place around the world, one thing that has remained unchanged is that the United States has key security interests in the Asia-Pacific that demand America remain a predominant military power in the region.

There exist many sources for potential instability and flashpoints in the Asia-Pacific region that concern the United States.

One of the most urgent threats is posed by Communist North Korea and her desperate quest for nuclear weapons. Acquisition of nuclear warheads, combined with a ballistic missile program and an intimidating military force numbering over 1 million soldiers, could lead to a major conflict on the Korean Peninsula. Needless to say, such a conflict would hold ramifications for the entire world.

With North Korea's stated intent to withdraw from the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] after inspection disputes with the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA], a major escalation of that threat has occurred. The move has sent shockwaves through Asia and the global community. Nuclear weapons in the hands of North Korea potentially threaten not only South Korea—but Japan, Taiwan, and even China. With development of a new generation of missiles with extended range, North Korea may be capable of delivering warheads as far away as Australia.

Some in the Congress have called for surgical strikes to destroy suspected nuclear weapons facilities in North Korea before their nuclear capacity becomes more deadly. Cooler heads have prevailed, however, and I join them in urging that President Clinton use all diplomatic measures necessary to bring Pyongyang back to the negotiating table and into compliance with the NPT. With recent reports, I am hopeful that negotiations between the North Koreans, The IAEA, and the United States will allow this matter to be resolved peacefully.

If necessary, however, the U.N. Security Council may have to move for economic sanctions to convince North Korea to fulfill her obligations under the NPT. With renewal of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on the table next year, the world community cannot permit North Korea to blatantly violate the NPT without punishment. To acquiesce here would set a terrible precedent, encouraging other rogue countries to join the nuclear club.

The deadly diplomatic dance with North Korea exemplifies why a high priority for United States policy in the Asia-Pacific must be the halting of nuclear and missile proliferation. Effective nuclear and missile arms control regimes must be supported that will bring North Korea, as well as China, into the fold.

The People's Republic of China, as noted earlier, has enjoyed great economic success. With her cash reserves, China has raised concern in the Asia-Pacific region by investing massive sums in high-technology military hardware. While the Soviet Union has collapsed and Japan remains pacifist, China has increased her military budget significantly.

In so doing, China has purchased a number of advanced Soviet jet fighters and bombers, and has shopped around for an aircraft carrier—the foundation for a blue water fleet in the South China Sea. China is also obtaining advanced missile guidance systems, which, seen in light of her nuclear test last year, her largest detonation ever, is worth noting.

At the time when relative peace is at hand, many in the region and the United States question China's heavy military buildup. The aggressive assertion of claims by China to the Spratly Islands and Taiwan, and her conducting of well-publicized military offensive exercises, have fed fears that Chinese expansionism in the Asia-Pacific region may result.

On the other hand, China's military investment is perceived in some quarters as being a reasonable modernization of their aging, obsolete defense systems. Witnessing America's state of the art, lightning-like devastation of Iraq in the gulf war has understandably made China feel inadequate and inferior. The advanced military hardware offered at fire sale prices by Russia and the Ukraine has provided China a rare opportunity to play catchup. It is fair to say the United States would act similarly if in China's position.

Some analysts conclude fears of China's defense buildup and territorial ambitions may be overblown. Seen in light of America's military budget of over $250 billion per year and Japan's annual defense expenditure of $30 billion, China's official military spending of $7 billion last year appears relatively modest. Even if the figure is doubled, as some would argue is more accurate, China's defense spending is considerably less than ours.

DEFENDING U.S. SECURITY POLICY IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Before and since World War II, the United States has played and continues to play a paramount role in maintaining stability and peace in Asia and the Pacific. When critics say America doesn't contribute enough foreign aid to the region like Japan, I point to our billions of defense dollars spent to preserve peace in the Pacific. In my eyes, that is one of the truest forms of foreign assistance. Our participation in the affairs of the region has greatly laid the foundation upon which the Asia-Pacific's present property has been built.

With the dynamic economic growth of the region, it is increasingly vital to the welfare of our Nation as well as the world that the United States continue to play a major role in the bilateral and multilateral security affairs of Asia and the Pacific.

I strongly support the U.S. Department of Defense's strategic framework for the Asian Pacific Rim in the 21st century, and I concur with the Pentagon that our Nation's security policy in the Asia-Pacific region must be flexible yet premised on six basic principles.

First, there exists the absolute assurance that America is committed to the affairs of Asia and the Pacific and will remain firmly engaged in the region.

Second, the United States will continue to foster a strong system of bilateral security agreements with nations in the region.

Third, our Nation will maintain a reserve of forward-deployed forces in the Asia-Pacific, although reduced in number to reflect the realities of the post-cold-war era.

Fourth, America is committed to maintaining overseas bases and equipment necessary to support U.S. forces in the region.

Fifth, our friends and allies in the Asia-Pacific must continue to bear greater responsibility for their countries' self-defense.

Last, America's defense cooperation with her allies shall be complementary in nature and not duplicative.

In applying this broad security policy in the Asia-Pacific, our Nation seeks to ensure that key security interests are protected.

Foremost among these is the protection of the United States and her allies from attack. In addition to defending Alaska, Hawaii, the U.S. Territories, and their lines of communication and navigation to the continental United States, America has pledged to assist in the defense of her allies and their vital sea lanes.

By so doing, another key security interest in the Asia-Pacific is achieved: Preservation of regional peace and stability.

Other vital U.S. interests focus on preserving political and economic access to the countries of the region, while fostering the growth of democratic government and the protection of human rights.

A final security interest pertains to averting the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons in the Asia-Pacific region, while contributing to nuclear deterrence where necessary.

FACILITATING DIALOG THROUGH A MULTILATERAL SECURITY FRAMEWORK

A measure that is vitally needed in the Asia-Pacific and holds great promise for increased regional stability is the creation of a multilateral security framework.

I strongly support and applaud Clinton administration efforts to pursue the formation of an Asia-Pacific regional security regime, whether or not it be shaped after NATO or the conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE]. The lack of such a forum facilitating dialog on security concerns has resulted in an escalating arms race in the region, as many of the smaller Asia-Pacific countries fear the defense buildup by China as well as the potential for Japan to unilaterally remilitarize.

A new post-cold-war defense arrangement in the Asia-Pacific would go a long way toward defusing regional security anxieties and the powderkeg of arms procurements. In a time of reduced U.S. military spending in the Asia-Pacific, such an arrangement could be a cost-effective supplement to existing U.S. bilateral security treaties with our allies. Although such a regional security framework would never displace nor act as a substitute for America's bilateral defense treaties, the initiative could realize significant financial savings for the United States by spreading burdensharing among the numerous nations of the Asia-Pacific.

A very encouraging development that may address this need has arisen from recent Asian post-ministerial meetings. A fledgling framework to discuss security concerns—the Asian Regional Forum [ARF]—has been proposed. The first meeting of the Asian Regional Forum will take place later this year in Bangkok, Thailand. The United States will be attending, along with China, Japan, Russia, Vietnam, Laos, Papua New Guinea, and the post-ministerial countries.

I believe it is a breakthrough of major significance that these countries, some of which are in the center of controversy, are willing to sit around a table and air their fears and concerns with security in the Asia-Pacific. Out of this open dialog, it is hoped that collective expectations, and later on mechanisms, will emerge—both encouraging and facilitating the resolution of conflict by peaceful means.

As the world's only superpower, U.S. support of the Asian Regional Security Forum is crucial and gives it credibility. Our participation will further the exchange and flow of security information between nations of the Asia-Pacific, easing much of the uncertainty and paranoia in the region about hidden agendas of fellow nations. By reducing regional tensions, a major benefit will be the freeing of capital in many Asia-Pacific countries. Funds from costly arms procurements can then be diverted to sorely needed programs fostering economic growth and societal improvements.

THE U.S. ROLE IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC RENAISSANCE

Mr. Speaker, the Asia-Pacific region is immersed in a renaissance of economic prosperity and relative peace. For our great Nation to become a greater participant in and beneficiary of that dynamic process, we must adopt new approaches demonstrating flexibility and sensitivity to the needs and concerns of countries of the Asia-Pacific. If we can achieve these goals, the United States and the nations of the region will achieve greater harmony through a true partnership that befits the dawning of the "Pacific Century."

IN HONOR OF ASIAN-PACIFIC AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, as many of you are aware, immigrants from the Asia-Pacific region are amongst the newest wave to arrive in the United States in recent years. However, they are merely the latest chapter in the long history of Asian-Pacific Americans in our Nation.

During this month for celebration, it is only fitting that we honor our fellow citizens of Asian-Pacific descent—both from the past and the present—that have blessed and enriched our Nation. I submit that Asian-Pacific Americans have certainly been an asset to our country's development, and it is most appropriate that our President and Congress have proclaimed May as Asian-Pacific Heritage Month.

The people of the Asia-Pacific have contributed much to America's development in the sciences and medicine. For example, in 1899 a Japanese immigrant arrived on the shores of this Nation. After years of study and work, this man, Dr. Hideyo Noguchi, isolated the syphilis germ, leading to a cure for the deadly, widespread disease. For decades, Dr. Makio Murayama conducted vital research in the United States that laid the groundwork for combating sickle-cell anemia. In 1973, Dr. Leo Esaki, an Asian immigrant to our country, was awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for his electron tunneling theories. And, in engineering, few have matched the architectural masterpieces created by the genius of Chinese-American, I.M. Pei.

Major contributions to U.S. business and industry have also been made by Asian-Pacific Americans. Wang Laboratories, the innovative business enterprise in computer research and development, was founded in 1955 by Chinese-American, An Wang. This Nation's largest tungsten refinery was built in 1953 by industrialist K.C. Li and his company, the Wah Chang Corp. And, in 1964, an immigrant from Shanghai, China, Gerald Tsai, started from scratch an investment firm, the Manhattan Fund, which today has well over $270 million in assets.

In the entertainment and sports fields, American martial arts expert Bruce Lee entertained the movie audiences of this Nation, while destroying the stereotype of the passive, quiet Asian male. World-class conductor Seiji Ozawa has led the San Francisco Symphony through several brilliant performances over the years.

A Native Hawaiian named Duke Kahanamoku shocked the world by winning the Olympic Gold Medal in swimming 7 decades ago; followed by Dr. Sammy Lee, a Korean-American who won the Olympic Gold Medal in high diving. Then there was Tommy Kono of Hawaii, also an Olympic Gold Medalist in weightlifting. And, yes, perhaps the greatest Olympic diver ever known to the world, a Samoan-American by the name of Greg Louganis—whose record in gold medals and national championships will be in the books for a long time. Japanese-American Kristi Yamaguichi's enthralling gold medal ice-skating performance at the 1992 Winter Olympics continues the legacy of milestone achievements by Asian-Pacific Americans.

In professional sports, of course, we have Michael Chang blazing new paths in tennis, Pacific-Islanders Brian Williams and Michael Jones of world rugby, and the tens of dozens of Polynesian-Americans—like all-pro Samoan linebacker, Junior Seau, and Jesse Sapolu of the San Francisco Forty-Niners—who have made their mark as players in the National Football League.

We also have Asian-Pacific Americans who are making their mark on history, not in our country, but in the Far East. Samoan-American Salevaa Atisanoe is a 578-pound sumo wrestler in Japan who goes by the name of Konishiki. Salevaa, or Konishiki, incidentally, also happens to be a relative of mine. Konishiki was the first foreigner in Japan's centuries-old sport to break through to the ratified air of sumo's second-highest rank. Another Samoan/Tongan-American, Leitani Peitani—known in Japan as Musashimaru—has also gained prominence as a sumo wrestler.

Native-Hawaiian Chad Rowen, or Akebono as he is known in Japan, has scaled even greater heights by attaining the exalted status of Yokozuna or grand champion. Until this Polynesian-American arrived on the scene, no foreigner had ever been permitted to fill this sacred position, as the Japanese associate the Yokozuna with the essence of Shinto's guardian spirits. The ascendancy to grand champion status goes to the heart of the Japanese religion and culture.

In honoring Asian-Pacific Americans that have served to enrich our country, I would be remiss, as a Vietnam veteran, if I did not honor the contributions of the Japanese-Americans who

served in the U.S. Army's 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry combat group. History speaks for itself in documenting that none have shed their blood more valiantly for America than the Japanese-Americans that served in these units while fighting enemy forces in Europe during World War II.

The records of the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry are without equal. These Japanese-American units suffered an unprecedented casualty rate of 314 percent, and received over 18,000 individual decorations, many posthumously awarded, for valor in battle.

With the tremendous sacrifice of lives, a high number of medals were given the unit. I find it unusual, however, that only one Medal of Honor was awarded, while 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars and 9,480 Purple Hearts were given. The great number of Japanese-American lives lost should have resulted in more of these ultimate symbols of sacrifice being awarded. Nonetheless, the 442nd Combat Group emerged as the most decorated combat unit of its size in the history of the U.S. Army. President Truman was so moved by their bravery in the field of battle, as well as that of black American soldiers during World War II, that he issued an Executive order to desegregate the armed services.

I am proud to say that we can count the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE and the late, highly respected Senator, Spark Matsunaga, both from Hawaii, as Members from Congress that distinguished themselves in battle as soldiers with the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry. It was while fighting in Europe that Senator INOUYE lost his arm and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the second highest medal for bravery.

These Japanese-Americans paid their dues in blood to protect our Nation from its enemies. It is a shameful black mark on the history of our country that when the patriotic survivors of the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry returned to the United States many were reunited with families that were locked up behind barbed-wire fences, living in concentration camps. You might be interested to know, my colleagues on the Hill, Congressmen ROBERT MATSUI and NORMAN MINETA, were children of the concentration camps.

The wholesale and arbitrary abolishment of the constitutional rights of these loyal Japanese-Americans will forever serve as a reminder and testament that this must never be allowed to occur again. When this miscarriage of justice unfolded during World War II, Americans of German and Italian ancestry were not similarly jailed en masse. Some declare the incident as an example of outright racism and bigotry in its ugliest form.

After viewing the Holocaust Museum in Washington, I understand better why the genocide of 6 million Jews has prompted the cry, "Never Again." Likewise, I sincerely hope that mass internments on the basis of race or religion will never happen again in our great Nation.

To those that say, well, that occurred decades ago, I say we must continue to be vigilant in guarding against such evil today.

Just weeks ago on Capitol Hill, an Asian-Pacific American, Bruce Yamashita, received his commission as a captain in the U.S. Marines at a congressional ceremony held in the House Armed Services Committee. Why the special treatment?

Four years ago, this Japanese-American, born and raised in Hawaii and a graduate of Georgetown University law school, was discharged arbitrarily from the Marine Corps when on the verge of receiving his commission as a second lieutenant. After years of perseverance and appeals, Mr. Yamashita was finally vindicated, after proving he was the target of vicious racial and ethnic harassment during his 10-week officer training program.

According to official records, Marine Corps instructors incessantly taunted Mr. Yamashita about his heritage, referred to him using ethnic slurs, and at one point told him: "we don't want your kind around here. Go back to your own country."

This attitude of discrimination, unfortunately, is not limited to the lower ranks but extends to the highest level of the Marine Corps. Last October, when the Yamashita case was still in controversy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Carl E. Mundy, appeared on television's "Sixty Minutes" and stated, "Marine officers who are minorities do not shoot, swim or use compasses as well as white officers."

Although General Mundy has since apologized for his remarks, I am deeply troubled that a military officer of his caliber would hold such opinions and show no reservation in voicing them to an international audience. It is a sign of the depth of the problem.

It is also ironic to note that Captain Yamashita is a descendant of those Japanese-American soldiers from Hawaii that distinguished themselves in battle during WW II with the legendary 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry combat group. When General Mundy says soldiers like Captain Yamashita "Can't shoot straight" it is these brave Japanese-Americans—Yamasita's people—that he belittles. They "can't shoot straight" but they can spill blood in defense of this country to merit 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars and over 9,400 Purple Hearts. Please, give me a break.

The significance of Captain Yamashita's case extends far beyond his personal plight. His challenge prompted the Marine Corps to discover, during a review in 1992, that minority candidates drop out of its officer training program at a higher rate than white officers. Some hold that the record reveals there has been a deliberate effort on the part of the Marine Corps to discourage minorities from becoming officers.

I commend the Secretary of the Navy, John H. Dalton, who after reviewing the record, overruled the Marine Corps and ordered that Mr. Yamashita receive his officer's commission. I also commend Senator DANIEL INOUYE for his tenacity in fighting on behalf of Captain Yamashita and in addressing this latest injustice and racism against Asian-Pacific Americans. Senator INOUYE has always responded to the battle call against the forces of bigotry and racism.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I think the Yamashita case bears implications not just for the military but for our society as a whole. It asks the question, how long do we have to endure the attitude of those who consider Asian-Pacific Americans and other minorities as lesser Americans?

I applaud Captain Yamashita for his tremendous courage, commitment and determination in seeing that racial discrimination is not tolerated. During this month as we recognize the diverse experiences and contributions of the Asian-Pacific American community to our great Nation, I would hope that we all take inspiration from his example.

With that in mind, I would like to close my remarks by asking what is America all about? I think it could not have been said better than on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial when Martin Luther King said, "I have a dream. My dream is that one day my children will be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

That is what America is all about, Mr. Speaker, and Asian-Pacific Americans wish to find a just and equitable place in our society that will allow them—like all Americans—to grow, succeed, achieve, and contribute to the advancement of this great Nation as we enter the "Pacific Century."

□ 1920

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS].

MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR CHINA

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak this evening to the statement of the President of the United States of just a few hours ago regarding the most-favored-nation status for China. I, as many Americans across the Nation and many Members of this body, just learned of this decision just a few hours ago. I have not read the President's statement. I have not studied the text of his thinking with regard to this decision, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it does warrant a response

from those of us who have deep concerns about our relationship with China in light of extensive human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important for we in Congress and we as Americans to ask ourselves some fundamental questions about who we are as a Nation, what we stand for, what is the foundation of this country, what should be the foundation of our foreign policy, and what is it that we mean by "human rights."

Indeed, do we as Americans believe what we say, and do we stand by what we say with respect to human rights?

I believe respect for human rights, human dignity, is a fundamental value that we as Americans share.

□ 1930

It is something that is extremely important to all of us regardless of our political persuasions, regardless of where we come from in this great country.

I truly believe that deep down inside of us we have a very deep and firm commitment to the rights and the dignity of human beings in our country and outside of our country.

There is a thing called most-favored-nation status, and it is what it suggests, a declaration that certain nations on this planet are most favored in the eyes of the United States and in the eyes of Americans. And so it is when we look at the human rights abuses at the hands of the Chinese, of the repression at the hands of the Chinese, when we look at the evidence of torture, of imprisonment, of people for standing up and expressing their political views, it becomes of great concern to all of us as Americans because it violates that fundamental principle and value that we share.

So it has been that the question of whether or not we declare a nation such as China with the record that China has on abuse of its citizens and others, clear violations of human rights, whether we should extend most-favored-nation status to such a country, whether we should declare a nation that engages so systematically in violations of human rights, a most favored nation.

Last year the President of the United States declared that if China was to have most-favored-nation status extended in 1994 that it had to make overall significant progress in the areas of human rights. What has happened in that year's time?

I know of no one who can say with a straight face that China has made overall significant progress toward human rights in this past year, no one who I know who is familiar with the situation in that nation and no one I know who is familiar with the situation in Tibet would suggest that overall significant progress has been made with respect to human rights by the Chinese.

Asia Watch provided testimony to this country and to this Congress that last year, as a matter of fact, was the worst for political arrests and trials. They cited evidence upon evidence upon evidence of repression in every province in China, and then they turned their attention to Tibet, the people who are seeking dignity and respect, seeking the basic, fundamental right to live as Tibetans, to practice freely their religion and their culture, to not be the objects of systematic torture and repression by the Chinese. And we find there are now more prisoners in Tibet than in every province in China combined. And we find strong evidence of a systematic attempt by the Chinese to repress if not annihilate the religious traditions and culture of the Tibetans.

So in light of all of this evidence, in light of all of this testimony, in light of the hearings that we have held here in Congress, in light of evidence and testimony that experts have brought to us of the systematic repression at the hands of the Chinese, the clear evidence that the Chinese have failed to meet the condition that we as a Nation established for extension of its most favored nation status, the question for us becomes what are we to do?

Well, the President of the United States today has announced that despite these facts and this evidence he believes that we should in fact extend most favored nation status to China, that we should through that policy declare that this nation is a most favored nation of the United States.

I was pleased to learn just a short time ago that the Senate majority leader of the other body, Senator GEORGE MITCHELL, indicated that he disagrees with the President's decision. He made a statement just a short time ago in which he said that the experience of recent years has been that each concession to the Chinese communist regime encourages its intransigence.

And he went on to say, "I believe this will be the unfortunate result of this decision. It will confirm for the Chinese communist regime the success of its policy of repression on human rights and manipulation on trade."

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe very strongly that two things need to happen. No. 1, this Congress needs to engage in a debate over whether or not we should declare China a most favored nation of this country. I believe that if we have a fair, and honest and thorough debate this Congress will respond, if it hears from the people of this country as Members of Congress go back to their districts, when they hear from the people of this country about our belief if human rights and the principles and values that we hold dear, that they will come back to this body and we will have a debate, and we will recognize that human rights means something, and most favored nation status should mean something as well, and that we should not stand idly by and declare China a most favored nation.

But there is something else that I think that we as Americans need to do in light of today's announcement by the President. I think we all have to ask ourselves: Who are we as a people? What do we stand for? What should be the foundation of America's foreign policy? When we tell the world that we believe in human rights, do we really mean it? When we declare to the world that our foreign policy decisions are going to be based upon the recognition that human rights should be respected everywhere in the world, do we really mean it?

What happens, ladies and gentlemen, when the United States says one thing and does another, when we stand up and declare our support for human rights, our support and respect for His Holiness, the Dalai Lama in Tibet, for the people of Tibet, and then declare China a most-favored-nation status? What does it all mean? What does our rhetoric mean? What do we really stand for? What in fact drives American foreign policy? Is it human rights, is it respect for individuals, is it the values that we cherish, or is the bottom line the bottom line, pure economics, pure trade, pure opportunities for profits?

Ladies and gentlemen, we are embarked on a very new and important era in world history. The cold war is over. The old ways of defining our planet and aligning our Nation have changed. We are engaged in a new challenge and a new opportunity. We have to establish at this time in our country's history what is the rudder beneath this ship of State, what is the foundation of this country's foreign policy? Where are we going and how does it reflect our values and our principles as Americans?

□ 1940

And are economics and profits the only foundation on which we stand?

I believe that many in this body, I believe that the President of the United States believes in human rights, is deeply committed to the principles that we cherish as Americans. But it raises a fundamental question. What in this new era are we to do about those beliefs, about those principles? What are we to do when we see nations engaged in such systematic repression as we see in China? What are we to do when we draw a line in the sand and make it very clear to the world that we are going to condition most-favored-nation status on human rights and then clearly see that the progress that we called for was not achieved and then extend most-favored-nation status anyway? What are the implications for all of the despots of the world, all those who are engaged in human rights violations and tyranny around the world?

What is the message that we are giving them?

And what is the long-term implications for the values and principles that we cherish?

I believe these are questions that we have to ask ourselves as Americans. I believe these are questions that we have to ask ourselves as a Congress, and I believe that the answers that we give to these questions will not only affect our relationship to this particular country and this particular trading status but will affect our relationship to nations all around the world and will lay the groundwork for future policies and potential future repression for generations to come.

I encourage my fellow Members of Congress, as they travel home, to engage in a discussion of these questions with their citizens, their constituents; I encourage those across this country to likewise engage in those discussions with their Members of Congress, and I call upon this Nation and this Congress to engage in a debate as to what we believe in as a nation, what we stand for as a nation, and whether or not human rights should be a part and a foundation of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman.

I really appreciate the comments and the concerns that he has expressed concerning the President's recent decision to grant MFN status to China. I look forward to debating the issue with the gentleman. I think it is a worthwhile issue that our country should, and the Members of both Houses should debate openly certainly for a better understanding of our people concerning this important issue.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), after 3 p.m. today, on account of the birth of his baby.

Mr. CLEMENT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), after 12 noon today, on account of official business.

Mr. COX (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of his wife having a baby.

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 Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KLUG) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT to include a letter from the U.S. attorney concerning House Resolution 436 after the request by Mr. KLUG to postpone consideration of House Resolution 436.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1030. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the Department of Veterans Affairs program of sexual trauma services for veterans, to improve certain Department of Veterans Affairs programs for women veterans, to extend the period of entitlement to inpatient care for veterans exposed to Agent Orange or ionizing radiation, to establish a hospice care pilot program, to establish a rural health care clinics program, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide per diem payments and construction grants to State homes for adult day health care services, to establish an education debt reduction program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 965. An act to provide for toy safety and for other purposes.

H.R. 1632. An act to amend title II, District of Columbia Code, and part C of title IV of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Government Reorganization Act to remove gender-specific references.

H.R. 3863. An act to designate the Post Office building located at 401 E. South Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "Medgar Wiley Evers Post Office."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1654. An act to make certain technical corrections.

S.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 12 through 19, 1994, as "National Men's Health Week."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 70 of the 103d Congress, the House stands adjourned until noon, Wednesday, June 8, 1994.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 8, 1994, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3262. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to recover costs of establishing standards for agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3263. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to recover the full costs for inspection of egg products performed at times other than an approved primary shift; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3264. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to recover costs of standardization activities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3265. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification making available emergency appropriations in budget authority for the Department of Commerce pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended (H. Doc. No. 103-263); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3266. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting notification of the delay of the report on the financing options for Federal energy and water conservation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3267. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3268. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1999 resulting from passage of H.R. 1134 and S. 341, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3269. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting a copy of the Legion's financial statements as of December 31, 1993, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(4), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3270. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on the private sector involvement program, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1060(d) (105 Stat. 2004); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3271. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a

copy of the Board's submission to OMB regarding S. 1588, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1903(b)(7); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3272. A letter from the Administrator, NASA, transmitting the annual report on actions taken and planned to implement fully the metric system of measurement; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

3273. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1995 Medicare physician fee schedule update and fiscal year 1995 Medicare volume performance standard [MVPS] recommendations; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BEVILL: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4506. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes (Rept. 103–533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOYER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4539. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes (Rept. 103–534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4501. A bill to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 46 East Ohio Street in Indianapolis, IN, as the "Holder-Noland Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 4502. A bill to include additional exchange rate policy information in reports required to be made by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Secretary of the Treasury to the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 4503. A bill to enhance the supervision and regulation of derivatives activities of financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 4504. A bill to amend the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act, and for other purposes: to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 4505. A bill to amend title 35 United States Code, to establish a 20-year patent term from the date of filing and to establish a domestic priority system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 4506. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 4507. A bill to require in certain circumstances that States disclose the HIV status of newborn infants to legal guardians of the infants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 4508. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. QUILLEN):

H.R. 4509. A bill to impose restrictions on the authority to enter into certain trade agreements reducing tariffs with respect to another country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WATT):

H.R. 4510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the limitation applicable to mutual life insurance companies on the deduction for policyholder dividends and to exempt small life insurance companies from the required capitalization of certain policy acquisition expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 4511. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development to provide assistance for programs of credit and other assistance for microenterprises in developing countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H.R. 4512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide employers a refundable credit for hiring AFDC recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN (by request):

H.R. 4513. A bill to provide eligibility for space-available transportation on military aircraft for former prisoners of war who are totally disabled as a result of a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 4514. A bill to amend certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, in order to ensure equality between Federal firefighters and other employees in the civil service and other public sector firefighters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide that the penalty for failure of employers to file certain reports with respect to the Medicare and Medicaid coverage data bank shall apply only with respect to reports required in calendar years beginning after 90 days after necessary regulations are promulgated; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and other laws to improve and promote the provision of long-term care in the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLINK:

H.R. 4517. A bill to reinstate the emergency unemployment compensation program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Agriculture.

By Mr. KOPETSKI (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LAROCCO, and Mr. KREIDLER):

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide a procedure for the termination of Federal Trade Commission orders which have been in effect for at least 10 years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 4519. A bill to increase access to health insurance for employees of small businesses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

By Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY (for herself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. COX, and Mr. PORTMAN):

H.R. 4520. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, to require that the President's budget submission separately reflect the budget aggregates relating to activities within the unified budget and aggregates relating to activities required by law to be excluded from the unified budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY (for herself, Mr. PENNY, Ms. LONG, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. COX, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 4521. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to improve the information made available in Social Security account statements and to provide for annual distribution of such statements to beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. FIELDS of Texas):

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend the authorization of appropriations of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 4523. A bill to provide for private development of power at the Mancos project and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 4524. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Old Spanish Trail and the northern branch of the Old Spanish Trail for potential inclusion into the National Trails System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 4525. A bill to authorize the transfer of a certain loan contract to the Upper Yampa Water Conservancy Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 4526. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to establish a

Federal civil right requiring that State laws, and the laws of the District of Columbia, relating to physical assault, sexual assault, sexual abuse, and sexual harassment be enforced without regard to the age of the victim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, and Mr. ALLARD):

H.R. 4527. A bill to assure fairness and choice to patients and providers under managed health care benefit plans; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. UPTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. WASHINGTON):

H.R. 4528. A bill entitled the "Mercury-Containing and Rechargeable Battery Management Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 4529. A bill to repeal the authority of the Mayor of the District of Columbia to requisition unlimited funds from the Treasury of the United States to meet the general expenses of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4530. A bill to provide authority for the extension of nondiscriminatory—most-favored-nation-trade treatment to Cambodia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of California (for himself and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 4531. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for jurisdiction, apprehension, and detention of certain civilians accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS of California:

H.R. 4532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to define tar sands for purposes of the credit for producing fuels from nonconventional sources and to repeal the minimum tax preference for intangible drilling costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO (by request):

H.R. 4533. A bill to promote entrepreneurial management of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHEAT:

H.R. 4534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate portability, enhance pension coverage, and provide employers an optional simplified method of complying with certain pension requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MARKEY, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HASTERT, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY):

H.R. 4535. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to the extension of unlisted trading privileges for corporate securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution designating June 10, 1995, as "Portuguese American Friendship Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.J. Res. 372. Joint resolution disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEAL (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MANN, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. COOPER):

H. Res. 445. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3266) to provide for automatic downward adjustments in the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 1994 set forth in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 equal to the amount of rescissions contained in the Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COX, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. FAWELL, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MICA, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H. Res. 446. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the issuance under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 of administrative guidelines applicable to religious harassment in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause I of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 4536. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Alpha Tango;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4537. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Old Hat;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4538. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Silent Wings;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. REED, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 123: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. WILSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 133: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 141: Ms. VALAZQUEZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 359: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 401: Mr. KING.

H.R. 417: Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 702: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. GILMOR.

H.R. 778: Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 967: Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1103: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 1164: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 1276: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1280: Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1500: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1583: Mrs. BYRNE and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1737: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1999: Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 2088: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 2346: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 2417: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 2418: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2460: Mr. MINGE and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 2467: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 2672: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 2708: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 2826: Mr. MFUME, Mr. ORTON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2873: Mr. FISH, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 2919: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 2927: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
H.R. 2929: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2985: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2995: Mr. MCHALE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 3023: Mr. KIM, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LAROCCO.
H.R. 3065: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.
H.R. 3125: Mr. BAKER of California.
H.R. 3128: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3173: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 3179: Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 3288: Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 3293: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 3407: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 3434: Mr. FINGERHUT.
H.R. 3486: Mr. LAUGHLIN and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.
H.R. 3494: Mr. FROST, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. PAXON.
H.R. 3513: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3637: Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 3663: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.
H.R. 3722: Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 3739: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.
H.R. 3769: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 3771: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3820: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. RAHALL, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3821: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3822: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3846: Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. SHARP, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HOKE, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 3900: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 3906: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. WISE, and Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 3939: Mrs. BYRNE.
H.R. 3943: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 3951: Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 3955: Mr. ORTIZ and Mrs. FOWLER.
H.R. 3992: Mr. CANADY.
H.R. 4019: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. KLINK.
H.R. 4051: Mr. YATES.
H.R. 4056: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 4078: Mr. TORKILDSEN.
H.R. 4095: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. WELDON.
H.R. 4115: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 4133: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. CANADY.
H.R. 4135: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. NCNULTY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PAYNE, of New Jersey, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 4137: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. KYL, and Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 4142: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. HOKE.
H.R. 4148: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4161: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. EWING, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4223: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 4237: Mr. MILLER of California.
H.R. 4260: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mrs. LLOYD.
H.R. 4271: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 4291: Mr. SWIFT and Mr. DICKEY.
H.R. 4306: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 4307: Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4365: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. PARKER.
H.R. 4393: Mr. MANTON, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. SCHUMER.
H.R. 4399: Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 4400: Mr. WYNN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. PASTOR.
HR. 4412: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4421: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 4434: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DEAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KYL, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MINGE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 4451: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4464: Mr. OWENS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. LONG, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WATT, Mr. KLEIN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GORDON, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KING, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KLINK, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WISE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. QUINN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.
H.R. 4468: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. EMERSON, MR. TALENT, and Mr. BORSKI.
H.R. 4475: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.J. Res. 15:
Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. DIXON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. FROST.
H.J. Res. 209: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. COX.
H.J. Res. 286: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. WOLF.
H.J. Res. 297: Mr. TORRES.
H.J. Res. 311: Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. BYRNE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. DUNN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MANN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.J. Res. 327; Mr. MANN, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. UPTON.
H.J. Res. 338: Mr. STARK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. MAZZOLI.
H.J. Res. 343: Mr. FISH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. SARPALIUS.
H.J. Res 356: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.J. Res. 362: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.J. Res. 364: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. RIDGE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BAESLER, and Mr. KLINK.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H. Con. Res. 147: Mr. FISH.
H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. MINETA.
H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. PICKLE, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H. Con. Res. 212: Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Con. Res. 219: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mrs. MORELLA.
H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PETRI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BYRNE, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H. Con. Res. 234: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ZIMMER.
H. Con. Res. 245: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.
H. Res. 234: Mr. BUYER and Mr. GRANDY.
H. Res. 337: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. MEEHAN.
H. Res. 430: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXVII, the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 20, May 25, 1994, by Mr. SANGMEISTER on House Joint Resolution 131, has been signed by the following Members: George E. Sangmeister and Thomas W. Ewing.

Petition 21, May 26, 1994, by Mr. HANSEN on House Resolution 405, has been signed by the following Members: James A. Hansen, Dan Glickman, Bob Stump, Scotty Baesler, Robert H. Michel, Richard W. Pombo, Jim Bunning, Dick Swett, Vernon J. Ehlers, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Bob Goodlatte, James M. Inhofe, Michael D. Crapo, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Lamar Smith, Jennifer Dunn, Dan Burton, Donald A. Manzullo, Jay Kim, Jim Kolbe, Mel Hancock, Wayne Allard, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Don Young, Charles W. Stenholm, Robert F. (Bob) Smith, Cliff Stearns, Calvin M. Dooley, Charles T. Canady, Dana Rohrabacher, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Peter Blute, Jane Harman, Craig Thomas, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Timothy J. Penny, Fred Upton, Bill Emerson, Jan Meyers, Scott McInnis, Bob Livingston, Cass Ballenger, Porter J. Goss, Richard K. Armey, Paul E. Gillmor, Tillie K. Fowler, Peter Hoekstra, John Edward Porter, Rod Grams, Jim Slattery, Pat Roberts, Frank D. Lucas, Bill Orton, Jim Lightfoot, Hamilton Fish, Jr., J. Alex McMillan, David Minge, Douglas "Pete" Peterson, Michael A. "Mac" Collins, Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Peter G. Torkildsen, Dan Miller, James A. Leach, Joe Barton, Rob Portman, Collin C. Peterson, Stephen E. Buyer, Larry Combest, Dave Camp, Barbara F. Vucanovich, James M. Talent, Alfred A. (Al) McCandless, Christopher Shays, Thomas W. Ewing, Steve Gunderson, Joe Skeen, Sam Johnson, Bill Barrett, Joel Hefley, Michael Huffington, John Linder, Jim McCrery, J. Roy Rowland, Michael Bilirakis, Joe Knollenberg, Dave McCurdy, Bob Inglis, Barney Frank, Rick Santorum, Bill McCollum, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Nathan Deal, David L. Hobson, Harris W. Fawell, Doug Bereuter, Dick Zimmer, Tom DeLay, William F. Clinger, Jr., Don Sundquist, Thomas E. Petri, James C. Greenwood, David Dreier, Henry Bonilla, Carlos J. Moorhead, Bob Franks, Ken Calvert, Nick Smith, Bill Baker, Gerald B.H. Solomon, William H. Zeliff, Jr., Jerry Lewis, Dean A. Gallo, Jim Bacchus, Toby Roth, J. Dennis Hastert, Arthur Ravenel, Jr., Newt Gingrich, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Elton Gallegly, Nancy L. Johnson, Philip M. Crane, James A. Barcia, Charles H. Taylor, Sonny Callahan, John T. Doolittle, Jim Nussle, Terry Everett, Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Jon Kyl, Constance A. Morella, Gary A. Condit, Jack Quinn, John A. Boehner, Deborah Pryce, and Wayne T. Gilchrest.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 11 by Mr. RAMSTAD on House Resolution 247: James M. Talent, John Kasich, Rich Santorum, John J. Duncan, Jr., and Nick Smith.

Petition 12 by Mr. TRAFICANT on H.R. 3261: Peter T. King and John Kasich.

Petition 13 by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey on House Resolution 281: John Kasich and Frank Tejeda.

Petition 15 by Mr. BILIRAKIS on House Resolution 382: Robert H. Baker, John A. Boehner, Charles T. Canady, John T. Doolittle, Peter T. King, Larry Combest, and Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.

Petition 16 by Mr. ZELIFF on House Resolution 407: Scotty Baesler, Timothy J. Penny, Ron Lewis, W.J. (Billy) Tauzin, James A. Hayes, and Bob Livingston.

Petition 17 by Mr. SHAW on House Resolution 386: Jim Ramstad, John A. Boehner, Bob Franks, Peter G. Torkildsen, Ken Calvert, Nick Smith, Amo Houghton, James H. (Jimmy) Quillen, Bill Baker, Bob Stump, J. Dennis Hastert, Wayne Allard, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Bob Livingston, William F. Goodling, Philip M. Crane, Dana Rohrabacher, Terry Everett, Michael A. "Mac" Collins, Herbert H. Bateman, Floyd Spence, Peter T. King, George W. Gekas, Peter Blute, William F. Clinger, Jr., John T. Doolittle, Steve Gunderson, Micheal G. Oxley, Richard W. Pombo, Robert H. Michel, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Jon Kyl, Dave Camp, Bill McCollum, Scott McInnis, Fred Upton, Jack Quinn, and Dean A. Gallo.

Petition 18 by Mr. HASTERT on House Resolution 402: Jay Kim, Bob Goodlatte, James M. Talent, Bob Inglis, John A. Boehner, Charles T. Canady, Dick Zimmer, Peter T. King, Robert F. (Bob) Smith, John Kasich, Tom DeLay, John Edward Porter, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Larry Combest, John Linder, Carlos J. Moorhead, Ken Calvert, Nick Smith, Bill Baker, Newt Gingrich, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, and Jennifer Dunn.

Petition 19 by Mr. EWING on House Resolution 415: Jay Kim, Jim Bunning, Bill Emerson, Jim Ramstad, Bob Goodlatte, Sam Johnson, Mel Hancock, James M. Talent, Howard Coble, Doug Bereuter, Jan Meyers, Jay Dickey, John A. Boehner, Charles T. Canady, Dick Zimmer, John T. Doolittle, Rich Santorum, Cass Ballenger, Rod Grams, Larry Combest, James C. Greenwood, David Dreier, Ken Calvert, Bill Baker, and William H. Zeliff, Jr.

Petition 20 by Mr. SANGMEISTER on H.J. Res. 131: Bill Baker.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO REV. D.L. WELCH

HON. EARL HUTTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the contributions of Rev. D.L. Welch. Reverend Welch is celebrating his 89th birthday this week. For over 60 years, Reverend Welch has contributed to the spiritual development of Escambia County through the First Pentecostal Church of Pensacola.

For more than 70 years, the Reverend Welch has preached the Gospel to all. He began the local phase of his career in the late 1920's with massive tent revivals drawing as many as 5,000 attendees in one night. Before long, the people of this community insisted he establish a church and pastor it. Today it is one of the largest in our worldwide denomination. At the present time, it is being expanded into a 2,000-seat sanctuary on a nearly 9-acre site

The Reverend Welch's accomplishments could take up a volume, but yet he is a humble man. Despite the fact that literally tens of thousands of people have come to salvation through his preaching, Reverend Welch has not sought nor received public acclaim. He believes his reward will come in Heaven; true enough—but obviously we wish to remember his record of helping all who came to him by instilling these values in others with something tangible today.

The Reverend Welch has authored two widely read books. The first, "Contending for the Faith," is hailed as a concise theological primer on the true nature of God, His Spirit and His incarnation as Jesus. His second, "D.L. Welch, A Man of War," chronicles—and preserves—the earliest foundations of Pentecostal theology and evangelism. Both are considered must reading for those who seek the truth of God's revelation to humanity.

Florida Governor Fuller Warren recognized his abilities. With the concurrent advice and consent of the President of the Florida Senate and the Senate as a whole, the Reverend Welch served as Chaplain of the Senate, becoming a trusted source of spiritual advice and comfort to the State's lawmakers.

The totality of his career's accomplishments are recognized by his denomination as well. He was unanimously elected to the general board of the United Pentecostal Church and still serves today, representing the membership at-large. This honor ranks the Reverend Welch among the Nation's top religious leadership, a point of pride for Escambia County.

But Reverend Welch's most significant accomplishment is changed lives. These are thousands of stories. But the Reverend Welch is not a self-seeker; the job of accomplishing such acts of life-saving renewal is sufficient recognition.

I am pleased to pay tribute to Reverend Welch. We wish him a happy birthday, and many more years of service.

IN APPRECIATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SPONSORED BY CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY AND THE TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and appreciation that I rise to commend the cooperative efforts of Central Connecticut State University in New Britain and the Technical University of Wrolaw who, throughout the past 3 years, have combined university and community resources and leaders to develop a partnership to promote Poland's historic transformation to a market economy. I have enjoyed the opportunity to work closely with this program in its qualification process for U.S. Agency for International Development grant funds and I am pleased to recognize the excellence of its work.

In 1991, with the aid of the Gen. Jozef Haller Post in New Britain, leaders at Central Connecticut State University undertook a tremendous initiative which resulted in more than $3.2 million being raised in private and public funds to support a broad variety of technical assistance projects for the people and major institutions of southwest Poland. New Britain, CT, is proud of its significant Polish community and their strong ties to their homeland. New Britain's "Polonia" was integral to the development and success of the AID grant-funded programs.

It has been an exciting period in New Britain and Central Connecticut State University's history, with this inaugural outreach effort reaching such a remarkable degree of respect and success in Poland. Strong bonds have developed between the academic teams and the participants in the program—bonds which will serve both communities in the years to come. All those involved have benefitted beyond the original scope of the program, and I would like to thank President John Shumaker and Vice President Zdzislaw Kremens for their initiative, leadership, courage, and perseverance in realizing the full potential of this worthy endeavor.

HONORING PATRICK O'DONNELL

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this weekend in my district, an outstanding citizen is being honored as Riverdalian of the Year by the Riverdale Community Council. A local businessman and community activist, Patrick O'Donnell richly deserves this recognition.

Mr. O'Donnell has been active in a wide range of community activities. His efforts have assisted children in local youth programs, neighborhood residents, and charitable organizations. He was a member of the North Riverdale Taxpayers Association, a predecessor to the Riverdale Community Association. His other affiliations include St. Margaret's Church, the Riverdale Irish Society, and the Knights of Columbus.

I am sure Mr. O'Donnell's wife and three children are proud of his accomplishments, and the community is grateful for his contributions. Mr. Speaker, it is people like Patrick O'Donnell who help maintain viable communities. I congratulate him on behalf of my constituents and extend my personal best wishes.

A POLICY THAT COSTS ME OVER $2,900 A YEAR, AND HAS A LIFETIME CAP OF $20,000 IN BENEFITS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress once again the importance of health care reform. The American people continue to face high insurance premiums, a lack of benefits, and excessive medical costs. I speak in reference to a letter I received from a man in Florida, who lost his job, and consequently his medical and life insurance.

Here is an excerpt from his letter:

> For more than ten years, I worked for [a large corporation]. I was told by human resources people that should I ever be terminated or laid off, I could continue my medical coverage. "Don't worry," they said, "nothing can happen."
>
> Then I got my HIV-positive test result.
>
> Then I was laid off.
>
> Then my medical and life insurance went away.
>
> What was a one-million dollar major medical and hospitalization policy is now a policy that costs me over $2,900 a year, and has a lifetime cap of $20,000 in benefits. I am delighted to report I may be able to survive this disease—but am less happy to report that my lifetime benefits will be exhausted in less than three years. At that point, I will need to pay the $800 per month cost of my drugs and lab tests. As I am now [self-employed], I can only hope that business is good when that happens.

This letter demonstrates the needs of the American people and emphasizes the necessity of a plan which guarantees universal health coverage and controls on health care costs.

"Please get something done," this man writes, "I do not want to plan my own funeral

just because I could not afford to continue my medication."

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. LEHNHART

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding public service of Robert E. Lehnhart of Orange, CA. Bob, who has demonstrated a remarkable dedication to the needs of the international community, will be honored on June 10, 1994, as he retires from his position as founder, president, and CEO of Air Serv International, a nonprofit, humanitarian aviation organization based in Redlands, CA.

In 1984 Bob founded Air Serv International and began operations a year later during one of Africa's worst crises. Since that time, over 100,000 flights have been successfully completed in remote and often war-torn areas of developing nations. Under Bob's leadership, Air Serv has provided safe and reliable air transport to agencies involved in relief and development, U.N. agencies, Embassy aid missions, and multilateral and national government agencies. Because of Bob's dedicated service, Air Serv has earned a solid, well-deserved reputation among the international community.

Using his experience gained through years of work with Air Serv and other charitable efforts, Bob plans on pursuing an advanced degree in international studies and hopes to teach. Despite Bob's retirement from Air Serv, he will continue to make a significant impact on the international community as he prepares others for careers in the international and humanitarian fields.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, Bob's family and many friends in honoring this unique individual for his extensive and dedicated service. Over the years, Bob has touched the lives of many people in our community and abroad and it is only fitting that the House recognize him today.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FISCAL AND POLITICAL HOUSE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia government is struggling to bring its house in order. There are serious fiscal and management problems confronting this city's elected officials. The District is in a financial mess because it did not realistically cut spending to meet declining revenues in recent years. Instead, it relied on congressional bailouts, short-term borrowing, and budgeting contrivances.

The District faces the problems, challenges, and opportunities common to many American cities today. But it also has the unique role of being the Nation's Capital, too. Congress must share responsibility with local officials for creating and solving these problems. My colleague from California, Mr. DIXON, is addressing these issues as his subcommittee considers the fiscal year 1995 appropriation for the District. The House District Committee will address them next month when we hold hearings on the District's Federal payment.

However, the ultimate judgment for selecting solutions will rest where it should, with the District's voters. I believe that District voters, like voters everywhere, will surprise many when they demonstrate their understanding of complex issues and competing candidates.

Twenty years ago, District voters passed the Home Rule Charter. Twenty years later, I am sure they will again speak with conviction. The answer to the city's problems will be found in the relationship between the residents and their elected leaders. I will only support congressional involvement which is built on that foundation.

I commend a recent Post column to my colleagues. It raises several interesting ideas about the District's government and elected officials. While I don't necessarily agree with everything proposed, this is the type of dialog the city needs. The article was written by two local journalists, Harry Jaffe and Tom Sherwood, whose recent book, "Dream City: Race, Power and the Decline of Washington, DC," charts the course of District politics since Home Rule. The article and the book should be required reading for everyone concerned about how the District came to be in this situation and what to do next.

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 1994]

GETTING REAL ABOUT D.C.: THE CASE FOR CITY MANAGEMENT

(By Harry Jaffe and Tom Sherwood)

Twenty years ago this month the democracy-starved voters of the District of Columbia went to the polls and ratified the Home Rule Act, a limited and in many ways begrudging form of government crafted by congressional overseers. It was the best the city could get at the time.

Now, after two decades in operation, that system of semi-independent self-government is in desperate need of reform. Debilitating social and fiscal problems spur flight by both white and black middle-class families who should be the heart of the city's stability and tax base. Yet more time is spent in Congress, the city government and the media spreading blame rather than working for change.

For those who stay in the District, and for those who live nearby but understand the need to keep the central city healthy, it is time to focus on the future of the nation's capital as hometown to (at last count) more than 575,000 Americans. This urgent undertaking will require a cold-eyed evaluation of the past 20 years, the strength to recognize home rule's shortcomings, and the courage to chart a new course.

There is no better place to begin the process than in Room 2400 of the Rayburn House Office Building, the offices of Rep. Julian Dixon of California. Advocates of more rights for District citizens may balk at beginning on Capitol Hill, but consider Dixon's unique perspective. He was born in the District and spent his childhood here in a stable, black middle-class neighborhood. Like thousands of other middle-class African Americans who grew up here, he remembers summer afternoons in a community where neighbors looked out for the kids on the block. In 1979, Dixon returned as the representative from the 32nd District of California, and he's kept a home in the District ever since. A year after he arrived he became chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee on the District of Columbia—a job with little prestige, but Dixon keeps it because he cares for his hometown. Dixon knows the city's finances, and he's confused.

"Where's the money?" he asked recently, referring to the half a billion dollars that the District government has either borrowed or received from Congress in the last two years, over and above the federal payment and tax revenues. "How can the government be $300 million in the hole? If the government stopped here tomorrow, how much would it owe its creditors?"

Dixon hopes to answer these questions in congressional hearings he will begin this week but he knows that the solutions to the government's shortcomings lie beyond the next budget cycle. "Without retrenching from home rule," he says, "we have to rethink its structure."

Dixon has the right idea, especially in two main areas in need of reform: political structure and management.

Politics first. Let's start by facing up to the fact that the District is not like Philadelphia, Boston, New York or any other city with similar urban problems. The city is unique, if only because its budget is controlled by a Congress where it has no voting representation. But that obvious difference masks a more fundamental disparity. From 1874, when Congress abolished local self-government, until 1974 when the home rule act took effect, the citizens of Washington had no local political culture, no patronage system other than one controlled by congressional overseers, no power over how their city was run. Every other major American city developed a political establishment that is now at least 100 years in the making. Our local political system has been growing for just over two decades. It's young, it's unruly and it's taken some bad turns.

For instance, it is effectively a one-party system; Democrats out-register fumbling and reclusive Republicans by 9 to 1. The Statehood Party is minuscule, and there are no solid, independent political organizations that can groom candidates for the ballot. In such a small political community, where's the public debate? Democracy is a participation sport. Solutions and a sense of community arise from vigorous political competition.

To invigorate local elections, Dixon suggests runoffs among the two top vote-getters in the mayoral race. A majority of voters would then elect the truly strongest candidate, rather than the current system of one more vote than the next candidate and you win.

Our next suggestion may come as a shock: There aren't enough elected offices in the current political system. An aspiring politician can dream of being an advisory neighborhood commissioner representing just 2,000 people, a school board member, a council member, the mayor or the non-voting delegate to Congress. With so few opportunities—and sporadic media coverage that fails to create the sense of a true hometown—the city hasn't developed a viable political farm system. Five months from the mayoral primary, here are the three choices so far: an unpopular incumbent, City Council member who's been rejected by the voters three times

in past mayoral bids and a former three-term mayor who's trying to resurrect himself. More seasoned politicians could grow out of a system with more opportunities.

Why not make the corporation counsel, or city attorney, an elective office instead of a mayoral appointee? How about establishing a local district attorney and having voters choose the person who prosecutes local criminals rather than the current system in which the presidentially appointed U.S. attorney serves as chief prosecutor. The city could elect a comptroller, a treasure, an independent auditor. Each would develop a political base with roots in the community, and from those roots could grow a truly committed and connected electorate.

The City Council needs revamping too. Dixon suggests the council elect its own chairman, rather than having voters decide who can best run the council. Why not also halve the salaries—now over $70,000 a year—and make the council a truly part-time job as it was conceived to be? Then double the number of members, to make it more like a legislature? We would get debate, diversity and coalitions of power.

And why should we have a year-round legislature? Maybe it should meet in legislative session for only two or three months, as in Virginia and Maryland, rather than its nearly nonstop churning of legislation. Who can keep track except staff members and lobbyists? The council could meet in monthly sessions the rest of the year to take care of routine municipal affairs. A defined legislative session would allow citizens to focus on and participate in the making of city laws.

Political reform is well and good, but in Dixon's eyes, nothing comes before good management, something the city is obviously lacking.

It's painfully clear that management of key city agencies has been marred by political considerations, low pay and lack of experience. Mayor Kelly's best hire in her first year was Jack Bond, a manager with a proven track record in Durham, N.C., and other cities. Although Bond officially resigned, in fact the mayor forced him out for reasons that remain unclear.

The worst case of horrendous management is in the public housing department, which has had more than a dozen directors in as many years. Thanks in part to inept management, the city's public housing complexes are breeding grounds for drug dependency, gunplay and poverty. Just as important, the spillover effect undermines what otherwise would be more stable working poor, middle and upper-income black neighborhoods.

Dixon suggests that the day-to-day operations of the city be placed in the hands of a professional city manager. That person could be nominated by the mayor and confirmed by the council. "The manager could then be more immune to the day-to-day politics of the city," says Dixon.

Identifying flaws in the way the District has developed under 20 years of the Home Rule Act is not difficult. The tough part is charting the course toward a healthy social, political and financial future. How do we make the second 20 years of the city's growth a success story?

The first step is to acknowledge our current dependence on Congress, and in return demand that Congress fulfill its part of the relationship. In this phase, the District gets its financial house in order. In some measure, this has already begun, with the recent request—by Dixon and Rep. Pete Stark (D-Calif.)—that two federal agencies conduct a thorough examination of the city's books.

But the District could play a leading rather than trailing role by embracing a financial oversight commission to review the nuts and bolts of many city agencies. The commission would be made up of local and federal officials whose mandate would be more than advisory. Such a preemptive strike could forestall the installation of a mandatory board like the one that was given power to oversee New York City's government in the 1970s.

To the most zealous statehood advocates, this could seem a serious retreat from home rule. But look around. The federal government is already involved in a host of local government functions: Federal agents police the streets; federal officials are now part of an executive commission assigned to fix city public housing; courts dictate foster care and prison health; federal auditors are examining every item of local spending.

An oversight commission might need as many as five years to do its work. But in the process, city residents would take control of more government functions, such as local criminal prosecution, while Congress relinquished power to review the city's budget. Such a slow but steady march toward full independence is the path Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton believes has the best chance of success.

Dixon and Norton aren't alone in their vision of restructuring and reform. The consensus to reevaluate home rule is spreading from the Greater Washington Board of Trade to the Democratic State Committee to the streets, where frustration with the status quo runs higher every day. All people of good will want safe streets, better housing, decent schools, steady jobs and a local government that works. Only a fresh look at home rule will get them what they want.

TRIBUTE TO MARTIN BARBER

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Mr. Martin Barber of Livingston, NJ. A longtime friend, Marty has most recently earned distinction as the chair of the Stamp Out Hate Coalition, an organization dedicated to promoting tolerance and understanding in my home State of New Jersey.

Marty has a lengthy and dedicated history of public service, balancing responsibilities to his family and profession with the demanding obligations of helping to lead his community. As vice president of the Metropolitan Chapter of the American Jewish Committee, as a member of the executive committee of the Jewish Federation of MetroWest, and as past president of Temple Beth Shalom in Livingston, Marty has consistently battled the bigotry and hate seemingly on the rise in our society. I commend Marty's resolute and steadfast opposition to these forces of discord, and his advancement of policies and practices that benefit all peoples.

Mr. Speaker, Marty Barber's courage and perseverance are a tremendous example of public service for us all. I am, therefore, pleased to announce that Marty will be honored at the American Jewish Committee Annual Dinner Meeting on June 1, 1994, and I commend him and his many outstanding accomplishments.

AIRLINER CABIN AIR QUALITY ACT

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Airliner Cabin Air Quality Act of 1994, to prohibit smoking on international flights to and from the United States. Congress banned smoking on all domestic flights of 6 hours or less in 1990. However, smoking remained permitted on U.S. carriers on international flights, and most foreign carriers serving the United States permit smoking as well.

On May 18, 1994, the Subcommittee on Aviation, which I chair, held a full day of hearings on airliner cabin air quality. While there are many concerns about the overall quality of the air, the single most effective—and cost-free—action that we can take is to ban smoking on international flights.

Most persuasive to the subcommittee at this hearing, as at our previous one, was the testimony of flight attendants, who are forced to spend their working lives aboard aircraft. Our flight attendant witnesses detailed ailments which they and their colleagues incur in the small, enclosed, smoke-filled cabin environment. They described health problems ranging from eye, nose and throat irritation, headache, nausea, dizziness, blurred vision, shortness of breath, and heart palpitations to permanent disability and even death from the occupational hazards of their jobs in airplanes. Nonsmoking flight attendants are suffering and dying from diseases common to smokers—simply from working in the smoking section.

There is also a safety issue involved. Flight attendant witnesses showed us photographs of cigarette butts all over the floor of the airplane—a potential fire hazard. They testified to passengers falling asleep in their seats, dropping lighted cigarettes on the floor—a clear fire risk.

Equally outrageous is the plight of children stuck in the smoking section with their parents. And businessmen who must be at their peak when they arrive at their destination, but stagger off, jet-lagged and debilitated by smoke-caused allergies and sensitivities. And pleasure travellers whose vacations are ruined by smoke-induced illnesses. And the millions of nonsmoking passengers who cannot really get away from the smoke, no matter where they sit in the airplane.

Mr. Speaker, the International Civil Aviation Organization [ICAO] has proposed that nations end smoking on aircraft in 1996. This is a proposal only, and unless all countries agree, passengers and flight attendants will continue to suffer, and airlines forced to go nonsmoking will maintain that they are at a competitive disadvantage.

Airlines serving the United States, whether carrying the U.S. flag or some other, would under my bill be smoke-free. There would thus be no competitive disadvantage between U.S. and foreign airlines, and I believe that the airlines themselves as well as the vast majority

of their employees and passengers will welcome enactment of this bill.

REMEMBER THEM WITH FLOWERS

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a call from a constituent who told me a story and gave me an idea that is especially appropriate to Memorial Day and the 50th anniversary of D-Day.

Doris Winkler, who syndicates the television show, "The Senior Report," lost her brother, Capt. John M. Hennessy, Jr., during World War II.

Captain Hennessy was killed in Italy near the Arno River a few days after participating in the liberation of Rome. He was a forward observer with the 88th Infantry Division, 337th Field Artillery Battalion. He died almost exactly 50 years ago on July 14, 1944, ironically his parent's wedding anniversary.

John Hennessy, who graduated summa cum laude from Notre Dame University, is buried in a U.S. military cemetery 7 miles outside of Florence, Italy.

Each Memorial Day his grave site, plot C, row 5, grave 38, is graced with a bouquet of flowers, a symbol of remembrance and affection from his sister.

Mrs. Winkler accomplishes this loving task with the assistance of the American Battle Monuments Commission. "The American Battle Monuments Commission is extremely sensitive to its ministry of caring for these sanctified graves and always sends me a picture of the decorated grave," she said. "The pictures from the Memorial Day placements always sadden me because the background reveals long rows of crosses with no flowers, save my brothers."

"It occurred to me," she continued, "that survivors of these men do not realize that for very little money the Commission, which oversees all foreign U.S. military cemeteries, will contact the appropriate cemetery and in very short order, get flowers to the grave site. All they need is the soldier's name and where he is buried."

Doris Winkler called the Commission yesterday to check about the arrival of her check for her brother's flowers. In passing she asked if the Commission had received many requests. "Oh, yes," came the reply, "We've had 12 already."

Doris Winkler would love to see more than 12 heroes honored especially since the ABMC is the steward of more than 100,000 graves and names on tablets of the missing.

She said she was certain there would be more flowers if more Americans were aware of the "fine service of the American Battle Monuments Commission." She asked if I might help spread the word among my colleagues in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to do so. For further information concerning these services call the ABMC at 202–272–0537. The commission also notes that flowers for all foreign military cemeteries can be ordered through any local florist who is a member of the "Florist Telegraph Delivery Association."

Again, Mr. Speaker, I hope this information allows more people to pay special homage to those that made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

TRIBUTE TO REV. SPENCER JONES

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Spencer Jones of the Southside Tabernacle Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Jones commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Rev. Spencer Jones was born and raised on a farm in Poplar Bluff, Missouri and felt the call of God on his life when he was three years old and confessed Christ as his personal Saviour at age nine, and in 1966 he was drafted into the United States Army, and was shipped to Viet Nam, and leaving Viet Nam, he enrolled in Central Bible College, and was elected Vice President of the Student Government and a member of Who's Who Among Students and graduated in 1972 with a B.A. in Religion; and

Whereas in November of 1972, Rev. Jones followed the leading of the Lord to come to Chicago and pastor the Southside Tabernacle Church and during the early ministry would knock on doors and present the plan of salvation to many, and trained and encouraged his congregation to do the same; and

Whereas the "Southside Vision" is to win souls, it is "Expanded Vision" is to train young men and women in pastoral care so they can effectively pioneer full gospel churches in every major inner-city in America, and in July of 1980, Brother Jones was led by the Lord to organize the first Inner City Workers Conference and Pastors and laymen came from all over America to encourage and motivate one another. They also came together to devise strategies on how to effectively reach inner city dwellers, and under his leadership, 15 churches have been started in various inner city neighborhoods throughout America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Pastor Spencer Jones.

PROVIDING TPS FOR HAITIANS

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, Haiti's military regime announced plans to enforce a 14-year-old law which would make "all irregular trips toward foreign lands illegal." This means that any Haitian returned to Haiti will be subjected to imprisonment, torture, and or death. It is imperative now more than ever that we provide temporary protected status to Haitian nationals, both those in custody at sea as well as those who currently reside in the United States.

It is incumbent that the United States immediately stop the repatriation of Haitians intercepted on the high seas and grant them temporary protected status. Temporary protected status is a status that has been granted to nationals from other nations such as Kuwait, Somalia, Bosnia, and El Salvador during conflict in their countries. By granting Haitians TPS, we would be doing no more for them than we have done for other refugees.

By granting Haitians TPS we achieve two objectives: undocumented Haitians can live and work in safety without fear or being deported, and the INS would know where they reside so that it can facilitate their return once conditions in Haiti are safe. Meanwhile, they would be granted work authorization, but would remain ineligible for any Federal benefit programs.

As a nation, we refused to protect desperate Jews seeking refuge from Nazi Germany. If we fail to protect Haitians, we will be setting a dangerous precedent for the future and risk repeating the mistakes of the past.

TRIBUTE TO REV. HOLLIS LEWIS, SR.

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Hollis Lewis, Sr., of the Greater Pleasant Green Baptist Church of Chicago, IL. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Lewis commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Hollis Lewis Sr. was born in Summit, Mississippi, he came to Chicago in 1934, he married Miss Josephine Jeanette White in 1937, they have been blessed with five sons, Hollis, Jr., Clarence E., Sr., Robert E., Raymond L., and Juan H. Lewis; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis joined the New Hope Baptist Church of Chicago and was Baptized under the pastorate of The Reverend William Dixon, he served as a Sunday School Teacher, Superintendent of the Sunday School, sang in the Choir, served as Church Treasurer, and as a Deacon, he was called to the Gospel Ministry in 1944, he was Ordained in 1946 at the New Hope Baptist Church under the pastorate of the late Reverend Calwell W. Jones; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis matriculated at the Morgan Park High School in Chicago, The Moody Bible Institute, and the Chicago Baptist Institute, receiving a Christian Leadership Degree, and the Bachelor of Arts Degree in Theology, in 1985 The Chicago Baptist Institute awarded Reverend Lewis the Honorary Doctor of Divinity Degree, he is on the Faculty of the Chicago Baptist Institute, and an Instructor in the Christian Education Congress of the National Baptist Convention, Dean of the Seminar for the Baptist Ministerial Alliance, and President of the Morgan Park/Maple Park Ministerial Alliance; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis organized The Rose of Sharon Baptist Church at 7039 S.

Wentworth Avenue in Chicago, where he served as Pastor for eight years, later he served as an Evangelist for two years, in 1964 he was called to pastor The Greater Pleasant Green Baptist Church, in 1974 the Lord led Reverend Lewis to build a new Church, the land was purchased at 115th and Ashland Avenue, today this vision is a reality, Reverend Lewis is a father, a shepherd, a builder, a teacher, a servant and a true role model in our community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Hollis Lewis, Sr. and The Greater Pleasant Green Baptist Church, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO HIRAIR HOVNANIAN

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute a man who epitomizes the American Dream. Mr. Hirair Hovnanian, chairman of the board of trustees of the Armenian Assembly of America, will receive the assembly's Distinguished Service Award at a gala in New York City on June 4, 1994. This is a richly deserved award for a man who has contributed immensely to two great nations, the United States and Armenia.

Hirair Hovnanian came to this country on a freighter in 1951 with only $25 in his pocket and the address of some relatives in Philadelphia who took him into their home. He enrolled at Villanova University in 1952, graduating 4 years later with a bachelor of science in civil engineering. That same year, he married Anna Hamparian, to whom he has been married for the past 38 years. He began his career as a civil engineer with a consulting firm making $90 a week, saving every penny he could. As chance or fate would have it, a distant cousin of his was building a home in Toms River, NJ, and Hirair went to see how it was done. It occurred to him that he could build a hundred homes just like it in a year's time. In 1958, he moved to Toms River, with $3,500 in his savings account, and he and his brothers bought 23 acres of land. With a secondhand Jeep and chainsaw, and working round the clock, the Hovnanian brothers created their first housing development. After several years of successful work together, the brothers formed separate building companies in 1963.

In 1963, Hirair formed Hovsons, Inc., and within a year he had built 72 homes. Since the majority of his home buyers were retirees, Hirair decided to build adult communities, but in a new way—creating single-family homes with their own individual lots. What better example could there be of realizing the American dream?

In 1965, Mr. Hovnanian started the first Holiday City adult community. This concept has expanded into a total community, including recreation, medical, and shopping facilities, and more than 15,000 housing units. His development business is complemented by his building materials and prefab manufacturing subsidiaries. He has also diversified into the development and construction of health care facilities, retail centers, office complexes, and mining operations in New Jersey, Florida, and California.

Mr. Hovnanian has always maintained that his hard-work ethic comes from his parents. His father fled the genocide perpetrated against the Armenian people by the Turkish Ottoman Empire, which began in 1915. The senior Hovnanian fled to Iraq where he succeeded in business until unrest in that nation forced the family to seek refuge in the United States. Hirair has said of his father, "He was a self-taught man. I think his drive to succeed became a family trait. My brothers and I were all competitive, but not to out-do one another, just to do our best and be successful at what we set out to accomplish. It's true with my children as well." Hirair and Anna have five children: four daughters, Siran, Edele, Leela and Tanya, and a son, Armen, all of whom are well on the way to successful careers. Edele and Armen work alongside their father at H. Hovnanian Industries.

While Mr. Hovnanian could very easily have devoted all of his energies to his business and enjoyed the fruits of his success, he has chosen instead to get involved with a diverse array of civic, charitable, educational, and philanthropic activities. He was a founding benefactor of the Armenian Assembly, organized in 1972 here in Washington. He has been the assembly's driving force, serving as president and chairman of its board of trustees.

In 1988, tragedy struck the Hovnanians' ancestral homeland of Armenia when a devastating earthquake tore apart the country, devastating cities and towns, and leaving thousands homeless. Hirair was one of the first Armenian-Americans on the scene, opening an Armenian Assembly office in the capital of Yerevan with a satellite phone to communicate with the rest of the world. He helped to raise $4 million which, with a $2 million grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development, established housing component manufacturing facilities under his direct management. Currently, he serves on the Hayastan All Armenia Fund, which is involved in humanitarian projects in Armenia.

In the past year, working with the Government of the Republic of Armenia, Hirair established the Armenia Oil and Gas Development Fund [ArmOil] for oil and gas exploration, contributing his own funds and working to secure a sea outlet for the landlocked country.

Back home in New Jersey, Hirair Hovnanian has been active in a variety of community activities and organizations, has donated some $20 million to charitable, religious, cultural, and educational entities, and has received numerous high awards and decorations for his years of work and dedication to the community. In recognition of his devotion to the Armenian Church, he has been bestowed many decorations. He has dedicated a 465-acre bird sanctuary to the Audubon Society, a 175-acre sanctuary park to the New Jersey Natural Lands Trust, and provided for the preservation of a site containing late nineteenth century gunpowder works and Indian burial grounds.

Not bad for a young man who came to this country 43 years ago with $25 in his pocket.

Mr. Speaker, Hirair Hovnanian is a man who represents the fulfillment of the great American immigrant story that makes our country so unique. He has worked to make a difference, both in his homeland and his adopted home. It is an honor to share some of his accomplishments with the Members of this body.

TRIBUTE TO REV. WILLIAM JENKINS, JR.

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend William Jenkins, Jr., of the First Union Missionary Baptist Church of Ford Heights, IL. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Jenkins commending him for his work:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend William Jenkins, Jr. entered into the Ministry in 1978 and served as Associated Minister of the Lively Stone Missionary Baptist Church of Chicago under the pastoral leadership of his esteemed father The Reverend William Jenkins, Sr.; and

Whereas Reverend Jenkins has matriculated at the following schools: George Westinghouse High School, Chicago, Malcolm X College, Chicago, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Selma University, Selma, Alabama, earning the Bachelor of Theology degree in 1985, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois, Master of Theology, currently Reverend Jenkins is a candidate for the Masters in Theological Studies at McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago; and

Whereas Reverend Jenkins is an experienced pastor, serving as Pastor of New Hope #2 Missionary Baptist Church of Demopolis, Alabama, for six years, in 1988 installed as Pastor of First Union Missionary Baptist Church of Ford Heights, Illinois, where God has prospered the congregation under his ministry; and

Whereas Reverend Jenkins has served as President of the Ministerial Union of Selma University, Chairman of the Selma Nursing Home Mission, member of the N.A.A.C.P. Selma and Chicago Chapters, Fairview Lodge #26 F & AM, the Chicago Westside Ministers Conference, Garrett-Evangelical Black Seminarians, currently President of the Ford Heights Ministers Fellowship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend William Jenkins, Jr. by entering these accomplishments into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and archives of the one hundred and third Congress.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ANNE MACK

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing our Nation today is the

education of our young people. Today I rise to honor a good friend of the young people, and all the people, of Marietta, GA, who has dedicated her adult life to teaching children. Mr. Speaker, her name is Anne Mack, and today she is retiring from a 30-year teaching career. During those entire 30 years, she taught first-graders in Marietta, first at Lemon Street Elementary School and then at Hickory Hills School. It is a fitting time to pause and reflect on the immeasurable contributions she has made to our community.

The success of Mrs. Mack's 30 years as a first-grade teacher is evidenced by the hundreds of children whose lives she influenced and enriched. Two of those hundreds of children, Mr. Speaker, are my children. They still remember Mrs. Mack vividly and fondly.

Also, her success as a teacher and community leader can be seen through her selection as one of the Outstanding Young Women of America, an honor she received in 1971. And on two occasions, she was selected as Hickory Hills School's Teacher of the Year.

From what I have learned, Mrs. Mack will now have more time to spend in her garden, which she greatly enjoys. Her retirement will also free her to expand her role as paster to her flock. Mrs. Mack and her husband Edgar (Johnny) Mack are copastors of the Sword of the Word Evangelistic Ministry in East Point, GA. And just as importantly, Mrs. Mack will have more time for her grandson, Austin Christopher McClendon.

We in Marietta are proud of Mrs. Mack's work over three decades. She has helped in a large way to make our community an exceptionally good place to live. On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I acknowledge her accomplishments by entering these remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and Archives of the 103d Congress and declare today "Anne Mack Day" at Hickory Hills School in Marietta.

TRIBUTE TO REV. FERLANDER N. LEWIS

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Rev. Ferlander N. Lewis of the New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church of Harvey, IL. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Lewis commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Ferlander N. Lewis is a native of Clarksville, Mississippi, he is a graduate of Alan B. Shepherd High School 1978, where he was an All Area and All State Basketball Player, a graduate of Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin, 1982 earning the Bachelor of Arts Degree in economics; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis is an accomplished musician, he was the musician for the first Black Gospel Choir of Thornridge High School, he has served numerous churches as the Minister of Music for twelve years, teaching music and choir throughout Chicago and the south suburbs, he has recording credits playing for Serenity, a Christian singing group, and the Christian Fellowship Choir, he is an active member of the Progressive National Baptist Convention, preaching, lecturing, and teaching in its National Congress of Christian Education; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis responded to the Call into the Gospel Ministry, he was Licensed to Preach, August, 1979, Ordained, October, 1981, in True Vine Missionary Baptist Church, Dixmoor, Illinois under the pastoral leadership of The Reverend Steven D. Lewis; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis was installed as Pastor of the New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Harvey, Illinois February, 1986, New Mount Olive was the first Senior Citizen Nutritional site in the State of Illinois, established the Christian Help Center, serving the poor with food and clothing care packages for homeless men, and many other programs to help people in need, Reverend Lewis is a family man married to Janice Lewis and they are blessed with three children, he is a shepherd, a community leader, a humanitarian, and a true role model in our community. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United State wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Ferlander N. Lewis, and the New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Harvey, Illinois by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

ANTHONY R. LENTINI RETIRES

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, Anthony R. Lentini retired as Director of the VA Regional Office in New Orleans, LA, following many years of distinguished public service. In fact, Tony has spent all of his adult years serving his country, first as an officer in the Army and later as Director of the VA Regional Office in New Orleans.

Colonel Lentini, a native of Kenner, LA, is a combat veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. Prior to retirement from the Army in 1967, Tony served in the Office of the Secretary of the Army as a legislative liaison officer and advisor to Members of Congress who were reserve officers in the U.S. Army.

His first assignment in the Veterans Administration started in September 1967 when he was assigned as Staff Assistant to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs in Washington, DC. In 1969, he was transferred to the New Orleans Regional Office as a management analyst on the Director's staff, and in August 1973, he was appointed Assistant Director of the New Orleans Regional Office. He was Acting Director from September 9, 1973, to May 19, 1974, when he was appointed Director.

Tony has been recognized many times for his outstanding work in the State and local community where he has worked and lived. He received the 12th Annual Rabbi Emil W. Leipziger Award—outstanding United Way volunteer. He received awards for outstanding service to veterans from the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, and the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Tony served in various ways to support the business community. For his leadership and work, he received awards from the National Alliance of Businessmen.

He served as chairman of the New Orleans Federal Executive Board in 1977–78 and 1991–92.

Tony attended Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. He received his degree from Loyola University in New Orleans and pursued additional studies at Pennsylvania State University.

Tony and his wife Ellen have enjoyed 46 years together and are the parents of four sons and one daughter.

Mr. Speaker, I and members of the committee staff have known Tony for many years. He has served the Nation well. He loves his country and has devoted his entire life to defending his country and helping those who went to war receive the benefits and services to which they are entitled.

Although Tony deserves to be free of the demanding schedule he has had to keep as Director of the VA Regional Office in New Orleans, he will be greatly missed by those of us who worked closely with him for so many years and by his fellow veterans. We wish Tony and his wife Ellen continued success and much happiness during the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO ELDER MILTON OLIVER

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Elder Milton Oliver of the ambassadors for Christ Church of God In Christ. Attached is a proclamation I issued Elder Oliver commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Elder Milton Oliver is a native of Chicago, Illinois, a life long resident of the Morgan Park Community, he is a family man, married to Augustine Walker-Oliver for thirty-seven years, God has blessed them with two children; and

Whereas Elder Oliver matriculated at the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois receiving a professional certificate in Evangelism and Pastoral Care, in secular training he holds two certificates of Completion Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor in Iron Work and in Construction; and

Whereas Elder Oliver is the Founder and Pastor of the Ambassadors For Christ Church of God In Christ, established in 1977, in the sixth Jurisdiction of Illinois, he is a national denominational leader, Vice President of the International Department of Evangelism, Church of God In Christ, Inc., Administrative Assistant to the Bishop of the sixth Jurisdiction of Illinois, District Superintendent of the H.W. Goldsberry District, Area Director of Evangelism Region eight, Assistant Finance Chairman, sixth Jurisdiction of Illinois, Church of God In Christ, Inc.; and

Whereas Elder Oliver is very active in his community, a member of the Roseland Clergy Association, the Roseland Hospital Clergy, the Maple Park, Morgan Park, Beverly Clergy Association, District 22, Chicago Police Department Beat Representative Program, Board of Directors of the Butler Career Academy, he is always ready and willing to help people, his personal motto is "I love you, and you can't do anything about it": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Elder Milton Oliver, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

THE NORTH AMERICAN COMMUNITY

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my colleague's attention to the attached excerpts from an article by Alan K. Henrikson on the North American Free-Trade Agreement. In matters of trade and North America, Mr. Henrikson is a visionary. Mr. Henrikson's "A North American Community: 'From the Yukon to the Yucatan'" transcends the domestic squabbles, the trinational deal making, and the heated politics associated with NAFTA's inception, negotiation, and passage of this historic agreement. Henrikson appropriately concludes that trade agreements are meaningless if there is not a corresponding sense of common purpose and community among the signatory countries. NAFTA like agreements will meet with tremendous success if the commitment of nations participating in that pact fully develop the ties that bring us together. I urge my colleagues to examine the important work that follows.

A NORTH AMERICAN COMMUNITY: "FROM THE YUKON TO THE YUCATAN"

(By Alan K. Henrikson)

During 1991, President George Bush joined the president of Mexico, Carlos Salinas de Gortari, and the prime minister of Canada, Brian Mulroney, in initiating a complex process designed to bring about a North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) on the continent. The idea was described variously by commentators as leading to a worldwide "strategic alliance" among the three partners, a business-based "North America Inc." to compete with the European Community and Japan, and even an economic "Fortress North America."

That the NAFTA scheme did implicitly threaten a new regional trade bloc, on the basis of which the United States, Mexico, and Canada could bargain collectively with Europe and Japan, is unmistakable. It clearly had coercive connotations as well as more constructive intent. US State Department Counselor Robert Zoellick, while denying that NAFTA would contribute to "the promotion of regional blocks," stressed that a NAFTA arrangement would "strengthen the hand" of the country's foreign economic policy. "The signal the United States wants to send the world," he stated, "is that we are committed to opening markets and that we will extend a hand to others who share that commitment"—and not, he seemed to imply, to others.

In August 1992, the continental free-trade negotiations were successfully concluded with congressional action expected in 1993. By negotiating a free market with both Canada and Mexico, the US government demonstrated that it had not abandoned "its leadership role" in the field of trade, thus answering critics who wondered if the "new world order" outlined by President Bush had a place for economics.

Apart from international power connotations, the NAFTA project, though focused on economics, seemed to prefigure what could be characterized as a "North American community"—that is, a new and positive identity shared by the peoples of the three North American countries. For the first time in their histories, Mexicans, Americans, and Canadians could come to feel that they had more in common with each other, despite cultural and other differences, than with any nonneighbor outside the hemisphere—notably their parent societies in Europe where a new identity also is rapidly forming. A NAFTA particularly could contribute to overcoming the estrangement between the Hispanic and norteamericano peoples in the New World. A greater inclusion of the continent's widespread, increasingly self-aware native groups—the continent's "first nations"—into a feeling of North American community, or family of peoples, also might result.

The notion of a North American community implicitly challenges the politically established concept of a "North Atlantic community," informally built around the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). It is not today widely remembered that the first suggestion of a "NAFTA," dating from the early 1960s, was for a North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement. This transatlantic NAFTA would have joined Canada and the United States with the United Kingdom, and perhaps other members of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), formed in 1960 in part in reaction to the 1957 Treaty of Rome establishing the European Community (EC) on the European continent. Today's concept of a westward-oriented NAFTA is similarly, though less intentionally, an alternative to the larger "Pacific Basin community" concept. Some thought was given during the 1980s in the United States to concluding a free-trade pact with Japan.

Today's North American Free Trade Agreement is premised on the formal fact and the economic "success" of the 1988 bilateral US-Canada Free Trade Agreement (USCFTA), which went into effect at the beginning of 1989. A further, trilateral pact, to include Mexico, could have competed with the USCFTA, complemented it, or completed it. The Canadian government had to decide what position to adopt toward, and what part to play in, trade talks between the United States and Mexico. Whatever the form of a new continentwide trading relationship, a NAFTA was sure to do more than merely include a further economic partner with its own resources and needs. A three-way North American continental trade bond has ideological and even geopolitical significance.

"Right now," as President Bush stated in April 1991 to a group of Hispanic-American businesspeople at a meeting in Houston, "we have the chance to expand opportunity and economic growth from the Yukon to the Yucatan. Think of it: The North American Free Trade Agreement would link us with our largest trading partner, Canada, and our third-largest partner, Mexico. It would create the largest, richest trade zone on earth—360 million consumers in a market that generates $6 trillion in output a year." Observing that there are some doubters who seem to "oppose letting our neighbors enjoy the benefits of progress," the president said pointedly: "Ask them what is wrong with increased productivity throughout the continent. And ask them what's wrong with a more stable Mexico."

The NAFTA will be good for the entire neighborhood. "A unified North American market would let each of our countries build on our strengths," the president said. "It would provide more and better jobs for US workers. It would stimulate price competition, lower consumer prices, improve product quality. The agreement would make necessities such as food and clothing more affordable and more available to our poorest citizens. It would raise productivity and produce a higher standard of living throughout the continent." Both America's neighbors, Mexico perhaps even more than Canada, would share in this overall progress. "A free trade pact would encourage investment, create jobs, lift wages, and give talented Mexican citizens opportunities they don't enjoy today." The development would have much larger, international importance: "A strong Mexico, in turn, means a stronger United States and a stronger North American alliance."

One can see in President Bush's concept of a Mexican-American-Canadian "alliance," though ostensibly a political concept, a broader community ideal—a notion of bringing together North American's nations on a basis of moral parity. The differences between the United States and both Canada and Mexico are, of course, vast. A decade ago, these were cited as reasons, among others, why a tripartite commonwealth would never work.

Indeed, the disparity between the United States and the others in economic strength and demographic size cannot be ignored. The Canadian economy, heavily resource-dependent though its industry is fairly modern, is one-tenth the size of the US economy. Canada's population of 26.6 million is about the same fraction of that of the United States with its 250 million people. The Mexican economy, although its population is sizable and growing (86.2 million and soon to reach 100 million), is barely more than one twenty-fifth the size of that of the United States.

Besides the obvious problem of finding a way to balance these three unequally weighted countries in a North American negotiation, there is the related problem, hardly less difficult, of overcoming the deep-seated alienation between Americans and their neighbors, especially those to the south. Historical tensions that have existed between US citizens and their culturally nearer cousins to the north must also be overcome. And between Mexicans and Canadians (viewed from a southern perspective as "gringos from the far north"), a lack of mutual knowledge—a veritable cultural void—has long prevailed. A bond must be formed where virtually none has ever existed, either positive or negative. The long-term success or failure of even a limited free-trade agreement among the three may well depend on whether the process engenders a harmonious feeling of a shared social identify.

CONCLUSION

Despite opposition that has slowed the development of a North American political consensus on NAFTA, if no necessarily the

actual NAFTA negotiations, an agreement has been concluded and must now be signed, drafted into legal form, and submitted to the legislatures in the three countries. So great are the historic forces moving these three economies toward some form of integration that it is difficult to imagine the NAFTA process ending in failure. The momentum began in 1979 and 1980, gained in 1983 and 1985, accelerated with the USCFTA in 1988, shifted direction with Mexico's decision to negotiate in 1990, and broadened in force with Canada's entry into trilateral talks in 1991. Enthusiasm seemed to decline somewhat in early 1992, but officials pressed ahead and were able to announce the conclusion of negotiations in August 1992.

After formal submission, Congress has ninety working days—which could stretch out as long as eight months—in which to approve the agreement, without amending it. Assuming that the necessary implementing legislation is promptly submitted, one could imagine fairly expeditious consideration by Congress. Approval, however, will not take place without committee hearings and a full debate. The upshot could be a delay of congressional consent until sometime in 1993. By that point, a change of government in both Canada and the United States might have occurred, complicating but probably not wholly confusing the transnational politics of NAFTA approval.

The attitude of Canada's Parliaments as well as the Mexican Congress toward trilateral North American trade, though the agreement surely will be criticized in those bodies, should follow the policies of Canada's and Mexico's leaders. Opposition in both countries—in the business community and labor unions as well as political circles—should be reduced somewhat by the North American dispute-settlement mechanism, including the Trade Commission. Experience with the USCFTA, however, has shown that providing adjudicative measures for trade relations does not end the task of diplomacy, which now involves peoples as well as governments. Both old and new diplomacy are needed to form a trinational consensus, such as Governors Reagan and Brown and others imagined in 1979 and 1980. A sense of North American community must be engendered. Without it, a North American market, no matter how well negotiated, cannot truly thrive.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RONALD WEBB

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader of my congressional district, the Reverend Ronald Webb of the Shiloah Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Webb commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Shiloah Baptist Church was established November 15, 1923, celebrating seventy years of service to God and humanity in the City of Chicago; and

Whereas Shiloah Baptist Church has been blessed with eight dynamic pastoral leaders in the past seventy years, including Pastor Ronald Webb; and

Whereas the Reverend Ronald Webb was elected Pastor of Shiloah in 1990. Pastor Webb is a graduate of Bishop College, Dallas, Texas, Bachelor's degree, Howard University, Washington, D.C., Master of Divinity, and he is presently a candidate for the Doctor of the Ministry degree, at United Theological Seminary in Ohio; and

Whereas under the dynamic and anointed leadership of Pastor Webb, God continues to prosper Shiloah Church to grow spiritually, numerically, and financially, touching the lives of many people through the love of Christ: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge and congratulate The Reverend Ronald Webb and the Shiloah Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois, on the occasion of the Church's 70th Anniversary, by entering this worthy Milestone into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

SALUTE TO JOYCE ERLINDA GAMBRELL DRAYTON

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute Joyce Erlinda Gambrell Drayton, who this weekend will be honored by the Baptist Ministers Conferences and Associations, in conjunction with the Martin Luther King, Jr. Mass Choir for her stellar service as a church musician in the Philadelphia church community. This service will be convened by the Reverend Anthony Floyd at the Hickman Temple AME Church on Baltimore Avenue in Philadelphia where Rev. Joseph Patterson is pastor.

Mrs. Drayton's musical career was born at the age of 9 when she studied piano under the late Vernon White, and organ under the late Helen Gatling. At the age of 10, Joyce joined the Sunday school choir at the Nazarene Baptist Church, under the direction of her mother, Georgia Gregory. Her musical studies continued, learning the violin and bass fiddle, as well as receiving a scholarship to the settlement music camp where she studied piano and bass with members of the Philadelphia Orchestra. While attending the Kensington High School for Girls, Joyce accompanied the Kensington High School concert choir under the direction of William Felton, and was a member of the All City Orchestra. While attending Cheyney State College, now Cheyney University, she accompanied the concert choir under the direction of D. Jack Moses.

Mrs. Drayton received an A.B.S. in elementary education from Cheyney, and a masters degree in social work at Temple University, where she was vice president of her class. Additionally, she has furthered her musical studies in organ under Dr. J. Edward Hoy and Rosemarie Coleman of the Combs College of Music.

Mrs. Drayton's 36 years of church music service reads like an encyclopedia of Philadelphia religious institutions, having served Ward AME Church, Second Macedonia Baptist Church, First Corinthian Baptist Church, and First Baptist Church of Cresmont. She was also a member of the Music Executive Board and accompanist for the Billy Graham Crusade in June 1992, and in 1985 was director of the City Wide Revival Choir where she has also served as a musician. Mrs. Drayton was the first director appointed by the Missionary Baptist Pastor's Conference, now under the presidency of Rev. Anthony Floyd, to organize the Martin Luther King, Jr. Massed Choir, which performed for the first Martin Luther King, Jr., celebration hosted by the Baptist Minister's Conferences and associations of Philadelphia and vicinity.

Mrs. Drayton is the founder and president of Church Musicians Services, Inc., a minority-owned business dedicated to the enhancement of religious music in Philadelphia, providing a referral system for church musician as well as training and education, and a quarterly newsletter, Hallelujah.

Mrs. Drayton's latest project is the publication of "Distinguished Church Musicians in the United States," a book to recognize all musicians who have and are serving in congregations across the country.

Mr. Speaker, Joyce Erlinda Gambrell Drayton is a pillar of the Philadelphia religious community. I am proud to stand with her friends, family, and congregation in thanking her for her many years of great service to God.

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP REESE PRICE, JR.

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Bishop Reese Price, Jr., of the Victory Apostolic Faith Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Bishop Price commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Bishop Reese Price, Jr. was the seventh son, the last of twelve children born to Reese and Hannah Price in Lee County, in the hills of Haynes, Arkansas. Bishop Price and his late wife Dovetta Marie Sloan are the proud parents of twelve children. God blessed him to find love again after the untimely death of his late wife and to marry the former Ruth Shaw; and

Whereas Bishop Price was Called by God to the Ministry November 4, 1957, he received the Bachelor of Religious Education from the International Bible Institute and Seminary, he is the Founder and Pastor of the Victory Apostolic Faith Church established July 10, 1961 growing spiritually, in numbers, and in its facilities. The church moved to May street in 1971, and added the "Dovetta Annex" in 1990 to accommodate the growth in membership; and

Whereas Bishop Price is a Churchman he was elevated to District Elder of the Pentecostal Churches of The Apostolic Faith, and was Ordained Bishop in August 1987, he is a former Chairman of the Illinois Council and Vice President of the Pentecostal Churches of the Apostolic Faith Board of Directors, Vice President of the Midwest Apostolic Bible College, member of the Ordination Committee, Overseer and Treasurer of Foreign Missions, Diocesan Bishop of Oklahoma and Arkansas; and

Whereas Bishop Price is a dedicated man of God and a Humanitarian, committed to serving the whole person, he provides free counseling, food pantry and the Victory Christian Centers providing a thrift store, free clothing for foreign missions, free school supplies, free tutoring. He is the overseer for mission work in Liberia West Africa and Haiti, with a trade school, an Orphanage, and three grade schools, including medical care for the children, transportation, clothing, and agricultural projects to feed the people and provide income. Bishop Price is the author of a book entitled, "We Are Fixed": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Bishop Reese Price, Jr. and the Victory Apostolic Faith Church, Chicago, Illinois by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

CRIMINALIZING JENNIFER CAPRIATI

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the recent arrest of Jennifer Capriati, essentially for the crime of being troubled, is further evidence of the pressing need to change our approach to drugs. Treating Ms. Capriati as a criminal because she had a small amount of marijuana for personal use is an example of counterproductive law enforcement, a waste of scarce government resources, and an act of cruelty toward a young woman who deserves help and not punishment.

I believe the time has come for us to stop wasting billions of dollars on a fruitless effort to interdict drugs; to stop treating users of marijuana and other substances as criminals; and to put the resources we will save thereby into a well-funded treatment program. The time has come for us to engage in a fundamental debate about our failed effort to deal with the social problems caused by drugs, and to work together to come up with a new one. Treating Jennifer Capriati as a criminal is a strong example of the wrong way to go.

In Tuesday's Washington Post, Richard Cohen expressed this viewpoint in a thoughtful and persuasive way. In the interest of furthering a much needed national debate on drug policy, I ask that Mr. Cohen's cogent article be printed here.

CRIMINALIZING JENNIFER CAPRIATI

(By Richard Cohen)

NEW YORK—Those who are cynical about the erstwhile War on Drugs (a term abandoned by the Clinton administration) had their case bolstered recently. Jennifer, Capriati, the extremely dangerous 18-year-old tennis star, was arrested in Florida for possessing a small amount (about 20 grams) of marijuana. A terrified nation—she had killer ground strokes—undoubtedly breathed a sigh of relief.

The cynics, of whom I am one, might have noted that if Capriati were 21 and had possessed a gallon of vodka and, like every other Floridian, a legal handgun, the law would have left her alone. Throw in a carton of cigarettes—as addictive as chocolate, according to the cigarette companies—and no lawman would or could have taken an interest in her. Guns, booze and cigarettes are either mentioned in the Constitution or have strong lobbies in Washington—I forget which.

Enough cynicism—even from a cynic. The fact is that the arrest of Capriati points up the silliness of our drug laws. The former tennis star—she hasn't played for almost a year—has since entered the Mount Sinai Medical Center in Miami for rehab, although from what is not exactly clear. Above all, she seems to be suffering from an acute case of teenage madness. The symptoms include estrangement from her parents, consorting with "the wrong people" and, possibly, abuse of drugs. In her case, it probably matters that she became a professional tennis player at the age of 13. Women's tennis and child abuse sometimes amount to the same thing.

But for all Capriati's fame and wealth ($1.5 million in "lifetime" earnings), she is depressingly typical. Whatever her problems, they are hardly criminal in nature. Yet, she was arrested for allegedly possessing an insignificant amount of marijuana. This is a drug of such power that it has made the entire government crazy. During the Reagan years, for instance, the discovery of a single seed prompted the Feds to seize a luxury yacht. Yet for some reason, of all the millions of people who have partaken of the weed, not a single one is known to have died as a result. Would that cigarettes could make the same claim.

Let me pause at this point to declare my steadfast opposition to drug use. I do so without reservation. But eschewing the stuff myself and recommending it to no one, I still have to wonder why we continue to treat drugs mostly as a criminal matter, waging a war not against drugs themselves but against our own people.

At the moment, some 330,000 people are in jail for drug violations. In the federal prison system, more than 60 percent of the inmates are there for violating drug laws—most relating to harder drugs than marijuana. But even when it comes to pot, the numbers are appalling. The FBI reports that in 1992, 535,000 people were arrested for possession, sale or manufacture of marijuana—this in a nation that doesn't have enough cops to start with. In six cases, reports Rolling Stone magazine in a special report about drugs, life sentences were imposed. As for harder drugs, mandatory minimum sentences are clogging the jails with small-time "mules" who are quickly and easily replaced. The money's very good.

The folly, not to mention the tragedy, of this policy ought to be apparent. For some reason, the United States persists in treating drugs as a criminal, not a health, problem. Certainly, the importation and selling of hard drugs is a criminal enterprise and ought to be dealt with accordingly. But that lucrative business—so lucrative it persists despite Draconian penalties for lawbreakers—would soon wither if the government decriminalized the use of drugs. That was the experience when Prohibition ended and there's no reason to think things would be different now.

To that suggestion—advanced to one degree or another by Baltimore Mayor Kurt Schmoke and former secretary of state George Shultz among others, and contingent on much study—certain politicians cry bloody murder. Congressmen who represent inner-city districts see drugs as such a scourge that they label decriminalization as nothing short of capitulation. Decriminalization does seem like capitulation—capitulation not to drug pushers or to the substance itself but to human nature. We have been fighting this fight for a long time, spending $20 billion a year, and have nothing to show for it. The true winners of the war on drugs are drug pushers and companies engaged in the construction of prisons. The rest of us are losers.

Whatever Jennifer Capriati's problems, they are not criminal. If she indeed has a problem with drugs, particularly marijuana, she will probably be more easily cured than if she were a habitual cigarette smoker (tougher to quit for a lot of people than heroin) or a serious boozer. The whole idea that she was arrested—rehab was her own idea—for possessing a small amount of marijuana is preposterous. She's not a criminal, but a kid with some problems—one of them now being a bust on a drug charge.

TRIBUTE TO REV. WILLARD PAYTON

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Willard Payton of the New Birth Church of God in Christ. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Payton commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Willard Payton is a native of Chicago, Illinois born to Glen and Mary Payton (both deceased), he was reared in the Englewood Community by Elder Johnie Wheeler and his wife, Missionary Ethel Wheeler. Reverend Payton is a family man Married to Gloria Lynne Payton for twenty-seven years, God has blessed them with five sons, three daughters, and three grandchildren; and

Whereas Reverend Payton matriculated at Lindblom High School, Wilson Junior College, Chicago City Colleges, the University of Illinois (Navy Pier), and the Charles Harrison Mason Bible College. A dedicated employee he worked eleven years for LTV Steel in production management, thirteen years for National Retractories and Minerals Corporation as Senior Sales Representative, a past member of the American Institute of Metallurgical Engineers and American Ceramic Society; and

Whereas, Reverend Payton has been a member of New Birth Church since 1968, he was Ordained an Elder in 1981, served as Assistant Pastor 1986-1991, he was appointed Pastor in October 1991. Reverend Payton is a denominational leader serving the First Jurisdiction of Illinois as Secretary of the Sunday School Department, Assistant Superintendent, Trustee, Assistant Secretary, Treasurer, President of the Youth Department, Vice President of the International Youth Department, a member of several standing committees serving Bishop Louis H. Ford, Presiding Bishop, Church of God In Christ, Reverend Payton is a dedicated shepherd, a humanitarian and a true role model in our community; and

Whereas the New Birth Church of God in Christ was founded in November, 1964 by the late Elder Johnie B. Wheeler with six members, today New Birth Church is an established congregation in the Englewood Community, building the present edifice in 1976,

there is a monthly food basket program, Headstart program ages 3 to 6, a Nursing home visitation ministry, and monthly financial support for homeless children in Haiti for over ten years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Willard Payton, and the New Birth Church Of God In Christ, Chicago, Illinois by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI SIDNEY AKSELRAD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Rabbi Sidney Akselrad, a dedicated community leader from California's 14th Congressional District who was recently honored by the Palo Alto Senior Coordinating Council with its prestigious Lifetimes of Achievement Award.

Rabbi Sidney Akselrad has practiced the art of coalition-building throughout his life—with his congregations, youth, fellow rabbis, other denominations, and the civil rights movement. His cochairmanship in 1960 of the Bay Area Committee for Freedom Riders led to his becoming extensively involved with civil rights activities in the South and his association with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Rabbi Akselrad also provided extraordinary leadership for 20 years as senior rabbi for Congregation Beth Am in Los Altos Hills. His community service includes working as a chaplain at Stanford Hospital, a founding board member of Opportunities Industrialization Center West [OICW], a board member of the United Way of Santa Clara County, and president of the Northern California Board of Rabbis. His numerous honors include the Palo Alto B'nai B'rith Brotherhood Award and the Israel Medal of Freedom, both received in 1968, and the South Peninsula Jewish Community Center Community Service Award in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, it has been written, "blessed be the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." The 14th Congressional District of California and our Nation have been bettered because of this extraordinary man. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on receiving a Lifetimes of Achievement Award.

TRIBUTE TO REV. STEPHEN LEWIS

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Stephen Lewis of the True Vine Missionary Baptist Church of Dixmoor, IL. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Lewis commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Stephen D. Lewis is a native of Chicago, Illinois, he matriculated at Moraine Valley Community College, completed Chicago Baptist Institute, entered the Bachelor of Theology from the International Bible Seminary; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis is a role model and a family man, serving as Minister of Music and Church Organist throughout Chicago for many years; he is married to Miss Hellen Freeman for fifteen years, they are blessed with four children; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis acknowledged his Call to the Ministry and was Ordained in 1977, he was elected Pastor of The True Vine Missionary Baptist Church, Dixmoor, Illinois over fourteen years ago in 1979, we thank God for a summer feeding program, the AWANA Bible Class (Workman that are not ashamed), the Midnight Musical, and the Stephen D. Lewis youth coral; and

Whereas Reverend Lewis is respected among his peers, he serves as the First Vice President of the State Progressive National Baptist Convention and Vice President of the South Suburban Ministers Fellowship, he is an outstanding Gospel Preacher and humanitarian: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Stephen D. Lewis, by entering these accomplishments into the Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS GAG RULE DEMONSTRATES NEED FOR A TO Z SPENDING CUTS PLAN

HON. WILLIAM H. ZELIFF, JR.

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, this House has been shut out of the process again.

Legislation considered today, the foreign operations appropriations, has been brought up under a closed rule. That prohibits real debate and real votes on real spending cuts from A to Z. This House has not be allowed by its leadership to have any real input on spending priorities for America.

This is precisely why we need the A to Z spending cuts plan. Members would be able to offer spending cuts, have them fully debated, and receive a rollcall vote on each spending cut.

Under A to Z we could have real votes on real spending cuts that the Rules Committee bottled up. The Rules Committee has refused to allow us to debate or vote on the following amendments:

A Solomon amendment to cut aid to the International Development Association by $211 million. Mr. SOLOMON represents 582,000 people whose voices cannot be heard because the leadership's gag rule turned down their Representative's amendment.

A Traficant amendment to cut overall funding by 10 percent, $880 million. Mr. TRAFICANT represents 571,000 people whose voices cannot be heard because the leadership's gag rule turned down their Representative's amendment.

A Klug amendment to cut the International Fund for Ireland by $9.6 million. Mr. KLUG represents 544,000 people whose voices cannot be heard because the leadership's gag rule turned down their Representative's amendment.

A Burton amendment to cut Agency for International Development overhead expenses by $5 million. Mr. BURTON represents 554,000 people whose voices cannot be heard because the leadership's gag rule turned down their Representative's amendment.

A Crane amendment to cut our voluntary U.N. contribution. Mr. CRANE represents 572,000 people whose voices cannot be heard because the leadership's gag rule turned down their Representative's amendment.

A Hoyer amendment to ensure no funds are used to enforce the embargo on Bosnia. Mr. HOYER represents 598,000 people whose voices cannot be heard because the leadership's gag rule turned down their Representative's amendment.

A Goodling amendment to cut overall funding by $42 million. Mr. GOODLING represents 566,000 people whose voices cannot be heard because the leadership's gag rule turned down their Representative's amendment.

These spending cuts were worthy of consideration, but the Rules Committee chose to ignore them. The Rules Committee has chosen to ignore elected Members of this House, and the millions of Americans they represent. This is unacceptable.

The A to Z spending cuts plan would allow us to trim the fat from the budget.

It is painfully obvious that, in this case, the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and the Rules Committee have refused to let us have debate, and up and down votes, on these spending cuts.

Those of you who are opposed to these types of business-as-usual gag rules should sign the A to Z discharge petition today.

TRIBUTE TO DR. KWAME PORTER

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Dr. Kwame Porter of the Christ United Methodist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Dr. Porter commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Dr. Kwame Porter was born in Mineral Springs, Arkansas as John Porter, due to the transformations brought about in his life today he is identified as Kwame which means, "one born on a Saturday with a commitment to keeping his peoples' history." He is a family man married to June C. Porter, and God has blessed them with six children, John T., Joseph D., Julia M., Jessica R., Jorja A., and Jerrianne C. Porter; and

Whereas Dr. Porter is a Pastor, Scholar, Prophet, and Community Leader, serving Christ United Methodist Church, Chicago, Illinois since the 1960's, he is a graduate of Kansas Community College, Kansas City, Kansas, Associate Arts Degree 1953, Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa,

Bachelor of Arts Degree 1959, Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary/Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, Master of Divinity Degree 1962, Union Institute, Cincinnati, Ohio, earning the Ph.D. Degree 1975, he is a prolific writer, the author of the Dating Habits of Young Black Americans "And All Most Everybody Else Too" and over eight other books and numerous articles; and

Whereas Dr. Porter has always been in the vanguard in the struggle for Black Liberation, he was the first minister in Chicago to invite Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to Chicago and organized the first official Southern Christian Leadership Conference Chapter in Chicago in 1964, Dr. Porter is mentioned in Dempsey Travis' books on the history of Chicago, a Harvard University Study of the Civil Rights Movement, a University of Chicago Study on Chicago and the Civil Rights Movement, and the Oral History Project of Chicago's Civil Rights Movement by the Art Institute and Columbia College, Chicago, Illinois; and

Whereas Dr. Porter is a builder of men, women, and Institutions he has enabled thirty-one men and women enter the Christian Ministry from various denominational backgrounds, he has created several institutions, the Talented Tenth African American College Prep Project, The Successful Employment Preparation Project, The Winners Circle Business, The Englewood Cluster Umoja-Shalom Village, and the Englewood Alternative Policing Community Organizers cadre: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Dr. Kwame Porter, and the Christ United Methodist Church, Chicago, Illinois on the occasion of Dr. Porter's thirty-three years in the Ministry, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

THE HAITIAN EMBARGO: NOT A GOOD SOLUTION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration's continuing effort to return Jean Bertrand Aristide to the Presidency in Haiti has proven to be frustratingly ineffective. Unable to force the military junta to accept Mr. Aristide's return, the Clinton administration has resorted to tightening the embargo and easing the restrictions on asylum seekers. This Member is gravely concerned that our current Haiti policy will continue to bring nothing but additional suffering.

A recent editorial in the May 24, 1994, edition of the Lincoln Star entitled "No good solutions, including an embargo," outlined the difficulties with our current Haiti policy. As the editorial correctly notes, General Cedras and the other junta leaders "have been emboldened by the Clinton administration penchant for tough, but ultimately empty, talk. American credibility has been damaged."

This Member would ask to place this editorial in the RECORD, and commend it to his colleagues.

[From the Lincoln Star, May 24, 1994]

NO GOOD SOLUTIONS, INCLUDING AN EMBARGO

Just as Haiti may have no good guys in political residence, President Clinton faces no good solutions for that country's problems and our country's unfortunate tangle in it.

Our tortured past with Haiti, recent policy missteps and a heinously cruel economic embargo morally bind the United States to resolve the Haitian crisis.

Clinton's announcement to grant political asylum hearings to fleeing Haitians is a humane if problematic decision, but no solution.

To continue to treat Haitians differently than other refugees gives credence to charges of racism.

Cubans, for one, have been welcomed by the boatload into Miami. The difference may reflect the United States' longstanding sympathy to anti-communist Cubans more than racism. But for whatever reason, it is clear that Haitians are treated one way, refugees from other nations another.

However, this runs the risk of encouraging more Haitians to flee and creating a nightmare of a refugee crisis as we scramble to care for an onslaught of poor, illiterate people.

The larger problem, of course, is what to do about Haitians in Haiti.

The exiled, democratically elected president, Jean Bertrand Aristide, is ensconced in the United States, nixing U.S.-proposed compromises to return him to Haiti. He makes a troubling democrat who will never be mistaken for George Washington. But he was elected by a majority of Haitians and illegally removed from office.

Its people are being slaughtered by military thugs and starved by an embargo intended to pry the military from power, but with the actual effect on inflicting incredible suffering on an already destitute population. The border is porous, but the goods that make it into Haiti go to the military and the black market, not to the poor—the Aristide supporters.

Its military leaders have been emboldened by the Clinton administration penchant for tough, but ultimately empty, talk. American credibility has been damaged.

Haiti sits on our doorsteps, clearly in our sphere of interest. Yet history taints the perception of our motives. U.S. Marines stormed onto Haiti's shore because of virtual anarchy in the country in 1915. We stayed until 1934.

Our shameful relationship with Haiti's dictators since then make us a suspect savior. As in Somalia, U.S. forces are likely to be first welcomed, but in any extended stay our welcome would quickly wear out.

We cannot sit idly while the embargo does its dirty work. We have a moral obligation to Haiti, to revisit diplomatic solutions with our allies in the region or through United Nations mediation.

The rebuilding of Haiti must be up to Haitians. But first we must remove the boot from its jugular.

Many innocents would die if the United States and allies launch an invasionary force to oust the military. But many will die also as a result of this embargo. The search for a resolution to this mess must continue.

[From the Lincoln Star, May 24, 1994]

AMERICA CHANGES FACE

"The offer was sweeter than a bushel of Iowa roasting ears: $25 million in incentives to a Maryland biotechnology company if it would leave the nerve-rattling East Coast and settle here in America's heartland—fresh air, quiet streets, smiling faces," read the news story about a company considering relocating to Des Moines.

"But after a closer look at Iowa, the company noticed that almost all of those faces, smiling or not were white." The offer was ultimately rejected—because Des Moines was not racially diverse enough.

Just as America's face is changing, the needs of companies are also changing.

Companies today have offices all over the country, all over the world. It's a good chance that some of their best people will be other than white. How is that company going to feel about sending someone to work in Iowa if they're going to lose them in a year, asks Max Phillips, an executive with U.S. West.

[From the Lincoln Star, May 24, 1994]

CZECH, SLOVAK REPUBLICS FACE CHALLENGES

(By Ann Toner)

The Czech and Slovak republics, formerly Czechoslovakia, are adapting at different rates to free enterprise, according to two Farmers National Co. officers who have been assisting the effort.

Speaking Monday to the Omaha Agri-Business Club, Max Evans of Des Moines, chief real estate appraiser, and Craig Harris of Shenandoah, Iowa, real estate associate, said in the more populous and industrialized Czech republic, unemployment is 3 percent and business is improving.

In the less populous Slovak republic, more rural and less industrialized, unemployment is 20 percent and likely to climb.

The two men have been helping through a grant to Iowa State University from the U.S. International Development Agency.

"A lot of people have changed on paper but not at heart," said Evans. One collective farm was divided into 90 smaller enterprises, turning the tractor driver under the former system into a custom tractor driver who still has to go to a central committee to get his tractor fixed when it breaks down.

Slovak farmers can't believe that a U.S. farmer could farm 1,200 acres with just his immediate family or possibly one hired hand. A Slovak farm that size might have 150 employees with a hands-off manager who directs them.

The collectives have reduced employment by about 30 percent and need to pare their worker force by another 65 percent in order to become efficient, Evans said.

Crop farms in the republics are a mix of modern and ancient with tractors, horse teams and hand labor all engaged in production, the two men said. Tillage is extensive, with no effort to terrace or save soil.

Many livestock farms are antiquated and in need of better genetics and animal nutrition, Harris said. Dairies milk dual-purpose animals that don't do a good job of either milk or meat production.

Feeds are hay, grass and silage with little effort to balance rations or protein content for optimum production.

Collectivization and confiscation of properties under communism have complicated land reform, Harris said. A lack of records makes it difficult it difficult to establish past ownership.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JOHN H. RICE

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Rev. John H. Rice of the Bethel Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Rice commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend John H. Rice was born in Starksville, Mississippi, reared in Chicago Heights, Illinois since the age of four matriculating at Dr. Charles Gavin Elementary, Washington Junior High, and Bloom High School; graduate of Moody Bible Institute, Prairie State College, Associate of Arts Degree, Governors State University, Bachelors Degree Majoring in Communication Science, currently a candidate for the Masters Degree in Communication Science; and

Whereas Reverend Rice was elected Pastor of St. Bethel Baptist Church in 1970, where he has had life long membership, the church has been blessed with an increase of over six hundred (600) new families involved in many christian ministries; and

Whereas under the dynamic leadership of Pastor Rice the Bethel Community Facility also known as "the miracle on Portland Avenue" was constructed, today this one million dollar debt-free multipurpose facility serves the community with day care, a medical clinic, alternative high school for at risk youth, adolescent basketball, computer classes, a pharmacy, and fellowship hall; and

Whereas Reverend Rice is a family man, married thirty-three years to the former Movita Tate, and God has blessed them with one son and three daughters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Reverend John H. Rice by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and archives of the one hundred and third Congress.

TRIBUTE TO THE BIBERMANS

HON. MARJORIE MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to two life-long residents of Pennsylvania who are celebrating the 50th anniversary of their wedding on June 4, 1994.

Fifty years ago, two days before D-Day, David and Annette Biberman were married in Philadelphia. Dave, then an artillery expert in the U.S. Army, was shipped to the Philippines where he served his country training GI's in the new munitions technologies. During the war, Annette worked for the Budd Co. where she wrote a monthly letter to American servicemen describing the equipment Budd was manufacturing to assist in the war effort.

At the end of the war, Dave and Annette started a family and raised two daughters. Dave and Annette have been lifelong supporters of liberal social causes. Since their retirements from careers in business and education, they have been active volunteers for cultural organizations in Philadelphia. They have also been devoted grandparents to two grandsons and two granddaughters.

It is a privilege to wish them many more years together on this great occasion.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM T. RUCKER

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Dr. William T. Rucker of the Soul Reviving Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Dr. Rucker commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Dr. William T. Rucker is a learned man, holding five earned academic degrees and one honorary degree. Dr. Rucker matriculated at City College of Chicago (Wilson Junior College), Associate of Arts degree in humanities, Alma College, Alma, Michigan, Bachelor Science degree in Physical Education, McKinley Theological Seminary, Bachelor of Theology, Governors State University, University Park, Illinois, Bachelor of Arts and Masters of Arts in Cultural Studies, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, candidate for the Doctor of Ministry Degree, McKinley Theological Seminary, Honorary Doctor of Divinity; and

Whereas Dr. Rucker has been an outstanding athlete and role model to his peers and others since the days of his youth. He was Captain of his High School Football and Track teams, earning twelve Varsity Letters in Football, Basketball, Track and Baseball, State Champion in the One Hundred Yard Dash, receiving thirty medals and thirty-five trophies, earning six Varsity Letters in College Football and Track, in 1986 he earned the Yudanshu Black Belt through the Wolfpack Karate Studio; and

Whereas Dr. Rucker was Licensed to preach and Ordained into the Gospel Ministry in 1974, since that time he has served as Pastor of Soul Reviving Missionary Baptist Church of Chicago, he is a member of the Southern Baptist Convention; and

Whereas Dr. Rucker is among the most dedicated and exceptional Child Welfare advocates in America, President of One Church One Child, State of Illinois, President of the Reverend Henry Rucker Memorial Services Organization a full service Foster Care and Adoption Agency, Member, Department of Children and Family Services Advisory Council, Co-Chairman, Adoption Reform Panel, Member, Governor's Advisory Board—Adoption Project Heart, Board Member, Olive Harvey City College, Board Member, Roseland Community Hospital, Chairman, South Area Social Services Coalition, and Chairman, South Area Planning Board: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of The United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Dr. William T. Rucker by entering these accomplishments into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States.

OUTRAGE IN BOSTON

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to read the following OP–ED by Bob Herbert from today's New York Times. It describes a flagrant violation of anti-discrimination laws and a violation of the principles upon which our society prospers. We cannot let incidents such as this be swept under the rug and explained away as mistakes. I am outraged that, at the request of a visitor to our country, the management of the Four Seasons Hotel decided to ignore a hundred years of progress in racial relations. Mr. Speaker, this travesty speaks for itself and I urge my colleagues to take note of it.

OUTRAGE IN BOSTON

It was the kind of ugliness you expected from the South in the 1950's, but it happened last week in one of the great hotels of Boston.

The Prime Minister of India, P.V. Narasimha Rao, and his entourage checked into the Four Seasons Hotel late on the night of May 16. Thirty-six rooms were booked for Mr. Rao and the approximately 50 aides who accompanied him. There was also a contingent of U.S. Secret Service personnel assigned to the Prime Minister, who was to speak at Harvard the next day.

Now in a great hotel like the Four Seasons, there is a surge of excitement and activity when important guests arrive. A variety of tasks have to be carried out by parking attendants, bellhops, clerks, maids, waiters and the like.

Last week at the Four Seasons, any of those tasks done for the Prime Minister of India had to be done by white people. No African-Americans could carry his bags, no Asians could clean his room, no Latinos could serve him his food. At the direction of a hotel official, the Prime Minister had to be served by whites only, American or European.

The offense was so blatant and egregious that the head of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination could not at first believe it. The initial reaction of the commission chairman, Michael T. Duffy, was that the allegation, made by hotel employees, was "too outrageous to be true." He ordered an investigation.

It turned out that the Four Seasons official, who has not been publicly named, had notified hotel supervisors in a memorandum that nonwhites were not to serve the Prime Minister. This was confirmed by the hotel's general manager, Robin Brown, who said, "There was a memo that went out to a number of employees saying that only certain nationalities should service the Prime Minister's room."

Mr. Brown has made extensive public apologies on behalf of the hotel and has described the memo and its aftermath as "very, very stupid and unforgivable and painful."

But how could the flap have happened? To carry out the directive, some nonwhite employees had to be shifted from their normal duties. How could anyone at the hotel have

thought that was all right? Last week marked the 40th anniversary of the Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court ruling that led to the dismantling of legal segregation in the United States. Clearly there are many who remain untouched by the spirit of that ruling.

Two African-American bellhops, Harrison Lilly and Jose Abad, were among those told by Four Seasons supervisors that they couldn't assist the Prime Minister or his party. Mr. Lilly, the night bellman, said he was given paperwork to do. He was quoted in The Boston Globe as saying, "I felt when it happened that they had traded my eight years of service for one night of revenue."

Four Seasons officials, while acknowledging that what happened was wrong, contend that hotel employees were carrying out a request made by the Prime Minister's security people, who felt that Mr. Rao would be safer if only white waited on him. The security people, according to hotel officials, were worried about the possibility of an assassination attempt or some other terrorist act.

The Indian Government has denied that any request was made that pertained to the racial or ethnic background of hotel staff members.

The Four Seasons is doing its best to make the controversy disappear. Hotel officials have apologized to Mr. Lilly and Mr. Abad, and have reimbursed them a total of $179 for lost gratuities. The two bellhops, who had filed charges with the Commission Against Discrimination, have withdrawn their compliant. Mr. Brown, the general manager, has said he would like the "healing" to begin.

But hold on. What happened at the Four Seasons last week was a moral outrage. Mr. Duffy said yesterday that the commission's investigation was continuing. Additionally, the United States Government has an interest in knowing whether a foreign head of state has been fostering racial discrimination here. That should be thoroughly investigated. And the hotel, which insists that it will not tolerate discrimination, needs to show that it's serious. There are times when heads should roll and this is one of them.

TRIBUTE TO REV. J.C. SMITH

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend J.C. Smith of the Bethlehem Temple Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Smith commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend J. C. Smith is a native of Montgomery, Alabama, he is a family man, married to Miss Willie Myricks for thirty-seven years and God has blessed them with nine children, all completing college and the eldest son is a candidate for the Ph. D. Degree; and

Whereas Reverend Smith is a community leader and a churchman, serving on the School Board of District 147 for twenty-one years, a member of the South Suburban Ministries Fellowship serving as chairman of the political affairs committee, Vice President of the state Progressive National Baptist Convention, and Moderator of the South Suburban District; and

Whereas Reverend Smith was Ordained in 1964, organized Bethlehem Temple Baptist Church in 1969 with five members, today the congregation numbers over one thousand souls with over fifteen ministries, including a Mens Mentor Ministry, a dynamic youth and young adult ministry, and a women's ministry who volunteer at Oak Forrest Hospital; and

Whereas under the leadership of Rev. Smith the congregation out grew its facilities, in 1990 a new church was completed located at Sibley & Ashland, a shining beacon of light in difficult times: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Reverend J. C. Smith, by entering these accomplishments in the Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER MARTIN GANZ

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a solemn occasion for my district because we are honoring one of our own who gave his life in the line of duty. The death of Manhattan Beach police officer Martin Ganz, who was gunned down while making a routine traffic stop on December 27, 1993, was a tragic reminder of the world around us.

Whether on the streets, in our cars, or in our homes, the fear of violence is one we all share. And with Officer Ganz's death we no longer feel that even those who are there to protect us are completely safe from the dangers of urban life.

The challenge is to overcome our fear with action. It is my goal to see that we do learn from the senseless act that has stolen from us a bright, promising, and caring young man who so selflessly committed himself to his family, his friends, and his profession. To paraphrase a comment made by Martin Ganz's fiance, Pamela Ham, at a recent forum I held to discuss gun violence, "we cannot let Martin's death be in vain."

Martin Ganz was a kind son and brother who offered support to his mother and five sisters, and a loving fiance to Pamela—planning to formally propose marriage to her on Valentine's Day. He was a model police officer who earned the respect of both his colleagues and the residents of his community. Let us keep these memories clear, and continue to work together to keep our community safe and strong.

TRIBUTE TO REV. BARNEY SHELTON SAULSBY

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Barney Shelton Saulsby of the Messiah Temple Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Saulsby commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Barney Shelton Saulsby is a native of Columbia County Florida, he is a graduate of Richardson High School, Lake County Florida, Chicago Technical College with a degree in Engineering, Chicago Baptist Institute, earning the Bachelor of Theology Degree, Southern Bible Seminary, earning the Master of Theology, and the International Bible Institute earning the Doctor of Theology; and

Whereas Reverend Saulsby is the Founder and Pastor of the Messiah Temple Missionary Baptist Church, established in 1965, serving as its faithful under-shepherd for over twenty-eight years, on Easter Sunday, April 19, 1980 the congregation moved to its new home a new edifice seating over one thousand, a fellowship hall, and educational facility; and

Whereas Reverend Saulsby believes in a Ministry to the total man and community outreach, in 1992 he was appointed Protestant Chaplain of the Chicago Fire Department, serving the spiritual needs of the Firemen and their families; and

Whereas Reverend Saulsby organized the Messiah Evangelistic Association with an outreach ministry reaching over thirty States, the God Squad Youth Ministry that includes the far south side of Chicago, and a weekly radio broadcast that covers the Chicago Metropolitan Area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Barney Shelton Saulsby and the Messiah Temple Missionary Baptist Church, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Achives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD McCREARY II

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Richard McCreary II, of the New Covenant Missionary Baptist Church of Phoenix, IL. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend McCreary commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Richard D. McCreary, II, Ph.D. is a native of Evergreen, Alabama, the son of the late Richard D. McCreary, Sr., and Mrs. Leodia P. McCreary. He is a family man, married to Barbara J. P. McCreary, M.D., they are the proud parents of two daughters, and two grandchildren; and

Whereas Reverend McCreary matriculated at Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida, earning the Bachelor of Science Degree, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Illinois, earning the Master of Science Degree, the University of Iowa, Iowa

City, Iowa, earning the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, earning the Master of Divinity Degree, and Northern Theological Seminary, earning the Doctor of Ministry; and

Whereas Reverend McCreary was Licensed to preach May 14, 1967 by the First Baptist Church of Evergreen, Alabama, under the pastoral leadership of The Reverend H. J. Hawkins, and Ordained March 1, 1970, by the Rock Hill Baptist Church of Carbondale, Illinois, Reverend McCreary is a Professor of Composition at Governors State University, University Park, Illinois; and

Whereas Reverend McCreary is the Pastor of the New Covenant Missionary Baptist Church, Phoenix, Illinois, he is an active member of the Greater New Era District Association, he is a staff writer for the "Worker" Missionary Magazine, the Founder and Director of the New Covenant Christian Academy, New Covenant Church provides leadership development classes, and has many outreach programs to meet the needs of the community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Richard D. McCreary, II, Ph.D. and the New Covenant Missionary Baptist Church, Phoenix, Illinois, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO REV. ALBERT LOVE

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Albert Love of the First Lilydale Baptist Church of Chicago, IL. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Love commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Albert Love is a native of Chicago, Illinois, he matriculated at Lindblom Technical High School, graduating with honors, University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois, Trinity Christian College, Palos Heights, Illinois earning the Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology and Theology, graduating Cum Laude, he is a family man, married to Miss Carolyn Knowlton of Chicago, Illinois since 1976, God has blessed them with a son, Brandon Alexander Love; and

Whereas Reverend Love responded to the Call to the Gospel Ministry, he was licensed to Preach in August, 1976, Ordained in April, 1980, in October, 1983 he became the tenth man to Pastor the historic Lilydale First Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois, the former Pastors were, Rev. C.D. Trice, Rev. E.W. Lowery, Rev. E.W. White (served twice), Rev. W.W. Franklin, Rev. A.J. Davis, Rev. J.W. Coleman, Rev. W.M. Moore, Rev. C.C. Yates, Rev. L.W. Johnson, all making their contribution in building the Kingdom of God; and

Whereas Reverend Love is a denominational leader, he is Secretary of the Presidents Council of Baptist Conventions in Illinois, Chief Operating Officer of the Baptist General State Convention, Member of the Permanent Organization Board of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Financial Secretary of the Greater New Era District Baptist Association, he is a much sought after teacher in the State and National Congress of Christian Education, and the World Baptist Alliance; and

Whereas under the Pastoral Leadership of Reverend Love the congregation has grown to over one thousand persons and is very active in the community, the Church will send an exchange student to Zimbabwe, a sponsor of the Inner-City Youth Camping Project, sponsor a summer Youth Jobs Program, involved in the Christian Ecumenical Development Corporation, rehabilitating housing for low income families, adopted a shelter for teenage mothers, scholarship programs, Monthly food drive, and Ministry to the Elderly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Reverend Albert Love and the First Lilydale Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois, on the occasion of Reverend Love's Tenth Pastoral Anniversary, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO REV. ALBERT MOSES SHEARS

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Albert Moses Shears of the Maple Park United Methodist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Shears commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Albert Moses Shears is a native of Marianna, Arkansas, graduating from Anna M.P. Strong High School with honors, matriculated at the University of Arkansas A.M&N at Pine Bluff, Bachelors degree and Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois earning the Master of Divinity Degree; and

Whereas Reverend Shears is a member and an Elder in the Northern Illinois Conference of the United Methodist Church, former Pastor of South Deering and Vincent United Methodist Churches, he was appointed Pastor of Maple Park United Methodist in 1988; and

Whereas under the pastoral leadership of Reverend Shears God has Blessed Maple Park Church to grow spiritually, in membership, in ministry to the hungry, to Senior Citizens, to youth, to those in prison, to the community and the promotion of aids awareness, to expand into a beautiful new church facility; and

Whereas Reverend Shears is a humble man, a servant of God, a member of the Board of Ordained Ministry of the Northern Illinois Conference, a former president of the Greater Grand Crossing Organizing Committee, and the president of the Board of the Developing Communities Project; and

Whereas Reverend Shears is a family man, a true roll model, married to Carolyn Sheers, God has blessed them with three children, Katundra, Derrick and Carlos and one grand daughter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the The Reverend Albert M. Shears by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the one hundred and third Congress of the United States.

REMEMBERING D-DAY

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of D-day. The landing of Allied troops at Normandy on June 6, 1944, was an event of historic magnitude. Not only did it mightily turn the course of the war in Europe toward Allied victory, but in so doing it played no small part in setting the stage for the entire history of the second half of the 20th century.

In remembering this event as we head into the next century, it is vitally important that we keep in mind that this was a victory in the fight against the intolerance, violence, and malevolence of fascism. The history of the 21st century is not yet written. It is imperative that we remember history and maintain our vigilance lest such a great evil rear its ugly head so forcefully again and we are faced with descending into the horrors of such a war another time.

We must also recall that the course of history on June 6, 50 years ago was swayed by the brave, honorable, and dedicated actions of individual servicemen from the United States and countries around the world. While thousands were involved, they all played their own part in giving of themselves—often with the ultimate sacrifice of their own lives—for the greater good. It is to the dedicated and brave service of these individuals that I believe we should remember and commemorate "the longest day" today.

In this spirit, I am submitting here for inclusion in the RECORD a recent article by Walter Adams on his return visit to the site of the Allied landing. Dr. Adams served in the 83d Infantry during WWII and fought in the liberation of Europe from Northern France to Germany. He is now the Vernon F. Taylor Visiting Professor of Economics at Trinity University in San Antonio. His article "Return to Normandy," appeared in the spring 1994 edition of Trinity, the magazine of Trinity University.

RETURN TO NORMANDY

(By Walter Adams)

It wasn't professional travel. Nor was it a vacation.

If anything, it was a pilgrimage. To remember. To reflect. To contemplate. To gain perspective on the most cataclysmic event in my life.

But, above all, to commemorate that brave armada which assaulted the monstrous fortifications of Normandy as a first step on the long road to the liberation of Europe from Nazi oppression.

This year will be the 50th anniversary of that June 6, 1944, which marks an incomparable feat in military history. No doubt, it will attract crowds of tourists, sightseers, curiosity seekers and a rapidly diminishing

group of veterans who survived "the longest day."

To avoid what may well degenerate into a commercial extravaganza and televised circus, I decided to go last year, in the quiet of September, accompanied by my wife, Pauline. I wanted to walk the beaches, visit the memorials, and pay my respects one last time at the cemeteries dotting the Norman landscape.

My trek started at the Pegasus bridge, a vital link across the Orne River, taken shortly after midnight of June 5, by Major Howard's glider troops of the 6th Royal Airborne Division. The house next to the bridge—the first to be liberated in France—still stands. Today, it is a combination snack bar/museum/souvenir shop. I dropped in to browse, I selected sixteen postcards, counted them out ceremoniously to the handsome middle-aged owner, and inquired lightheartedly whether I was entitled to a quantity discount. Without a change of expression, she carefully checked the number of cards and, noting my army fatigue uniform (which I wore throughout the trip), asked if I was there in '44. I explained that I was in the American sector, on Utah Beach, and that I did not land until D+13.

"But you were part of the liberating force?"

"Yes."

"In that case, please take these cards with my compliments—in appreciation of what you and your comrades did."

Overcome by this unanticipated gesture, I couldn't hold back the tears. (For the moment, I didn't even feel embarrassed.) In subsequent conversation, it turned out that the house next to the bridge had belonged to her parents, that as a little girl she witnessed a German officer choking her mother and since that liberation she has been fighting "the bureaucrates in Paris" who want to demolish the bridge and replace it with a modern structure. Her mission, she felt, was to keep alive the memory of what the brave men of the Pegasus Division had done on this fateful night 50 years ago.

SAND OF UTAH BEACH

In the town square of Sainte-Marie-du-Mont, just off Utah Beach, I stopped for information at a small restaurant/hotel. Attracted by my uniform, and assured that I had participated in the invasion force, the proprietor (a man about 40) regaled me with stories about June 6. The town, he said, was liberated by the Screaming Eagles of 101st U.S. Airborne Division, and its inhabitants—led by their parish priest—guided the paratroopers to the German sniper nests infesting the area.

He proudly pointed to the memorial plaques recounting diverse incidents in the town's liberation. Then, suddenly, he asked me to wait a few minutes. He had a souvenir for me. He returned with a small wine bottle which he had just filled with Utah sand: "This is a token of our appreciation. It will help you remember." (I didn't have the heart to tell him that I had already collected sand from each of the beaches—British, Canadian, and French, as well as American.)

AN INTERESTING DEBRIEFING

Perhaps our most curious encounter was with Owe Svenson, a used car salesman from Sweden. Born in December 1944, he had an obsessive interest in a war that neither he nor his country experienced first-hand. Now he was in France to see for himself, systematically visiting the several beaches, ravenously exploring the monuments and memorials. Waiting for us at the exit from "La Madeleine" museum on Utah, he expressed outrage that I was asked to pay the (very modest) admission charge to the museum.

He asked permission to take my photograph—then another together with Pauline. Then he invited us for coffee and proceeded to debrief me as if he were a military intelligence officer. Did I land on Utah? With what unit? In how many major battles did I participate? How old was I at the time? What did each of the decorations on my uniform signify? And, finally, how difficult was it?

My division, the 83rd Infantry, I told him, relieved the 101st Airborne south of Carentan. Our first mission was to capture Periers (not the Perrier of sparkling water fame)—a village some 12 miles away. Fighting from hedgerow to hedgerow, literally yard by yard, it took us nearly a month to reach our objective.

The cost? Some 5,000 casualties, including killed, wounded, or captured. And after Normandy? Four other major campaigns: Northern France, the Rhineland, the Battle of the Bulge, and Germany. How many men of the 83rd Infantry survived from Utah to V-E Day, I couldn't tell him. Svenson was genuinely appalled. When we took our leave, as if to make amends, he gave us his address and telephone number: "Visit me any time you want. Don't worry about the cost. Everything will be on me."

TOUCHING, TELLING

These random, unplanned encounters were emotional—and revealing. To a wide variety of people, in different walks of life, the events of 1944 were more than stale history. There was a feeling among the many, almost exclusively European visitors to the beaches and little museums that something of transcendent importance had occurred there half a century ago.

Equally touching and telling were the memorials that are ubiquitous in the area. Every kilometer on the road from Utah to St. Lo to Avranches, the Voie de la Liberté 1944 (liberation route), displays a red-white-blue road marker indicating the distance from the landing area.

In the town square of Sainte-Mére-Eglise, in front of its famous church, stands a stone monument with the stark reminder: "On 6 June 1944, the paratroopers of the 82nd and 101st U.S. Airborne Divisions liberated this District." Near Ouistreham, on Sword Beach (British), the exploits of Commandant Kieffer, leader of 177 French Commandos, are commemorated:

"With their British brothers-in-arms, they conquered this beach to open the road for the liberation of Europe."

At Pointe du Hoc, on a sheer 200-foot cliff, which the 2nd U.S. Ranger Batallion had to climb with ropes and ladders (under withering fire) to knock out a 155 mm gun battery that commanded "bloody" Omaha, a stark granite stalagmite stands in mute tribute.

A nearby sign post records this "mission impossible":

"Pointe du Hoc

"Strongest German position on the invasion front in Normandy

"It had to be taken

"The success of the landings in the American sector depended on it."

GRIPPING MEMORIALS

Inevitably, there is a memorial to George "Blood and Guts" Patton, the Allied general most admired by the Europeans. It is a majestic obelisk, flanked by a pair of American flags, erected on soil brought over from every state in the Union. It stands in the middle of a major thoroughfare in Avranches, and records the exploits of the most brilliant tank commander on the Western front.

One of the most gripping memorials, perhaps, is the tribute to Major Thomas D. Howie (age 36), located in St. Lo, the crucial road junction that had to be captured before the Allies could break out of the deadly hedgerows of Normandy. Major Howie had wanted to be the first American to set foot in St. Lo, but was killed one day before the town was taken. His men of the 2nd Battalion, 116th Regiment, 29th Infantry Division, loaded his body on the first jeep to enter St. Lo and thus made his wish a sentimental (however macabre) reality. The memorial, erected by the French, stands in a square renamed in his honor.

THEY REST IN PEACE

Nothing, of course, can approach the emotional impact of Normandy's military cemeteries. On beautifully landscaped, meticulously tended tracts, designed in parade-perfect order, are the identical headstones that mark the graves of thousands of young men—men whose lives and hopes were prematurely terminated, men who today would be my age.

There is an air of tranquility, even serenity that exudes from their resting place—belying the violence and brutality that sent them to their deaths. The American markers include only name, rank, unit, home state, and date of death. The British and Canadian also contain age and a message from the family. On the Canadian cemetery at Beny-sur-Mer: "In memory of my dear husband and our only son. May he rest in peace." and "Bon Jesus, donnez lui le repos eternel." In the British cemetery at Ranville: "Deep in our hearts his memory is kept." and at Bayeux the all-too-frequent: "A soldier of the 1939–1945 war known unto God."

In these hallowed places, one gets a sense of intimate cameraderie, pervasive equality, and democratic unity. At Beny-sur-Mer, where all markers are imprinted with the Maple Leaf, an Anglo from the Winnipeg Rifles lies next to a Quebecois from the Regiment de la Chaudiere. At St. Laurent, my comrade from the 83rd Infantry Division, Lieutenant Engene Zender from Wisconsin rests close to Private-first-class Lawrence Slutzker from New York. Killed in the same battle, one lies under a cross, the other under a Star of David. "E pluribus unum!"

There are 16 British cemeteries (19,137 graves) interspersed on Normandy's peaceful landscape, two Canadian (5,007 graves), and five German (58,172 graves). We did not visit all these sites. Most of our time was spent at St. Laurent, the American cemetery on the plateau overlooking the steep bluffs of bloody Omaha.

AMERICAN CEMETERY

The memorial structure consists of a semicircular colonnade with a loggia housing battle maps at each end and a large bronze statue in the open area formed by its arc. A circular chapel in the graves area contains the inscription, "They endured all and gave all that justice among nations might prevail and that mankind might enjoy freedom and inherit peace."

Behind the memorial structure is the Garden of the Missing. Its semicircular wall records the names and particulars of 1,557 soldiers, sailors, and airmen from 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Guam. Their memory is preserved along with that of 9,072 servicemen, 4 women, 3 Congressional Medal of Honor recipients, and 307 Unknowns whose remains are interred at St. Laurent. (At the

request of their families, some 14,000 others were brought home for burial.) Remembering them is an obligation for those of us lucky enough to have survived. It is also a catharsis.

WHAT DID IT MEAN?

On the long flight home, I tried to assess the meaning of World War II. Did it make any permanent difference in the course of world affairs?

Wasn't total victory soon followed by the Cold War, Korea, Vietnam, and assorted police actions? Isn't the world still beset by tribalism, nationalism, and ideological confliction—Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Eastern Europe? Has human nature been transformed? Have we learned to sublimate our instincts of aggression and bestiality? Or, as the cynics suggest, is war an inevitable part of the human condition that can be expected to recur with unfortunate regularity in one generation after another?

I like to believe that liberating Europe from Nazi oppression (and East Asia from Japanese hegemony) was not a sterile adventure. I like to believe that defeating a megalomaniac regime, intent on world domination and the extermination of peoples not belonging to the "master race"—a regime capable of perpetrating the holocaust—was an unavoidable necessity and obligation. I like to believe that keeping the hand of an Adolf Hitler away from the atomic trigger was an achievement of capital importance.

Assessing the impact of the war on my personal life was less problematic. It taught me, above all, the evil of ideological bigotry and a racial hatred.

When I witnessed its consequences in the concentration camps we liberated—the most notorious at Mauthausen in Austria—I recalled, and never since forgot, the warning of Pastor Martin Niemoeller. "When they came to get the Jews, I said I was not a Jew. When they came to get the Communists, I said I wasn't a Communist. When they came to get the Socialists, I said I was not a Socialist. When they came to get me, it was too late."

After seeing—first-hand—the ultimate in man's inhumanity to man, I vowed that for the best of my life I would stand up and speak up against injustice. Looking back, I hope I have been true to that pledge.

OBSERVING MEMORIAL DAY 1994

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women who risked and lost their lives to safeguard the democratic principles which we, as Americans, hold so dear. As we head into our annual observance of Memorial Day, we must pay homage to individuals who served with distinction and who faithfully devoted their lives to the preservation of our freedom.

In 1868, Gen. John A. Logan, the Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic first issued the decree ordering that the graves of the Republic's war dead be decorated with flowers and other adornments. Although this was not the first time America had honored their war dead in this way, it marked the first official recognition of memorial by a national group. Up until that time, different communities celebrated Memorial Day on different days. The numerous ceremonies which we hold today have built upon this foundation laid by General Logan.

Those of us who are not veterans of war will never know the deafening sound of shells, or the shear terror of battle. Moreover, we may not even know the feeling of losing a friend in combat, or risking our very lives for the rights we hold so dear. But I assure you, we do know speeches, prayers, and parades do not adequately serve to express our respect and gratitude to those who lost their lives while serving us so proudly. We perform these various acts not only out of respect for the sacrifice that our war dead endured, but out of responsibility that we as survivors have to keep their memories and deeds alive.

We are a better and stronger country for the sacrifices borne by our war dead. For that reason we should remember them in the glory that they died. Let us not be sorrowful this day. We will continue to long for our friends and relatives who died on the field of honor. We will continue to wish that events could have been different, so that those who died so selflessly could be here now among us. All Americans stand proud in recognizing the sacrifices made by these fallen heroes and we fully acknowledge that our great country would not be what it is without them.

MANCOS HYDROPOWER LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Mancos hydropower legislation to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to issue a lease-of-power privilege to the Mancos Water Conservancy District in Colorado.

This noncontroversial measure has also been introduced in the Senate by Colorado Senators HANK BROWN and BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL and we believe it should have the approval by both Houses as soon as possible.

Over the last 3 years, the Colorado congressional delegation has worked with the Department of the Interior and the Mancos Water Conservancy District to resolve a dilemma which has challenged the future of this project.

Faced with increased costs of operation and maintenance and increased demand—with the cooperation and support of the Bureau of Reclamation—the Mancos Water Conservancy District applied for a lease-of-power privilege to construct a small hydroelectric facility at the Mancos Project.

However, the original legislation was not clear as to the ability of the Department of the Interior to contract with the Mancos District to issue such a right for hydroelectric power development.

Therefore, all the parties concerned, including the Colorado congressional delegation, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Mancos District; have come together to the Congress to petition for this clarification of the power of the Department of the Interior to issue this lease-of-power privilege.

This is an excellent program. It demonstrates how local authorities, faced with costs for necessary renovations, and also faced with future increases in demands; can design a solution that not only meets those needs, but benefits all the parties involved. Not only will enactment of this legislation result in no cost whatsoever to the Federal Government, it actually would result in increased income to the Federal Government in the form of the fees which would be paid for the leases.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following report for the RECORD.

HISTORY, DEVELOPMENT, AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE MANCOS PROJECT AND PROPOSED HYDROPOWER PROJECT

The Mancos Project is an off-river storage project authorized in 1939 by the Water Conservation and Utilization Act ["WCUA"], 53 Stat. 418 (16 U.S.C. 590y–590z–11). The Project consists of 4.8 miles of canal and one dam, the Jackson Gulch Reservoir. Water from the reservoir serves ca. 13,750 acres of agriculture, urban and suburban areas. The federal government utilizes storage rights within the reservoir for Mesa Verde National Park.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The District has a repayment responsibility for the dam of $900,000. and the original repayment contract required the District to pay the Department of Interior an additional, annual operation-and-maintenance fee set by the Secretary. In January 1993, the District assumed operations and maintenance of the project from the Bureau of Reclamation.

The District presently has an annual income from the Project of $76,000, which is allocated for the following expenses: $15,000 for insurance, $20,000 management salary, $18,000 debt retirement, $9,000 administrative expenses, and $14,000 operations and maintenance.

PHYSICAL PLANT AND CONDITIONS

Project features and equipment, now 45 years old, are in increasing need of repair. The 1.1 miles of concrete flumes have suffered from nature's wear and tear including rocks falling, ground moving, and freeze-thaw cycles. The District anticipates that those flumes will have to be completely replaced by the District in the next 15–20 years with an anticipated, present-day cost of $1.5 million. The 3.3 miles of earthen canal are eroding to the point that, within the next 5–10 years, erosion control, repairs, and up-to-date equipment will be necessary at present-estimated costs of $30,000 to $100,000. The Project headquarters built in 1942 as temporary structures to house the men who built the dam, were remodeled in 1948 to serve as the manager's residence, machine shop and warehouses. In 1990, the electrical and water system were redone and upgraded with the residence to bring them to safety standards. The machine shop, and storage units have not been upgraded due to lack of funds throughout the years. However, in 1994, due to budget restraints, the only repair planned within the limited budget of the District is to the inlet canal stilling the basin at an approximate cost of $5,000.

THE MANCOS VALLEY

The Mancos Valley has a low-to-middle income population economic base. Present water rates are within the means of consumers but a rate increase, necessary to conduct requisite maintenance, repairs, and renovations would be prohibitively expensive for the population served. After careful analysis

of this situation, the Board concluded that, without income to be generated from this hydroelectric project, the District would not be able to maintain the project.

THE HYDROELECTRIC SOLUTION

Several years ago, anticipating the dilemma of finding funding for necessary maintenance, renovation, and improvement; without sufficient rate increases, the Board began investigating developing hydroelectric power. The locations in the area which were studied were a) Ames Hydroelectric Plant, which is still operating after 90 years, and two, younger projects: Lemon Dam and Pine River Dam. In 1990, after being advised by the Bureau of Reclamation that the federal government could not economically construct such a facility, the Board commissioned a feasibility study on a hydro-power project on Jackson Gulch Reservoir. Preliminary results were that a small hydropower plant would be feasible and would accomplish the District's revenue goals.

The planned project would require a) construction of a small building (ca. 14' by 16') on an existing spillway wall and b) installation of a 260 kw turbine and generator within the building. The turbine and generator would be operated on existing releases of irrigation water. There would be no changes in water releases, release patterns, water storage, or project operation from current operation of Jackson Gulch Dam and Reservoir. Projected revenue from the Project is $30,000. per year, with a debt service of 18 years.

In April 1990, the District began the process of applying for a lease-or-power privilege from the Bureau of Reclamation; in reliance by the parties (both the District and the regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation) that the WCUA authorized a lease-of-power privilege as in other project authorization laws. The underlying assumption was based on a 1986 Memorandum by the Commissioners of the Bureau to the Regional Directors. Lease terms, including amendments to the District's repayment contract, were negotiated with the Bureau of Reclamation regional office. Financing had been arranged for construction and contracting for the sale of power was underway.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Both the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Colorado Division of Wildlife have conducted a preliminary environmental review of the proposed hydroelectric project and believe that the project is not likely to adversely impact any federally listed endangered or candidate species.

ISSUE ONE—AUTHORITY UNDER WCUA

On November 12, 1993, the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior opined that the WCUA did not authorize such a lease. That opinion was that the Act limits all right, title, and interest in any facilities constructed and revenues resulting from hydroelectric development of the project exclusively in the United States; anticipating that any hydroelectric project authorized by the WCUA would be constructed by the Bureau, and that the revenues generated by the hydroelectric facility would be "sufficient to cover the appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost of the project and such fixed charges, including interest, as the Secretary deems proper." (Section 9, Water Conservation and Utilization Act, 16 U.S.C. 590z-7). However, the Bureau of Reclamation has never found hydropower development feasible and the District is now solely responsible for maintenance and repairs for the project.

ISSUE TWO—FEDERAL AGENCY JURISDICTION

A second complication arose as a jurisdictional dispute between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ["FERC"] as to which, or both, had regulatory authority. In 1986, FERC had issued a license for a non-federal hydropower development on the project to a private developer. (That license was surrendered by the developer in 1988.) The current position of the Department of Interior, expressed in the Solicitor's Opinion of November 12, 1993, and based on interpretation of intervening case law; is that the WCUA excluded FERC jurisdiction over hydropower development on WCUA projects. Although a Memorandum of Understanding entered into by the Department of Interior and FERC on November 16, 1992, attempted to resolve some the jurisdictional dispute, this legislation is necessary to eliminate any questions that might exist or arise regarding identification of the proper federal agency with jurisdiction over this project.

This legislation would amend the WCUA to authorize the Mancos Water Conservancy District to (a) enter into a lease-of-power privilege with the Bureau of Reclamation on the Mancos Project and (b) utilize the revenues generated for operation and maintenance of the Mancos Project and (c) other purposes consistent with other such lease-of-power privileges to similar entities. The development of such hydropower would be without cost to the United States and would protect the government's interests in the reservoir by empowering the District to adequately maintain the Mancos Project without federal subsidy. The government would receive a fee to be paid to the reclamation fund for the lease-of-power privileges comparable to fees received for similar hydroelectric leases.

TRIBUTE TO MATTHEW PATRICK BROWN

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished young man from Rhode Island who has attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. He is Matthew Patrick Brown of Troop 22 in Cranston, RI, and he is honored this week for his noteworthy achievement.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts do. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 merit badges, 11 of which are required from areas such as citizenship in the community, citizenship in the Nation, citizenship in the world, safety, environmental science, and first aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop. This young man has distinguished himself in accordance with these criteria.

For his Eagle Scout project, Matthew designed, made, and installed fire alarm signs at Western Hills Junior High School in Cranston, RI.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Eagle Scout Matthew Patrick Brown. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. This program has through its 80 years honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans, two dozen of whom now serve in the House.

It is my sincere belief that Matthew Patrick Brown will continue his public service and in so doing will further distinguish himself and consequently better his community. I join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute him.

TRIBUTE TO DR. VICTOR GORDAN

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of New Hampshire's most admired citizens, Dr. Victor Gordan of the Manchester Veterans' Hospital.

Dr. Gordan escaped from Communist Romania in 1970 and, after being recognized as a refugee by the United Nations' High Commissioner for Refugees, obtained a visa to come to the United States, where he continued his medical training. Upon completing that training, Dr. Gordan dedicated his life to helping people, in particular New Hampshire's veterans.

After overcoming the hardships of immigration, Dr. Gordan obtained positions at some of the Nation's most prestigious medical institutions. He was recognized by the American Board of Internal Medicine as a specialist in internal medicine in 1977 and was later recognized as a subspecialist in pulmonary diseases in 1982. Dr. Gordan also is a member of the American College of Physicians and the Society of Critical Care Medicine.

Since coming to the Manchester Veterans' Hospital in 1984, Dr. Gordan has been tireless in his efforts to help those service men and women who have given so much to their country.

In recent months, Dr. Gordan has taken a particular interest in what has come to be known as Persian Gulf syndrome—the mysterious symptoms and ailments that have plagued many of our soldiers since they returned from the Persian Gulf war. He has been relentless in his efforts to solve this puzzle and selfless in his commitment to the veterans afflicted by it.

Mr. Speaker, we must remain vigilant in our efforts to ensure that full medical treatment and honest answers are provided to our Persian Gulf veterans. Recognizing and supporting people like Dr. Gordan is essential to this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Dr. Victor Gordan and in supporting all those like him who are working to find answers to the ailments of our Persian Gulf veterans.

SIMPLICITY AND CHOICE—THE WATCHWORDS OF TRUE HEALTH CARE REFORM

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following article dated February 5, 1994, which I read in the Detroit Free Press. This editorial cuts through the obfuscation that opponents of true health care reform have used to stir fear and suspicion among the public toward the President's Health Security Act and toward a single-payer system. The only two proposals which, not ironically, will provide universal coverage and therefore the only two proposals which will bring genuine reform to a system in crisis.

CRISIS OR NOT, OUR SYSTEM BADLY NEEDS MAJOR REFORM

General Motors Corp. spends more on health care for its employees and retirees than on steel to build its cars, which explains a lot about why the automaker is trying so hard to ratchet down its cost of retiree coverage.

GM is not alone. The percentage of U.S. employers that pay for full medical coverage has dropped steeply. Cutbacks in health benefits were a major issue in more than half of all strikes in recent years. Eight out of 10 new businesses don't offer any health benefits. Americans do have the best medical care in the world, as foes of the Clinton health care plan keep insisting—but only if they or their employers can afford it.

Opponents of the Clinton plan are trying to hijack the debate and turn it into a semantic argument about whether or not there's a health care "crisis" in this country. Look at it this way: Health care gobbles up 14 percent of the gross national product—$1 out of every $7 earned and spent. A fat slice of every dollar you spend on groceries, clothing, cars, appliances goes to pay somebody's health care bills.

So we spend nearly $1 trillion a year on health care, and tens of millions of Americans still have inadequate coverage or none at all. Millions more workers and retirees fall asleep every night praying: "Please, God, don't let them cut my health care benefits." If that's not a crisis, it's a heck of a problem, and President Bill Clinton is right to want to do something about it.

We share some of the concerns of the Business Roundtable and others about the Clinton plan. The proposed purchasing alliances have the potential to become bureaucratic behemoths run by insurance companies, with neither the compassion nor the simplicity Mr. Clinton promised. States should not be discouraged from pursuing flexible, homegrown reforms in cost control and delivery of care. And the president's cost projections still seem rosy.

We continue to believe that a single-payer plan, along the lines of the Canadian system, has virtues that make it worth fighting for, including a hefty savings from wiping out bureaucracy and paperwork. The president has wisely indicated he's willing to deal on almost everything but universal coverage. He'll have a first-class fight on his hands just to hold on to that cherished target.

He might as well go all the way and press for a single-payer plan. There's a small but expandable core of support in Congress for such a system. And it comes closer to meeting Mr. Clinton's important objectives of simplicity and choice than anything else we've seen yet.

TRIBUTE TO REV. LEROY TAYLOR

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Leroy Taylor of the New Faith Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Taylor commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Leroy Taylor is a native of Rosedale, Mississippi, migrating to Chicago as a youth to make his mark on the world. Later he volunteers for military service in the United States Navy, and

Whereas Reverend Taylor matriculated at Chicago Baptist Institute, and is a promoter of Education and Christian Education, and

Whereas Reverend Taylor has served as Pastor of New Faith Missionary Baptist Church for 19 years, under his pastoral leadership totally renovating the church and constructing a new educational building in 1990, engaged in active youth ministries, weekly food distributions to the hungry, and prison ministry at the Cook County Jail, and

Whereas Reverend Taylor is a family man, a loving husband married to Ms. Rose Lewis, and the proud father of 10 children, with four sons in the ministry, two of the four serving as senior pastors in the Chicago metropolitan area. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Reverend Leroy Taylor.

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD ELAM

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to recognize and congratulate an upstanding citizen of Colorado, Mr. Harold Elam of Grand Junction.

Mr. Elam, the owner of Elam Construction, was the recent recipient of the Colorado Contractors Association's most prestigious award. The Contractor of the Year award was given to him in recognition of his significant contributions to that association, the construction industry in general, as well as his contributions to his community.

Mr. Elam is a native of Colorado, who went to work in the construction business soon after receiving an associates of science degree in engineering. In 1964, he joined the Navy as a Naval Aviation Cadet and served for 5 years. He returned to the construction firm that bears his family name in 1970.

Since Elam Construction joined the Colorado Contractor's Association in 1981, Harold Elam has served on the CCA Legislative Committee, chaired the Western Slope Municipal-Utility Joint Cooperative, served as chairman of the membership committee, served 8 years as a member of the board of directors an is a past CCA president.

In his community, he served as a member of the County Safety Council, Chamber of Commerce, River Front Commissioner, and as a director of the River Front Foundation.

I would like to take this time to thank Mr. Elam for his service to his community and his country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL FIREFIGHTER PAY EQUITY ACT

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus, it gives me great pleasure to introduce the firefighter pay equity bill. Senator SARBANES, a distinguished cochair of the Fire Caucus, introduced a similar bill in the Senate.

Our Government employs approximately 10,800 structural firefighters, and nearly 1,600 wildland firefighters. These brave men and women protect our military bases, Federal civilian property, and vast expanses of forest and national park land. It is ironic that despite the serious responsibilities of Federal firefighters, and despite the risk they face, these men and women are among the lowest compensated employees in Government.

Unlike other paid firefighters across the country who work an average of 50 hours a week, Federal firefighters work an average of 72 hours a week. Consequently, when you translate their Federal salary into an hourly wage, these firefighters are earning slightly more than entry level fast food servers—$6.20 an hour. This is not only unbelievable, but it illustrates why the Federal fire service has trouble attracting and retaining firefighters.

In 1990, I worked very hard to help pass the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act to bring Federal civilian employees' salaries in line with comparable private sector salaries. We also included a study of Federal firefighter pay in this legislation. In response to this directive, the Office of Personnel Management drafted a pay reform proposal for firefighters which Senator SARBANES and I used as the base for our own legislation.

Our proposal would finally give firefighters time and a half for each hour of overtime work. Overtime would only be considered if a firefighter worked more than 106 hours during a 2-week period. In addition, this bill also includes pay incentives for training, so that the Government cannot only retain qualified candidates but encourage our firefighters to continually improve their level of service.

This legislation finally focuses attention on a problem which has been overlooked too long. I encourage my colleagues, and all of the Members of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus to consider this bill, and support its passage this year.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES P. TILLMAN

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Dr. James P. Tillman of the Memorial Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Dr. Tillman commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Dr. James P. Tillman was born in Joliet, Illinois, he is a graduate of Wilson College, a honor graduate of the Chicago Baptist Institute, he received the Doctor of Divinity from St. Stephens College, Los Angeles, California; and

Whereas Dr. Tillman is a family man, he is married to Berve Tillman celebrating forty-two years of holy matrimony, God has blessed them with four children: James, Jr., Andre, John and Teresa, and five grandchildren; and

Whereas Dr. Tillman is the Founder and Pastor of the Memorial Missionary Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois established September 1st, 1957. His motto is, "The Church with a Mission, a Pastor with a Message." Dr. Tillman and the membership are celebrating forty-three years of service; and

Whereas Dr. Tillman is the President of the Chicago Baptist Institute, serving in that capacity for the past twelve years, he is responsible for the three million dollars restoration of the original site located at 5120 S. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. He is a member of the Council of Religious Leaders of Chicago Bible Society, member of the State and National Progressive Conventions, a Lifetime member of the N.A.A.C.P., Chaplain at Statesville Correctional Facility, a Trustee of St. Stephens College, and a Member of the Interfaith Council: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Dr. James P. Tillman and the Memorial Baptist Church, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

TRIBUTE TO MORGAN A.L. GOULET

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished young man from Rhode Island who has attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. He is Morgan A.L. Goulet of Troop 1 in East Greenwich, RI and he is honored this week for his noteworthy achievement.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts do. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 merit badges, 11 of which are required for areas such as citizenship in the community, citizenship in the Nation, citizenship in the world, safety, environmental science, and first aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop. This young man has distinguished himself in accordance with these criteria.

For his Eagle Scout project, Morgan coordinated the first major cleaning since 1935 of the Briggs Lot Cemetery in Warwick, RI.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Eagle Scout Morgan A.L. Goulet. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. This program has through its 80 years honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans, two dozen of whom now serve in the House.

It is my sincere belief that Morgan A.L. Goulet will continue his public service and in so doing will further distinguish himself and consequently better his community. I join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute him.

THE ESSENTIAL COMPONENT OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial dated April 25, 1994 which I read in the Detroit Free Press. It speaks to the single most essential component of true health care reform—universal coverage. While my colleagues sort through and debate various financing mechanisms and timetables for reform, I urge them to remember that without universal coverage, any reform measure that Congress passes will only institutionalize the worst parts of the status quo.

HEALTH CARE—BOLDNESS AND A SINGLE-PAYER SYSTEM ARE BEST MEDICINE

Congress has plunged into health care reform with a vengeance, vastly increasing the chances that a viable bill will emerge this session. Such key Democratic players as Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell and Rep. John Dingell of Michigan are working hard to deliver on Bill Clinton's promise of universal coverage—although not necessarily in the form the president first proposed.

If we could add two words of advice to the millions they're already getting, they would be these: Be bold. Cut through the complexities, flummox the lobbyists and go for a single-payer system. That's still the simplest way to deliver universal coverage, even at this late date in the debate.

Mr. Clinton might usefully cast his eye north from Washington to Canada, where such a system seems to work just fine. Opponents of dramatic reform like to cite anecdotes from Canada about long waits for doctors and about treatments delayed or denied. But every horror story out of Canada probably can be matched by ten from the United States.

At least under the Canadian system, poor people don't clog emergency rooms for lack of care elsewhere, running up gilt-edged hospitals bills for common ailments. Hospitals aren't forced to swallow or sneak onto the bills of the well-heeled or well-insured the cost of providing indigent care.

Canada doesn't have millions of people who live in sheer, unabashed terror of getting sick or being fired and losing their health insurance. And it doesn't bear the stigma, as we do, of having the worst infant mortality rate in the developed world.

The chief arguments against the single-payer system come from the billing bureaucracy, that legion of insurance companies and others who earn their living by selling, administering, marketing or servicing the health care industry. They eat up 15 to 20 percent of the U.S. health care dollar before the first aspirin is prescribed. And they are heavy contributors to the congressional campaign coffers.

If Congress can't resist their blandishments, it should at least incorporate into any reform plan the best features of single-payer: simplicity, universality, portability and choice. Reform also needs to protect incentives for medical research, to be wary of octoploidal cost control measures, and not to lay too great a burden on employers.

The president and Congress do need to be more frank about costs and how to spread them fairly. Otherwise, they risk the kind of backlash that panicked Congress a few years ago into rescinding an otherwise estimable catastrophic health care plan.

But President Clinton deserves credit for getting reform on the table and creating a groundswell for universal coverage. We doubt that Congress will dare back off from that principle now, no matter how many lobbyists or what blizzard of dollars descends on Capitol Hill.

Universal care is the last great gap in the safety net. With the help and advice of the wiser heads in Congress, the president may close it at last.

TRIBUTE TO REV. GEORGE M. WADDLES, SR.

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend George W. Waddles, Sr., of the Zion Hill Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Waddles commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend George W. Waddles, Sr., is a native of Wichita, Kansas, accepted Christ and was baptized at the age of seven years, acknowledged his call to the Ministry in 1975 and ordained in 1977; and

Whereas Reverend Waddles matriculated at Bethal College in North Newton, Kansas, earning the Bachelor of Arts degree, and the Masters of Social Work degree from the University of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas; and

Whereas Reverend Waddles has pastored several churches, Ninth Street Baptist

Church in Lawrence, Kansas as interim pastor, second Baptist Church in Vincennes, Indiana, Zion Baptist Church in Springfield, Illinois, and the Zion Hill Missionary Baptist Church in Chicago since 1983, organizing the Zion Hill Christian Academy grades kindergarten through eight; and

Whereas Reverend Waddles is a Churchman, serving as Director of Finance the Minister's Division of the National Baptist Congress of Christian Education, Vice-President of the Baptist General State Congress of Christian Education, Fourth Vice-Moderator of the Greater New Era Baptist District Association, and the Developing Communities Project; and

Whereas Reverend Waddles is a family man, a loving husband married to Mrs. Karen L. Waddles, they are the proud parents of George, Jr., Anglea, Nicholas, Nathanael, Genesis and one grandchild—Erin Elise Waddles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Reverend George W. Waddles, Sr.

ADDRESS BY THE HON. MILES LERMAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COMMISSION, AT THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, recently in the rotunda of our Nation's Capitol, just a few steps from where we are now standing, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council organized the annual National Civic Commemoration to remember the victims of the Holocaust in connection with the annual Days of Remembrance. The ceremony is a key part of the yearly observance in memory of the 6 million victims of the Nazi German slaughter of innocent women, children, and men.

Mr. Speaker, one of the principal speakers on that solemn occasion was the distinguished Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Mr. Miles Lerman. Prior to assuming that position, Miles was an active and creative member of the Council. Since becoming Chairman of the Council just over a year ago, he has demonstrated great sensitivity, imagination and leadership in this important position. His remarks at the National Civic Commemoration were particularly appropriate and insightful.

Mr. Speaker, a number of our colleagues were not able to attend this important solemn occasion because the Congress was in recess at that particular time. For this reason, I ask that the remarks of Chairman Miles Lerman be placed in the RECORD, and I urge all of my colleagues to read and reflect upon his thoughtful speech.

ADDRESS BY MILES LERMAN AT NATIONAL DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY APRIL 6, 1994

Thank you, Secretary West

Mr. Vice President, members of Congress distinguished ambassadors, honored guests of the diplomatic corps, ladies and gentlemen.

It is with a deep sense of gratitude that I accept on behalf of the United States Holocaust Museum the flag of the 50th Anniversary of WWII commemoration.

We will display it proudly in the Holocaust Memorial Museum along side the flags of the 14 American Fighting units who were the first to encounter the world of concentration camps. We will display this flag as a symbol of our eternal gratitude to the American fighting men who upon encountering the camps have undergone a remarkable transformation—from warriors to healers and then to eye witnesses.

In the exhibition of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, we do not concentrate only on the horrors and crimes committed by the Nazi murderers, but we also depict human sensitivity and acts of kindness that warm the heart and lift the spirit.

The first thing the museum visitor encounters as he enters the permanent exhibition is the bewildered faces and angry voices of the American soldiers who first discovered the horrors of the concentration camps. Within the exhibit the visitor learns about the compassion of the military doctors and nurses who so desperately tried to save the lives of the camp inmates who were too far gone and were on the edge of certain death.

The Holocaust Museum has become the epicenter of education.

More than one and a half million visitors crossed its portals, and 3,000 school groups have come to learn the devastating results of hatred and bigotry. Two out of three of our visitors are non-Jews so the museum has become a magnet for the American people, a national shrine, a hallowed place of education, remembrance and introspection.

We have received diplomats and school children, most of the members of Congress, many ambassadors and thirty heads of state from all over the world.

We are told that this museum is the most powerful lesson in contemporary history.

We realize that we cannot bring the dead back to life. But within the Museum and within today's ceremony of commemoration we can make sure that the memory of their deaths serves life, deepens our understanding for the sanctity of human life, and intensifies our determination to preserve the freedoms and values that are the hallmark of our nations glory.

We are approaching the first anniversary of the opening of the Museum. Last April, President Clinton officially opened its doors to the American and International public. This museum is a result of a bi-partisan effort. Four Presidents—Carter, Reagan, Bush and Clinton, and both Houses of Congress have supported the creation of this living memorial. The land is a gift from the United States government. But all the necessary funds to build and equip this center of learning came from broad America—Jews and non-Jews alike.

Today I stand before you as Chairman of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council to thank the American people, its legislators, and four American presidents for helping us to create this temple of memories.

As a survivor of this cataclysm who found a haven at the shores of our beloved country, the United States of America, I also must express my gratitude to the state of Israel for opening their gates and providing homes to most of the remnants of the Holocaust.

I must thank them for embracing the survivors with open arms and above all for helping them to regain their pride and human dignity.

We survivors know more than anybody else what it meant to live in a world without an independent state of Israel.

I would like the ambassador of the State of Israel, Itamar Rabinowich and his entire delegation to stand up and accept our public thanks.

Next year we will address the fiftieth anniversary of the Allied Liberation of Europe and it is most appropriate that the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum is now an official World War II commemoration site, and we will fly this flag with honor and gratitude. For this and much more, Mr. Secretary, we thank you and the American people very much.

As Chairman of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, I also have the honor of presenting our Eisenhower liberation medal.

Each year, the medal is given to extraordinary men and women as an expression of the deep gratitude that we feel toward the members of the US armed forces who brought an end to Nazi tyranny.

The medal is named in honor of Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe, the leader of the invasion of Normandy that led to the final defeat of Nazi Germany.

Today I am honored to present the Eisenhower liberation medal to Lt. Gen. Claude M. Kicklighter, executive director of the 50th anniversary of WW II commemoration committee, a US army officer who has demonstrated throughout this career a deep commitment to those democratic principles we all hold so dear.

Last year, American liberators and survivors whom they had liberated went on a joint pilgrimage to collect soil from the places of martyrdom and from the American military cemeteries, the resting place of our valiant soldiers who fought and died to keep the world free.

This soil is deposited in the hall of remembrance of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, and will become an integral part of our task to remember.

Our journey was painful, tearful, and at times even joyous as it reunited survivors with their liberators in an encounter with memory and destiny.

Gen. Kicklighter was with us on this emotional journey. He became one of us as he demonstrated the deepest personal sensitivity to the cause of remembrance. On this journey we have gotten to know you, Gen. Kicklighter, we were touched by your emotions, we sensed your soul.

As we have collected the soil of the American military cemeteries at Margraten and Normandy. You have pointed to the perils of war, but you have also taught us that there are certain values that are worth fighting for, certain freedoms that must be defended and certain moments in time when peace-loving men and women must take up the call of arms.

I want to assure you, Gen. Kicklighter that survivors and their decedents will forever carry in their hearts a sense of gratitude to the Allied forces for putting an end to the Nazi nightmare and for restoring trust and human goodness in the hearts of those who have suffered so much and have survived the Nazi inferno.

On their behalf and on behalf of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, it is my honor to present you Gen. Kicklighter with the Eisenhower Medal of Liberation.

TRIBUTE TO FRED L. NEWHART ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to Fred L. Newhart Elementary School of Mission Viejo, CA for winning the prestigious Blue Ribbon School Award. Fred L. Newhart School is one of 260 schools across the country that was selected by the Department of Education to receive Blue Ribbon School status based on strong leadership, academic excellence, high quality teaching, community service, strong parental interest and involvement, unique and up-to-date curriculum, and policies and practices that ensure a safe environment conducive to learning.

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program identifies and gives national recognition to a diverse group of public and private schools that are unusually effective in meeting local, State, and national goals and in educating all of their students. Recognized schools serve as models for other schools and communities seeking to provide high quality education for all their students.

Fred L. Newhart Elementary School is a pioneer in community service programs. With its participation in K.A.S.T.—Kids and Seniors Together, students interact with the seniors in the community by volunteering at Norman P. Murray Senior Citizen Center of Mission Viejo and in return, the seniors volunteer in the classroom, working directly with students. This type of intergeneration program is very beneficial to both students and seniors.

K.A.S.T. includes programs such as Authors Day, where seniors meet with students and talk about favorite authors. During Poetry Day, seniors and students write poetry together. When they go on field trips to the senior citizen center, students do drama, band, choral, and orchestra programs for the residents. A program called What's My Line involves seniors going to the classroom to discuss their previous careers with the students. The senior buddies program is also a success where at-risk students and seniors are matched up for lunches, walks against drug and alcohol abuse, and just to talk about personal problems. More student and senior interaction involves the Meals on Wheels Program where students help pack lunches to go to the senior center.

In addition to its high degree of involvement with its community's seniors, Newhart Elementary School is also recognized for its high CAT [California Assessment Program] scores. Their high scores reflect the academic excellence and commitment to education that ranks Newhart Elementary at the top in this area not just in California, but in the Nation. Positive factors that contribute to their achievement are the school's high degree of parent involvement. Education is not just learned in school, but at home as well. Newhart Elementary recognizes this important link and has successfully instituted programs where parents play an active role in their child's education. Along with an exceptional instructional program, Newhart Elementary has ensured a superb environment conducive to learning.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and my colleagues will join me in recognizing the achievements of Fred L. Newhart Elementary School. I look forward to their visit to Washington, DC this fall when they will be honored for receiving the Blue Ribbon School Award.

OBSERVATION OF THE FORMER SENATOR ROGER JEPSON

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, due to an inadvertence, the following statement by the Republican leader of the Senate, BOB DOLE, was not published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 25.

In that the Senate has now adjourned until June 7, I ask that the following along with an article written by former Senator Roger Jepson appear at this point in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BOB DOLE

I commend to my colleagues an article written by the distinguished Republican former senator from Iowa, Senator Roger Jepson. He recently returned from a 2½-week trip to China, where he had the opportunity to see first-hand the social progress and economic dynamism of China. He calls for unconditional renewal by the U.S. of MFN for China. His observations are timely and clear-eyed.

Senator Jepson's observations follow:

Since 1979 China has been granted the international trade status of Most Favored Nation [MFN] by the United States. Early in 1994 proponents of MFN and human rights advocates opposing the renewal of MFN increased their activities in what has been since 1989 an annual battle over MFN–China. In the past four months much has been written; public hearings in and out of Congress have been held; delegations from China, spreading good will and sizable purchase of U.S. products, have appeared in the halls of Congress; U.S. State Department personnel have darted in and out of China gathering information for the "report" to the President. High stakes—human and economic—exist as President Clinton moves toward his June 3rd decision whether to renew MFN–China.

During my recent 17 day fact-finding trip to China, I observed a number of things that were surprising to me. I saw people riding to work on their bicycles while talking on mobile pocket telephones—much like we see in the United States. On two successive Sundays I attended church services unannounced and found over two thousand people at each service, worshipping, openly reading Bibles and participating in Bible study classes taught via video on television screens after the services. Whether traveling by train or airplane between cities within China, it was always the same. Large numbers of people were moving about from one city to another. They were standing in line for tickets and all seats were filled. Small business entrepreneurs by the thousands lined the streets as they sold their wares and cooked their version of fast food. It was one continual, buzzing marketplace. Why should all this be surprising? Because not too many years ago none of this would have been possible. Mobility was restricted and controlled, and many items of food and merchandise did not exist, or were available only by coupon in the location of one's residence. These everyday examples of improving human rights did not exist prior to 1979.

I also observed first-hand a vibrant, exploding economy . . . special high tech parks, huge industrial development sites staffed by informed specialists wanting to "do business," international trade, telecommunications, infrastructure development (building cranes in major cities as thick as the quills on a porcupine's back), merchant banking, stock exchanges, new industry, etc. The People's Republic of China, in its on-going transformation into a "socialist market-based economy," is becoming increasingly integrated into the regional and world economy—taking her place in the international community. Supported by many Asian and European countries, China is working hard to attract the "2004" Olympics, as well as negotiating to rejoin GATT. Many progressive things are happening in China today; anyone who says otherwise needs a "reality check."

Deng Xiaoping said, "It makes no difference if it is a white cat or a black cat—if it catches mice, it is a good cat." However one choose to measure success, the "free market economy" move in China is making progress. Economic success fires the engine of reform that inevitably leads to greater political liberalization and improved human rights. To cut MFN off now, or even cut it off partially, as some are advocating, is to blunt the very instrument currently promoting social pluralization. To inhibit MFN with any conditions is to endanger the progress that has been made for human rights in recent years.

Relinquishing MFN as a tool for human rights does not mean that the United States is abandoning its long tradition of championing human rights, or that we should now remain silent. Human rights abuses are worldwide; occurring in Europe, Africa, South America, the Middle East, Asia, etc. Instead of singling out China, we should address this serious problem in the many international forums available to us; including the United Nations Security Council, the UN Human Rights Commission, the World Bank, the GATT. The West has won the Cold War, but that is not enough. The United States should exert human rights leadership in international organizations—while renewing MFN for China without conditions!

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP CLAUDE E. TEARS

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Bishop Claude E. Tears of the First Corinthians Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Bishop Tears commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Bishop Claude E. Tears was born in Pulaski, Tennessee, coming to Chicago at the age of fourteen, he matriculated in the Chicago Public Schools and Moody Bible Institute; and

Whereas Bishop Tears was led by God to organize the First Corinthians Missionary Baptist Church July 17th, 1966, he began with

six members in Fernwood School, today the congregation numbers over 1,600 persons, and has been in its present location since 1973 serving the community; and

Whereas under the leadership of Pastor Tears the Church has maintained an energetic outreach ministry leading many people to surrender their lives to Christ, in this great congregation former gang members, drug addicts, and alcoholics have changed their way of living; and

Whereas Bishop Tears is a churchman he has affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention since 1972, he serves as Moderator of the local Southern Baptist Association and as President of The Illinois Baptist Pastors Conference, and on the Board of Directors of Illinois Baptist for twelve years as pastoral advisor for Baptist Student work at Chicago State University: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Bishop Claude E. Tears by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

TRIBUTE TO MARILYN GLICK

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and inspired leadership of my very dear friend, Marilyn Glick of San Bernardino, CA. Marilyn, who has demonstrated a remarkable dedication to the needs of the people of the 40th Congressional District, is retiring from my staff after 16 years of outstanding service.

Marilyn began her career in public affairs as an intern in my State assembly office in March 1978. Her sensitivity to the needs and concerns of people was very apparent from her very first day and I hired her as a member of my full-time staff in August of the same year. Most remarkable to me is the fact that Marilyn, who enrolled in college a the age of 42, completed her degree by attending school at night and was the recipient of numerous academic honors.

During her tenure, Marilyn has touched and had a positive and direct impact on the lives of thousands of people. The impersonal business of government often has the tendency to put numbers on people—but not Marilyn. She has treated every constituent case as a mission and, more often than not, she has succeeded in making the bureaucracy of government work for our citizens. Marilyn has been a tireless and tenacious advocate and, to say the least, she will be sorely missed.

Marilyn has also provided leadership in numerous civic and community-based organizations enriching the lives of people young and old alike. She has served by running an after-school enrichment program for over 600 elementary school children, as a Girl Scout leader, in the PTA, and as president of the Inland Empire American Red Cross. She has also served as an advisory board member of the Inland Adolescent Clinic Board and the Alumni Association for Cal State, San Bernardino.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, Marilyn's husband, Larry, their two daughters, Lori and Karen, and their many friends in honoring this special woman for her remarkably dedicated service. Over the years, Marilyn has touched the lives of many people in our community and it is only fitting that the House recognize her today.

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP NORMAN N. QUICK

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Bishop Norman N. Quick, who on Monday, June 11, will be inaugurated Jurisdictional Prelate of New York's Southeast Jurisdiction at a ceremonial luncheon to be conducted by the Bronx Shepherds Restoration Corp.

I hope my colleagues will join me in sending best wishes to Bishop Quick and to the Bronx community in honor of this joyful event.

SALUTE TO CHESTER KRAUSE

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, Memorial Day, the people of Iola, WI will join in a special community salute to Chester Krause, civic leader and entrepreneur who, over a period of 40 years, transformed his central Wisconsin village of 1,125 residents into a publishing empire.

Krause Publications, Inc., internationally known publisher of hobby and collectible magazines and guidebooks, was founded in October 1952 when Chet Krause's desire to have a means by which to exchange information with fellow coin enthusiasts led to his producing and disseminating the first issue of a 1-page newspaper he called Numismatic News.

For that early dining-room-table effort, Chet solicited the ads, sold the subscriptions, and wrote the copy, while pursuing his original occupation as a carpenter. Now acknowledged as America's foremost hobby publications firm, Krause Publications employs 350 people and publishes 26 periodicals and 50 books annually. In addition to the seminal Numismatic News, publications include magazines devoted to old cars, baseball cards and other sports collectibles, and old record, toy, firearm, and comic book collections.

In 1990, after a decade of phenomenal growth in his business, Chet was named Wisconsin's Small Business Person of the Year by the Small Business Administration. Although he retired as company president in 1988, he remains chairman of the board.

It is not only for his tremendous business acumen and entrepreneurial success that Chet Krause is being recognized by his fellow citizens this weekend, but also for his extraordinary and heartfelt commitment to public service, to his employees and to his community. He is Iola's leading citizen, and it is difficult to imagine that one man has left so great an imprint and transformed so completely the life of a town.

Twenty years ago, Chet parlayed a lifelong interest in vintage automobiles into the annual Iola Old Car Show, one of Wisconsin's largest festivals and tourist attractions and the biggest such event in the Midwest. Proceeds from the show are funneled back into the Iola community and have supported innumerable charitable and civic development projects over the years.

Recognizing the vital role his employees have played in the success of Krause Publications, upon his retirement as company president Chet sold 30 percent of his ownership back to the company to be given to employees as part of an employee stock ownership plan. Not only has the plan allowed Krause workers to have an interest in the company's profitability, it has worked to ensure the company's continued viability in the village of Iola.

Chet has served as a village trustee and as member of the Waupaca County Selective Service Board. He is a combat veteran of World War II and is active in organizing reunions for his batallion. Still an inveterate collector, Chet has a growing collection of World War II military equipment.

On the national scene, Chet has played a crucial role in the development of public policy relating to the minting and sale of commemorative coins. I was privileged to work with him and his company's personnel in 1982 when they directed my attention to a badly flawed House Banking Committee proposal which would have allowed a private firm to make windfall profits from the marketing of Olympic coins. Chet and his people were instrumental in providing me with the background information I needed to help derail this costly and misguided effort and replace it with an Olympic coin program that returned millions of dollars more to the U.S. Olympic Committee and served as the prototype for future Olympic coin programs.

Over the years, Chet Krause has been an invaluable source of sound advice on legislation dealing with coinage and similar topics, and our country owes him a debt of gratitude for his participation in this arena of public policy. He has testified many times before congressional committees, beginning in 1967 with his successful effort to restore mint marks on U.S. coinage. In 1961, President Kennedy appointed him to serve on the Annual Assay Commission, and in 1977, he was awarded the American Numismatic Association's Farron Zerbe Award, the most prestigious honor bestowed by America's coin collecting community.

I will be honored to join with the people of Iola this Memorial Day as we gather to express our thanks to Chet Krause for all his many contributions to the village of Iola, the State of Wisconsin and our country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MERCURY-CONTAINING AND RECHARGEABLE BATTERY MANAGEMENT ACT

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to enhance the recycling of rechargeable batteries and prohibit the manufacture of batteries containing mercury. This is significant environmental legislation which will provide real relief from the effects of mercury, lead and cadmium in landfills and incinerators. I am pleased to be joined in the introduction of this legislation today by Representatives RON COLEMAN, MARTIN FROST, NYDIA VELASQUEZ, VERNON EHLERS, CRAIG WASHINGTON, and FRED UPTON.

My legislation, the Mercury-Containing and Rechargeable Battery Management Act, has two main purposes: First reduce the amount of mercury used in disposable batteries by phasing out its use, and Second to stimulate the recycling or proper disposal of lead- and cadmium-containing rechargeable dry cell batteries by establishing uniform national labelling standards for such batteries and requiring appliances in which they are used to be labelled as containing easily removable recyclable batteries. The legislation also requires the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to regularly report to Congress on the activities and successes of the new labelling and recycling program.

This bill is identical to S. 1949, legislation introduced by Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG of New Jersey in March of this year. I look forward to working with the Senator and his colleagues in the Senate to secure passive of this legislation at the earliest possible date.

As many Members of this body are well aware of our recent discussions on Superfund, Safe Drinking Water Act and Clean Water Act reauthorization, toxic heavy metals are a pernicious problem in waste cleanup efforts. Unlike many organic toxic substances, toxic heavy metals like mercury, cadmium and lead found in common household batteries do not break down over time into less hazardous substances. In fact, these metals persist in the environment and can accumulate in the fatty tissues of animals which are then consumed by humans and passed up the food chain to cause serious health effects.

The EPA has identified mercury, cadmium and lead as three of the 17 high priority toxic chemicals on which that agency is focussing its pollution reduction efforts. Any reduction of their incidence in the environment will have a positive effect on public health, environmental remediation efforts and waste reduction activities.

Lead is used in the electrodes of sealed lead rechargeable batteries. Cadmium is used in the electrodes rechargeable nickel-cadmium batteries. Mercury is contained in some battery casings. These metals pose no risks while the batteries are in use, but they can be a significant concern when the batteries which contain them are discarded into the Nation's solid waste stream.

In 1992, Americans used approximately 4 billion dry cell batteries. Dry cell batteries only account for less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the 180 million tons of garbage generated each year, but they have significant sources of mercury, cadmium and lead contamination of the solid waste stream. Dry cell batters in landfills can break down over time, releasing their contents into the environment. The toxic compounds released from dry cell batteries break down and leach into soil and ground water. When burned in incinerators, dry cell batteries release their toxic components into the air.

Mercury has been linked to decreased motor functions and muscle reflexes, memory loss, headaches, brain function disorders and nervous system and kidney damage. Lead has been shown to retard physical and mental development in children. In adults, elevated lead exposure has been linked to high blood pressure and kidney and central nervous system disorders. Cadmium can cause kidney and liver damage and the EPA has determined that exposure to high levels of cadmium can result in pulmonary edema and death. Even at low levels, chronic exposure can result in fibrosis of the lung and lung cancer.

The recycling of rechargeable batteries containing cadmium and lead will divert millions of tons timebombs from solid waste landfills across the country to responsible, industry-led recycling programs currently being established voluntarily by battery and appliance manufactures and retailers.

The Mercury-Containing and Rechargeable Battery Management Act has been endorsed by the Electronic Industries Association, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association and the Portable Rechargeable Battery Association. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this significant environmental protection legislation and in working towards its swift enactment into law.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JESSE SUTTON, JR.

HON. MIKE PARKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, today I am here to honor an outstanding citizen, a philanthropist and a true community leader, the Reverend Jesse Sutton, Jr., of Jackson, MS. He will be retiring May 27, 1994, from Blackburn Middle School in Jackson, and I would ask that you join me in saluting Reverend Sutton for his many, many years of community service.

Born in Jackson, MS, Reverend Sutton is the son of the late Reverend J.S. Sutton, Sr., and the late Mrs. Flora M. Sutton. He is married to Dellas M. King Sutton and is the father of three children and the grandfather of four. He attended Utica Junior College in Utica, MS, then earned his bachelor's degree at Mississippi Industrial College, Holly Springs, MS; and his master's at Jackson State University. He pursued additional education at Alcorn State University, Mississippi State University, Winona State, Dillard University and Jackson State University.

He has dedicated his life to education and discipline for our youth, by working at the Florida School for Boys, Oakley Training School, West Side Junior High, St. Matthew Missionary Baptist Church, and most recently, at Blackburn Middle School and New McRaven Hill Baptist Church.

Reverend Sutton has been recognized many times for his philanthropic deeds. Among his numerous honors and civic contributions are a commendation by the Governor, Personalities of the South, Coach of the Year, Man of the Year, Colonel Staff, Bicentennial Saluate District Educational Contribution, precinct manager No. 88, formerly third vice president of West Side Civic Club, second vice moderator of Jackson Missionary Baptist Association, board member of the General Missionary Baptist State Convention, instructor of the Metropolitan Baptist Ministers Association, member of the National Baptist Convention, member of Jackson Educational Association building representative, member of the advisory board of the Public Service Commission, the Hinds County Human Resource Agency City Planning Board, the Jackson Housing Authority and the Historical Preservation Commission.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that my colleagues join me in paying a well-deserved tribute to Rev. Jesse Sutton for sharing his life with Mississippi's children and giving his heart and helping hands to the citizens of our great State. Reverend Sutton, I thank you.

HONORING JESSE M. LUERA ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF NORWALK-LA MIRADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a special individual, dedicated educator and dear friend, Mr. Jesse M. Luera, former board member of the Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District.

Born in historic Dodge City, KS, Jesse at a young age understood the importance of attaining a higher education. He received his associate of arts degree from the Dodge City Community College and his bachelor of science degree from Kansas State Teachers College. He has done substantial graduate work at Kent State University, California State University-Fullerton, Pepperdine University, and Wichita State University.

Jesse was one of our country's courageous Marine Corps soldiers, who fought in the Korean conflict. In the conflict, he distinguished himself for his bravery and was awarded a Purple Heart.

Jesse has enjoyed an extensive and varied professional career. He began his teaching career in Haysville, KS. Relocating to California, he taught and counseled at La Habra School District. As director of Social Services for the city of Norwalk, he worked arduously for 19 years to provide the citizens of Norwalk with the best possible service. Currently, he is the

owner of a dry cleaning business in Norwalk, the city he calls home.

Jesse has an impressive record of participation on various school boards. He is a former member of the board of directors for the Southeast Los Angeles County Regional Occupation and he also served as a member of the California School Board Association and the Mexican-American School Board Association, State of California. Most notably, Jesse will be fondly remembered for his 19 years of service on the Board of Education of the Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District. Following his election to the Norwalk City Council in April 1994, Jesse resigned his position on the school board.

In addition to his career responsibilities and civic leadership, Jesse has contributed his time and energy to various community organizations. He has volunteered for the Selective Services System Board and as the Cubmaster for Cub Pack #494C. He also was PTA president of the Tierra Rica School in La Habra, and has been an active supporter of the Excelsior High School Booster Club.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to recognize a respected educator and community leader, Jesse M. Luera. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting him for his outstanding commitment to the Norwalk community and the education of our children.

THE FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE HISPANIC EMPLOYEES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 and June 18 in San Antonio, TX the Hispanic Affairs Advisory Committee of the Social Security Administration will hold the first national conference of the Social Security Administration.

Among the goals of this conference will be improved service to our Nation's Hispanic communities, and the advancement of the Social Security Administration's Hispanic work force.

Hispanic Social Security Administration workers from around the Nation, including the South Bronx and Puerto Rico will attend this event.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sending best wishes to all of the participating members and leaders of the Hispanic labor movement on a successful conference.

OLD SPANISH TRAIL

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation to designate the Old Spanish Trail and its Northern Branch for study as a potential addition to the National Trails System.

Designation of the Old Spanish Trail and its Northern Branch as an historic trail would greatly enhance tourism in western Colorado. The Old Spanish Trail is replete with the rich and fascinating history of exploration and development of the American West.

Between 1829 and 1848, the Old Spanish Trail was established as a major trade route between Santa Fe and Los Angeles that stretched approximately 1,121 miles. This route enters Colorado south of Pagosa Springs, and passes through Arboles, Ignacio, Durango, Mancos, Dolores, and Dove Creek before heading west to Utah. This was essentially the route used by Fathers Dominguez and Escalante in 1776. The Old Spanish Trail and its Northern Branch have been the routes of travelers for many years and were instrumental in the creation and establishment of many of Colorado's towns and communities.

Another historic trade route, the Northern Branch, was used predominately by fur trappers for access to northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah. Very little information actually has been recorded concerning the Northern Branch, and much more can be learned about the Old Spanish Trail.

This legislation would recognize the importance and historical value of the Old Spanish Trail and acknowledge the culture and prompt passage of this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO REV. A. WILLIAM STATEN

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend A. William Staten of the Calvary Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Staten commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend A. William Staten was elected Pastor of Calvary Missionary Baptist Church in Chicago Heights, Illinois assuming the pulpit the first Sunday of July 1988; and

Whereas under the steadfast leadership of Reverend Staten Calvary Church improved it's facilities including becoming handicap accessible; and

Whereas the ministry of Reverend Staten has been blessed expanding the outreach of the church through recreational ministry, education and scholarship ministry, church participation in teaching and mission ministry on the District, State, and National Convention levels, most importantly over six hundred (600) persons have committed themselves to Christ increasing the membership of Calvary Church to over one thousand (1000); and

Whereas Reverend Staten is an ecclesiastical leader, a former Secretary, Vice-President, and President of the Ministerial Alliance of Chicago Heights, Assistant Recording Secretary—Greater New Era District Association of Chicago 1992, recently elected Assistant Recording Secretary of the Baptist General State Convention of Illinois, and serves as a member of the Baptist Legislative Advisory Council; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Reverend A. William Staten by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional record and archives of the one hundred and third Congress.

FOREIGN AID TO INDIA, FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

HON. ROD GRAMS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, in his recent address to the Congress, Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao of India has demonstrated the progress India has made in the last 47 years of her democracy and how United States-India relations have blossomed because of that progress. Mr. Rao has helped to lead India's socialist-type economy out of decades of protectionism, loosened state control on industries, and cut red tape on foreign investment. These kind of reforms have been significant in bringing our two countries closer together.

Our countries have very productive trade relations. The United States buys one-fifth of India's exports, more than any other country. Exports from India to the United States are growing. Last year they were up 20 percent alone. India has also enjoyed a trade surplus growing to $1.8 billion in India's favor in 1992 and 1993.

However, I am concerned about United States relations with India and efforts by Pakistani terrorists to undermine progress in building upon this friendship. You will recall that during floor debate over the fiscal year 1994 foreign operations appropriations bill, key concerns over human rights violations by the Indian Government led to the reduction in developmental aid to India by $4.1 million.

I am glad to know that we did not repeat this mistake this year by offering an amendment to the fiscal year 1995 foreign operations appropriations bill to reduce the level of aid to India. I am concerned that the information presented to Members of Congress is one sided. India stands as one of the few democracies that offers positive trading opportunities for this Nation. Before we close the door on India, I would urge my colleagues to take an objective view at the market potential and continued productive relations between our two countries.

SALUTING THE MASJID BILAL 15TH ANNUAL TESTIMONIAL DINNER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 4, 1994, Masjid Bilal Inc. will host its 15th Annual Testimonial Dinner. The event will be held at Swingo's at the Statler. Elected officials, business and community leaders, and a

host of friends are expected to gather for this special event. I look forward to joining the leader of Masjid Bilal, Imam Clyde Rahman, and other friends for the testimonial dinner.

One of the highlights of the testimonial dinner is the presentation of the outstanding citizen awards. This year's award recipients are Comdr. Anthony Jackson; Dr. Edgar B. Jackson; and Ms. Barbara Brown-Daniels. At this time, I want to share with my colleagues and the Nation some important information regarding these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony Jackson currently serves as chief of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority. Prior to this assignment, he enjoyed a distinguished 21 years with the Cleveland Police Department. A graduate of Max Hayes High School, Mr. Jackson joined the police department in 1973. He quickly earned a reputation as a hard-working, professional officer as he came up through the ranks. His promotion to sergeant resulted in the assignment to the Professional Conduct/Internal Review Unit. The unit is responsible for investigating misconduct charges against police officers. One of the most controversial cases the unit investigated was the Arthur Feckner drug case, which resulted in the indictment of several police officers.

In 1991, Mr. Jackson was appointed commander of the fourth district, which is the largest populated district in the city of Cleveland. In his position of commander, he was responsible for supervising 217 police officers, including those assigned to the detective bureau, vice unit, strike force, and basic patrol.

During his career, Commander Jackson has received numerous commendations, including the Valor Award for bravery. He is a graduate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy, and presently serves as a board member for the Center for the Prevention of Domestic Violence.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Edgar B. Jackson, a resident of Shaker Heights, OH, has enjoyed a distinguished medical career. He serves as cochief of staff and senior vice president for clinical affairs at University Hospitals of Cleveland. His previous assignments have included health director for the city of Shaker Heights; acting associate dean of students, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine; and associate chief of staff, University Hospitals.

Dr. Jackson is a graduate of Central High School. He received his medical degree from Western Reserve University, where he was selected as class president. Dr. Jackson is a member of numerous national boards and committees, including the Committee on Under-represented Minorities, and the Clinical Practice Committee, American College of Physicians; the Health Advisory Panel, Pew Commission on Health Professions; and the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences. In addition, Dr. Jackson serves on the board of directors of University Suburban Health Center, and as director of the Janice Douglas-David Satcher Clerkship at University Hospitals. Dr. Jackson and his wife, Thelma, are the proud parents of Gary, David, Michael, and Laura.

Mr. Speaker, attorney Barbara Brown-Daniels is a graduate of Kent State University and Case Western Reserve University Law School. In addition, she is the recipient of a master's of business administration and masters of social science/administration degrees from Case Western. Ms. Brown-Daniels is the founder and executive director of Community Guidance, Inc., a comprehensive community mental health and substance abuse center. She has also served as president of Community Living, Inc., and as a consultant for Barbara Brown-Daniels and Associates.

Ms. Brown-Daniels holds memberships in the National Association of Social Workers; the NAACP; and the Multi-Cultural Diversity Training Institute. Her past memberships include the National Council of Community Health Centers; the National Legal Defenders Association; the Black Professional Association; and the Ohio Mental Health Center Directors Association.

Ms. Brown-Daniels is the recipient of several honors and awards for her efforts. They include an award for Outstanding Community Service, the Ebony Rose Tribute, the YWCA Career Women of Achievement Award, and the Outstanding Community Human Service Award.

Mr. Speaker, the individuals being honored have made significant contributions to our communities and the Nation. I am proud to salute each of them, and I look forward to the opportunity to offer my personal congratulations at the testimonial dinner.

HONORING PERLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, today the Department of Education announced the names of the 1994 Blue Ribbon School Award winners. I am especially proud of one particular name on that prestigious list, a school in my hometown of South Bend, IN: Perley Elementary School.

You can learn a lot about Perley just by dialing their telephone number. When they answer—"Perley School, where children are our future"—do not think for a moment that this is simply a gimmick or a nice little bit of PR. For it is the credo and calling of the faculty, staff, and families that make up Perley School. It is what sets them apart. It is the attitude that leads them to succeed.

Led by an infectiously enthusiastic principal, Dr. Shelly Contreras, members of the Perley family recognize that their mission goes beyond dry lessons and books. They are there for the children, and all work together—parents, teachers, students and community—to bring up these children with knowledge, love, respect, and understanding. To quote Principal Contreras, "to explore new ways to bring together our love for kids and our love for learning."

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I am frequently bombarded with a litany of our public school system's failures, and we do have problems. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot to celebrate in our schools, as well, and to look past these bright spots would be a sad mistake. Perley Elementary is one of our triumphs. I am proud and honored to represent them in this Congress. I congratulate the Perley Elementary School family and offer them and the other 1994 Blue Ribbon School Award winners my gratitude for their commitment to our children.

HONORING DR. ALEX A. SANCHEZ ON HIS RETIREMENT AS SUPERINTENDENT/PRESIDENT OF RIO HONDO COLLEGE

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a special individual and dedicated educator, Dr. Alex A. Sanchez, Superintendent/President of Rio Hondo Community College.

Born on August 7, 1934, in Tome, NM, Dr. Sanchez early on demonstrated a burning desire to learn. His teachers discovered this potential and actively encouraged him to pursue his education. His drive and inspiration came from two important people, who played instrumental roles in attainment of his educational goals, his parents.

Dr. Sanchez graduated from New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts in 1956 with a B.S. in agricultural education and a M.A. in counseling. In 1976, he received an Ed.D., with a concentration in higher education administration and student personnel from New Mexico State University at Las Cruces.

For over 20 years, Dr. Sanchez served as administrator and/or professor at various academic institutions in New Mexico. As academic dean of the New Mexico Military Institute, Dr. Sanchez was responsible for the overall instructional operation of the institute. In 1979, Dr. Sanchez began his long-term professional career at the University of New Mexico, at Albuquerque, serving a dual role as professor of educational administration and associate provost for community education. In 1985, Dr. Sanchez was appointed vice president for community and international programs, a position he held until he relocated to California.

Since 1989, as superintendent/president of Rio Hondo Community College, Dr. Sanchez has gained a reputation as an effective administrator. During his tenure, Dr. Sanchez has positively affected the administration and students alike, admirably leading the college through a very difficult fiscal period. Undeterred by tough economic times, Dr. Sanchez has set an extraordinary example for students who seek entry into higher education.

In addition to his many duties and responsibilities at Rio Hondo, Dr. Sanchez has been actively involved in various civic organizations and has volunteered countless hours to the community. He is an active Rotary member, sits on the board of the Whittier Presbyterian Hospital, he has served on several State and Federal commissions, where he has contributed his expertise and knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this distinguished educator, Dr.

Alex A. Sanchez, and in saluting him for his exemplary leadership and outstanding service to Rio Hondo Community College and the surrounding community.

A MEMORIAL DAY SALUTE

HON. SONNY CALLAHAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as Memorial Day, 1994, approaches, I would like to celebrate a little early. When I say celebrate, I don't mean the usual barbecue, watermelon, and day off from work.

No, I mean remember Memorial Day the way it was meant to be celebrated: By honoring a group of American soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice for the good of their country. Today, I would like to recognize the Marine unit of 1st Platoon of Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment, for their actions on hill No. 64, in the battle of Khe Sanh, during the winter of 1968.

Since millions of Americans today were not even born during this dark time in American history, I would like to set the stage for a brief history of hill No. 64. The battle occurred during the time of the Tet offensive by the North Vietnamese Army in the Vietnam war. The combat base at Khe Sanh was surrounded during this offensive and was under seige for approximately 3 months by an overwhelming enemy force.

President Johnson was worried the base would be captured, and he kept a scale model of it in the White House. He required daily briefings by the Pentagon to keep him informed as to its status. Outside the main base perimeter of Khe Sanh was a small hill, hill No. 64, on which the 1st Platoon was placed to act as an outpost for the main base. Its military designation was Alpha 1 outpost.

The platoon, which totaled 64 marines, was attacked on February 8, 1968 by what some military historians believe was a reinforced battalion of the North Vietnamese Army. The fighting was fierce, hand-to-hand at times, and before it was over the few marines who could still fight were running out of ammunition and actually threw rocks at the enemy out of desperation.

Of the 64 marines on this small outpost, 24 were killed and 29 were severely wounded. Only 11 were able to walk down the hill after the battle. They walked down the hill carrying the bodies of their friends and helping the wounded.

The assault on the 1st Platoon by such a large North Vietnamese force and their resulting failure to take the hill was a turning point in the siege at Khe Sanh. That attack was the last ground assault against the marines because the North Vietnamese realized they could not take the territory held with ground troops in face to face combat.

Despite the heavy losses in life and artillery, the actions of the platoon proved to be substantially heroic. Heroic because the battle was a turning point in the siege of Khe Sanh. And heroic because they demonstrated overwhelming bravery that went far beyond the call of duty. These soldiers knew better than most what it felt like to be the few and the proud.

Despite this incredible bravery, pride, and heroism demonstrated by the platoon, only two men have been individually recognized with a Silver and Bronze Star. Not once has the platoon as a whole been recognized. Not once has it been officially thanked for its sacrifice. Not once has it been praised for its dedication. This is a shame, Mr. Speaker. It is a crying shame that such honorable men have never been honored.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for speaking out today is to shed light on this unfortunate oversight. While but one Member of Congress, I believe I speak for an entire Nation when I honor, recognize, and praise the actions of these heroic marines. In the words of one member of the platoon, Cpl. David R. Ford, I am here to "right a wrong" that occurred over 26 years ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we approach this Memorial Day, I salute this brave platoon, those who are still living and the memory of those who have died. I salute them for what they tried to do and for what they did. While I know this single recognition can not erase the years of feeling overlooked and unappreciated, I know they stand shoulder to shoulder with the millions of veterans from other wars. Therefore, I also salute the men and women all around this great country who have fought and are fighting for our country, yet are very rarely recognized. Thank you brave soldiers. Thank you for giving your time. Thank you for giving your energy. And thank you for giving your lives.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS PULLER, JR., FROM THE VIRGINIA OBSERVER

HON. OWEN B. PICKETT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, a commentary about the life and untimely death of Lewis Puller, Jr. written by Gordon Dillon appeared in the Virginia Observer on May 20, 1994. Lewis Puller, Jr., the only son of Gen. Lewis "Chesty" Puller, Sr., the most decorated officer in Marine Corps history, was himself a decorated Marine, a disabled Vietnam Veteran, a husband, a father, and an inspiration to many. He won a Pulitzer Prize for his 1991 autobiography, "Fortunate Son," in which he shared the story of his recovery from both his physical injuries and bouts with depression and alcoholism. Lewis Puller, Jr. fought valiantly many battles in his life, but in the end, tragically, could fight no more.

I respectfully request that the following commentary by Gordon Dillon be included in the RECORD.

THE BRAVEST MAN—A COMMENTARY

(By Gordon Dillon)

He went down into the Valley of Death five times and survived. He survived differently that when he first looked death in the eyes.

He was to live without legs. He was to live without most of his fingers.

He was to live the rest of his life in constant and excruciating pain.

But he endured. He became a symbol to all those who had made that journey with him.

He went on to graduate from law school and to write a Pulitzer Prize—winning novel.

I first met him when he ran for Congress. He was shy, but eloquent. As he sat in his wheelchair, he was the tallest man in the room.

His courage, his quick smile brightened all those around him.

He went on to become critical of the war that had cost him and his comrades so much. He would denounce war. He would tell how he was trained to be a killer.

For all of his adult life he gave so much to his country and to his fellow human beings.

Last week, he could give no more.

He left this world by his own choosing, brave to the end.

Lew Puller was the bravest man I ever met. We shall not look upon his like again.

THE INTRODUCTION OF H.R. —, THE STAGECOACH RESERVOIR PROJECT ACT OF 1993

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Stagecoach Reservoir Project Act to authorize the early payout to the Federal Government of the Stagecoach Reservoir Project.

It is not every day that we bring to the floor a bill which not only does not ask for funds or assistance but is actually intended to facilitate an early repayment to the Federal Government. All the parties stand to benefit: the Federal Government receives its money sooner and at today's values, the District can refinance the project privately, and the Bureau of Reclamation can close this account.

As you may be aware, this legislation is only made necessary—as a formality—in order to amend the original contract terms, that is, enacting legislation: the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, 32 U.S.C. 422a et seq.

There is no opposition to the measure by any interested party. The Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal office to receive the early payout, as well as the House Natural Resources Committee, and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, all have no opposition to this legislation.

Senators HANK BROWN and BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL have introduced the companion measure in the Senate and the bill mirrors two provisions in the omnibus water bill of the 102d Congress.

Therefore, I bring this bill forward today and hope to see its prompt passage.

TRIBUTE TO MOTHER OPHELIA TURNER

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the

outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Mother Ophelia Turner of the St. Mary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Mother Turner commending her for her work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Mother Ophelia Turner was born April 8, 1910 in Sunflower, Mississippi, she was affectionately known as, "Momma Shug"; and

Whereas Mother Turner is the Mother of twelve children, including Alderman/Committeeman Shirley A. Coleman of the 16th Ward in the City of Chicago, rearing her children in the city to become God fearing responsible adults, while at the same time caring for children throughout the community including the church; and

Whereas Mother Turner was an active member and leader of the Saint Mary Baptist Church over thirty-seven years, serving in several capacities: President of the Pastor's Aide Society, Chaplain, Missionary Society, Treasurer, Gospel Chorus, President, Kitchen Staff, membership in the "Over The Hill Gang," and the Sunday School Department; and

Whereas God has blessed Mother Turner with long life, and for many people to have the opportunity to know her, she departed this earthly life Saturday, October 30, 1993, at the age of eighty-three years. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the life and journey of Mother Ophelia "Momma Shug" Turner, and extend sincere condolence to her family and friends, and shall enter this pronouncement into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress of these United States of America.

ADMINISTRATION RENEGES ON SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST REPEAL

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, in testimony on Tuesday, May 24, 1994, before the Senate Finance Committee, Social Security Administrator Shirley Chater told Senators the administration could only support a $1,000 increase in the Social Security earnings limitation. The current limit is $11,160. Because of the limit, senior workers between age 65 and 69 are penalized $1 for every $3 they earn over the earnings limit.

President Clinton in his campaign blueprint, "Putting People First," promised seniors he would repeal the earnings limit, but instead he delivers almost nothing. The earnings limit, which has an annual escalator, would likely rise next year by $500 without congressional action. Thus, President Clinton's $1,000 plan as mentioned by Chater may only amount to $500 a year of new relief. In fact, it is probably not accurate to call it a plan, because in follow up conversations with SSA staff after the hearing the Social Security Administration indicated no timetable for seeking a change, but only that the Administrator was answering a hypothetical question.

Assuming the proposal is forthcoming, allowing seniors to earn $500 more a year without penalty cuts their unfair burden by $166, or about $3 per week. With seniors facing higher taxes and health care costs, $3 a week will barely buy them lunch on Monday. What happened to the Clinton administration that promised seniors bold reform and fairness during the Presidential campaign?

When coupled with other Federal taxes, seniors who earn above the modest earnings limit are faced with a 56-percent marginal tax rate—nearly twice the rate millionaires pay. This is unfair and discriminates between differing demographic groups that make the same amount of money.

For instance, take the example of two seniors and one middle-aged person, each making $25,000 per year. The senior whose income comes from unearned sources is subject to income taxes. The middle-aged person's income is subject to income and FICA taxes. However, the senior whose income is earned because he or she receives a salary is subject to income, FICA and a 33-percent penalty for any salary over the $11,160 limit. This is ludicrous. The working senior pays more in taxes than any other group in his or her income bracket.

I would like to point out the story of Jean Austin, an Illinois woman who must work to make ends meet. Her annual earnings are only $15,000 but she pays a $1,600 penalty. This woman is a perfect example of why the earnings limit should be repealed. She's not wealthy by anyone's standards, but because of the 1930's vintage earnings limitation she's penalized through her Social Security. It's time we stopped penalizing our senior citizens for remaining active in the workplace.

Critics of repeal argue that if seniors get to keep their earnings the Federal Treasury will suffer, but a study conducted by former Treasury economists found that net Federal revenues would actually increase if the limit were raised as high as $39,000. Common sense tells you that seniors will go back into the work force or stay on in their current positions throughout the year if they won't be working for pennies on the dollar. Other seniors engaged in the underground economy will report their incomes. If you stop confiscating senior's wages they will keep working and they will pay their fair share of taxes.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor my bill, the Older Americans' Freedom to Work Act—H.R. 300. The bill currently has 222 cosponsors. At the very least, this issue should be debated on the House floor. Because the committee with jurisdiction will not consider the bill, and has not scheduled hearings, even though I introduced this legislation he first day of the 103d Congress, I have introduced Discharge Petition No. 18 for a rule to consider H.R. 300.

In the last Congress, the Senate passed complete repeal and the house passed a 5-year liberalization of the earnings limit to $20,000. But no satisfactory agreement could be reached between the Houses of Congress. Let's make 1994 the year to end this discrimination against seniors.

NATIONAL COURT APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM DIRECTOR OF THE YEAR

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to extend my congratulations to Sally Wilson Erny, executive director of the Court Appointed Special Advocate [CASA] Project of Louisville and Jefferson County, KY, on being named Program Director of the Year by National CASA in ceremonies this month in Tampa, FL.

CASA is a program which uses trained volunteers to represent the interests of abused and neglected children before the courts handling their cases. There are now a total of 556 CASA projects around the Nation.

In 1983, Sally Wilson Erny was the first employee of CASA in Louisville and Jefferson County. Under her stewardship, CASA has grown from serving 72 children in 1985 to serving over 300 children in 1994. She has also been instrumental in assisting in the start up of all other CASA programs in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. She also succeeded in convincing the Kentucky General Assembly to pass legislation which gives statutory standing to CASA in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

CASA's early assignment program, established by Sally Wilson Erny, provides a child with representation by a CASA member at the earliest stages of the court process. This ensures that the child's rights are fully protected from the start of the court process.

Sally Wilson Erny's contributions to CASA extend well beyond Louisville, Jefferson County and the whole of Kentucky. She lends her experience and creative efforts to numerous CASA programs across the Nation. She is frequently called upon to mediate delicate problems in the areas of Social Services, Family Courts, and foster parenting situations.

She has been described by colleagues and associates as "generous, indefatigable, caring and tireless." I endorse those descriptive tra"s because I have seen them on display in my dealings with Ms. Erny over the years.

I congratulate Sally Wilson Erny on her award and I commend her for her selfless actions in bringing justice and fairness to the children of Kentucky and the Nation.

HONORING EUGENE A. MALINZAK ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE MONTEBELLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a special individual and dedicated educator, Mr. Eugene "Gene" A. Malinzak, a teacher, counselor, and administrator with the Montebello Unified School District.

Immediately upon graduating from Waynesburg College in 1956, Gene began his

long-standing career in teaching at Turkeyfoot Valley Joint High School in Confluence, PA. One year later, he was teaching at his alma mater, Beth-Center High School, in Fredericktown, PA. He taught at Beth-Center for the next 4 years. During this time, he completed his masters degree at West Virginia University. Soon thereafter, he relocated to California.

The Montebello Unified School District has benefited tremendously by Gene's decision to venture to California. For over 33 years, Gene has selflessly dedicated his life as a teacher and counselor to the education of children and adults of the district. Gene began teaching U.S. history at Montebello High School; 6 years into his teaching, he was promoted to counselor and worked with "at-risk" students after school. In addition to his regular teaching assignment, Gene taught adult education for 20 years, home students and behind-the-wheel training.

In 1970, Gene was appointed vice principal of Montebello High School. The following year, Gene was assigned to the position of coordinator, and then as assistant director of compensatory education for the district. In 1981, he became director of Federal and State projects, a position he currently holds. Under his capable leadership, the district's fund have increased, with the total budget for categorical programs currently exceeding $15 million.

In addition to his extensive professional responsibilities, Gene has been involved in local, county, State and national issues and efforts to improve our educational system. Most notably, he has been an advocate of empowering parents to become active partners in their children's education.

In 1988 and 1989, Gene served as chairperson of the statewide conference for the California Association of Administrators of State and Federal Education Program. Because of his exemplary work as chairperson, Gene was recognized by the State Department of Education as Project Director of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to salute a widely recognized and respected educator, Eugene A. Malinzak. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to him for his outstanding commitment to the education of tomorrow's leaders.

THE PUBLIC MANAGER

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the work of Allan Kam and Jerry Shaw. They are the cochairs of the Coalition for Effective Change [CEC], to represent career Federal professionals, managers, and executives. The CEC has grown to 25 Federal employee associations with a membership of well over 100,000 people. Their hard work in the area of reinventing government has been extraordinarily valuable. I would like to submit their recent article, "Federal Managers and Top Professionals Band Together to Help Reinventing Government," in the Public Manager into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I represent a large percentage of the Federal work force. In accordance with the Vice President's hard work on behalf of reinventing government, we now have the very difficult task of the implementation of the National Performance Review.

In February, the CEC met with the Vice President, who indicated that the CEC would serve in an advisory relationship with the President's Management Council. Mr. Speaker, the Coalition for Effective Change has, and will continue to, play a major role in the reinventing government process and throughout the implementation of the National Performance Review.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I submit this article by Allan Kam and Jerry Shaw into the RECORD. Moreover, I am sure that my fellow colleagues and the public will find this information both insightful and helpful.

THE COALITION FOR EFFECTIVE CHANGE: FEDERAL MANAGERS AND TOP PROFESSIONALS BAND TOGETHER TO HELP REINVENT GOVERNMENT

(By Allan J. Kam & G. Jerry Shaw)

In spring 1993, leading professional associations of senior managers and executives such as the Federal Executive Institute Alumni Association (FEIAA) and the Senior Executive Association (SEA) encouraged members to send suggestions to the National Performance Review (NPR). We have as much an interest as anyone in making government work better and cost less. In June, NPR Project Director Bob Stone spoke at the FEIAA monthly luncheon and at the SEA annual conference, asking for continued support. In short, at NPR's request, the respected organizations of federal career executives, managers, and other professionals gave their imprimatur to the NPR, thus adding legitimacy in the federal community to Vice President Gore's "reinventing government" efforts.

THE NPR REPORT

We eagerly awaited the scheduled release of the NPR report on September 7. In summer, we were informed that while the overall NPR report would be released on September 7, the agency-specific and "cross-cutting" reports on areas such as personnel and procurement would take somewhat longer to complete. We expected to be engaged in a constructive dialogue with the administration throughout the fall and winter on the various observations, suggestions, and recommendations of the NPR reports. Through the Public Employees Roundtable (PER), a consortium of approximately 30 professional associations with more than a million members, which SEA and FEIAA helped co-found 11 years ago, briefings for PER member organizations were scheduled for September 2 and September 30.

At the September 2 briefing for PER, we were surprised (but not disturbed) that NPR had invited many union representatives. We *were* disturbed to learn that the NPR report to be released five days later would recommend creation of a "national partnership council" consisting of political appointees and union leaders, but no representatives of career managers, executives, and other professionals. At the end of the September 2 briefing, after hearing the NPR leadership respond to several questions from labor union leaders, PER Chair Jerry Shaw complained that the views of professional/management associations were not being taken into account. At the September 15 FEIAA monthly luncheon, President Allan Kam expressed dissatisfaction with the exclusion of career professionals from the "partnership:"

The NPR proposal to establish a so-called National Partnership Council should be viewed with great caution. . . We are concerned that the administration seems more interested in empowering labor unions than in working with career managers and executives and their professional associations.

How did the unions get this extraordinary role in implementation of the NPR, while the professional/management associations, which had given the reinventing government effort their all-out support throughout the spring and summer, were left out? We may never know all of the reasons. However, a month after the NPR report was issued the outline of how an agreement had been reached between the vice president and the union leaders was reported. An article said that the key players were Vice President Gore, his senior domestic policy advisor, Dr. Elaine Kamarck, and two union leaders, John Sturdivant, president of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFL-CIO), and Robert Tobias, president of the National Treasury Employees Union.

In pertinent part, the article reported:

Last summer, before the review was released, Kamarck briefed Sturdivant and Tobias on its personnel ideas. The two leaders were appalled that unions were never mentioned in the NPR drafts. "We said, 'This stuff is not going anywhere,'" says Sturdivant. They demanded a meeting with Gore and got it in late August. The next day, they started a week-long series of sessions with Kamarck and other Gore staffers in which the National Partnership Council was born.[2]

HASTY REPORT IMPLEMENTATION

While we were stunned that career managers, executives, and nonunion professionals had been excluded from the National Partnership Council, we were even more concerned about the implicit attacks on the value of career managers and supervisors in the report. (We have subsequently been assured by the NPR staff that this was never intended.) The speedy timetable for implementation of the NPR recommendations could also preclude review by professional/management associations with the administration. Unlike the unions, we did not have the benefit of briefings on NPR drafts and negotiations with the vice president and his senior staff before the NPR report was finalized.

The initial NPR Report, *Creating a Government That Works Better & Costs Less*, was mailed on September 7, and received later that week. On September 11, four days after the report was mailed, and before it could be reviewed by its recipients, the NPR implementation steamroller started its roll. On that date, President Clinton signed his "Streamlining Bureaucracy" memorandum to agency heads [58 Federal Register 48583 (September 16, 1993)]. The president ordered a reduction in the overall federal workforce by only about one-eighth, or 12 percent, but decided to reduce the number of managers and supervisors by one-half. The NPR's message (intended or not) was widely interpreted and reported by union leaders and the media as:

The vice president says that government is broken and doesn't work. The problem is too many managers and supervisors. The solution is to get rid of half the managers and supervisors.

CHANGES AT OPM AND SUNSETTING FPM

We were also concerned about the image the NPR had created of governmentwide personnel regulations. The NPR report recommended that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) phase out the Federal Personnel Manual (FPM), suggesting a careful, deliberate, consultative process by OPM before any parts of the FPM were sunsetted.

However, in summer and fall 1993, ominous rumors circulated that OPM was about to be gutted. Severe downsizing was reportedly being planned, even though the NPR's agency-specific report on OPM had not yet been issued.

It was also rumored that the FPM was to be the fuel of choice for a book-burning party. While we recognize that parts of the FPM are redundant or worthy of sunsetting, other parts are important to federal professionals and other users, and no replacements have been developed. Yet, OPM was apparently working at a swift pace to repeal large chunks of the FPM.

FEIAA, SEA, the Federal Managers Association (FMA), and the Professional Managers Association (PMA) were briefed on FPM sunsetting by OPM staff on October 22. Our quick comments were invited, but we were told candidly that the staff's recommendations to the OPM director were due November 15 and there would be a presumption against retention of any portion of the FPM. It was clear that meaningful consultation with the affected federal community and their professional associations was not the order of the day. The perceived marching orders were to rescind the FPM.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS MUST BAND TOGETHER

By late October it was distressingly clear that:

The administration was moving rapidly to implement the NPR recommendations;

The unions were institutionally involved as full partners in NPR implementation;

Professioal/management associations were not at the table or in the loop;

OPM was reportedly going to be severely downsized;

Much of the FPM and the guidance it provided was being sunsetted; and

To say the least, career professionals, managers, and executives and their professional associations were about to be "rolled over" by the NPR bandwagon.

In September and October, several professional and management associations individually sought to establish a dialogue with the administration about the NPR report and how it would affect their members. Some had more success than others, but by late October we concluded that none had yet had meaningful input. Since the associations could not obtain meaningful input individually, FEIAA initiated conversations among several of the organizations about joining together to be heard.

At the PER annual retreat on October 24, it became apparent that virtually all the major professional associations were deeply concerned about the NPR report and its implementation. Since PER itself was not the appropriate vehicle, we decided to organize a new coalition right away, before any further critical decisions on NPR implementation were made without our input.

FORMATION OF THE CEC

SEA and FEIAA co-sponsored an organizing meeting on November 5, attended by representatives of several concerned professional/management associations. A consensus was reached to form a coalition. We agreed that the coalition was not being formed to oppose NPR, but rather to involve professional associations in its implementation. We were convinced that trying to implement NPR without career professionals, managers, and executives would be like trying to run a car on three wheels—it raises a lot of dust but does not work very well.

A mission statement, which was finalized and adopted at the next meeting of the coalition on November 12. The authors of this article were selected to co-chair the new Coalition for Effective Change.

INCENDIARY BOMBS TO RABAUL

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, a large group of Congressmen leave for Europe next Tuesday to pay their respects to American fighting men in celebration of the 50th anniversary of the breakout from Anzio Beach Head and the liberation of Rome, June 4, 1944 and, of course, the 50th anniversary of the D-day invasion at Normandy, June 6, 1944.

However, we're also passing through the 50th anniversaries of deadly struggles in the South Pacific. Imperial Japan fought a tenacious struggle along the entire north coast of New Guinea and their major naval base at Rabaul on the island of New Britain including many hard-fought aerial battles overhead.

Lt. Col. Walter A. Krell, of the 22d Bomb Group, the first medium bomber group to arrive in the Pacific, wrote a letter 50 years ago describing just one exciting and deadly mission. I've worn his same small St. Christopher medal through two very harrowing ejections from crippled jet fighters.

Colonel Krell had that medal on every combat flight totaling over 100 combat missions. I submit his heroics today for the RECORD.

INCENDIARY BOMBS TO RABAUL—LT. COL. WALTER A. KRELL, RET.

In early 1942, Army Air Force Ordnance developed an aerial incendiary bomb, a device four-feet long and 16 inches or so in diameter. It consisted of 36 individual incendiary units, tiny bomblets with fins and detonators all wired together. The entire bundle, or contained unit, was attached to the shackles on our Martin B-26 Marauder bomb bay racks like an ordinary bomb, to be released in the standard way. Each B-26 would carry 30 or more incendiary clusters.

There was one simple difference between high-explosive bombs and incendiary bombs. When the arming wire was pulled away upon release of these new incendiaries, a shotgun shell would fire a slug that would cut the wires holding together the bundle of bomblets. Then the 36 individual bomblets would break up, releasing each separate incendiary unit to fall on the target. The arming wire was supposed to be of sufficient length to allow the incendiary mother-bomb to clear the aircraft before the arming wire pulled loose and fired the shotgun shell thereby dispersing the cluster. Of course, nobody bothered to tell that to the B-26 aircrew/gunners who helped with bomb loading, so they routinely clipped the wire short as was done with ordinary iron bombs. The result was that upon "bombs away", the clusters came apart while still within our bomb bays, clattering around and bouncing off the structural members of our aircraft. These incendiary bomblets were magnesium, and had any of them lodged in the many angular recesses of the fuselage, it would have been very exciting indeed.

When I experienced the first release of incendiaries my B-26 was flying only 15 feet above those powerful little bomblets tumbling away, when many of them began igniting and burning. After that, the bomb loading of incendiaries had the undivided attention of our entire crew of six.

Now that we, in the 22d Bomb Group, had such interesting new bombs, it was decided that they should be delivered all over the docking facilities at Rabaul. The first mission to try to do just that would be a flight of three Marauders. Lt. Chris Herron would lead and Lt. George Kersting would be flying his right wing with me on his left. After an early morning take-off from 7-Mile Airfield near Fort Moresby, New Guinea our Marauders flew northeast, climbed over the Owen-Stanley Mountains, descended over the north coast of New Britain, and then turned east to Rabaul Harbor. Unhappily, for an undetermined cause, gasoline siphoned from my right wing tanks for a full 45 minutes after take-off. Because we never returned home from those long Rabaul missions with much fuel to spare, my crew was obviously worried. To turn back, however, would have aborted the raid for the other two crews. We flew on.

Chris Herron was clever the way he took us in to the target. Still heading east, we kept descending and skirted the north side of the Rabaul harbor at low level, then banked right and pulled into a hard 180-degree turn up and over the rim of the volcanic hills that circle the harbor on the north side. I remember clearly from my left-wing position in our very tight turn, looking to my right across Herron's B-26 and seeing George Kersting's propwash mash down the tops of coconut trees. Chris then rolled us out right down on the deck and along the wharfs, and headed west.

There was a Japanese cargo vessel tied up broadside along the first dock with dozens of loading personnel moving about on the freighter's deck and at dockside. All of them were totally surprised. I vividly remember their reaction of panic. Two Japanese loaders were carrying something up a gangplank that resembled a litter. Suddenly they dropped the litter and while the guy in the back was still looking up, the guy in front wheeled around and charged back, right over the top of the litter thing, and slammed into the guy staring up at us.

I could see that Lt. Herron intended to try to take out this ship which was positioned parallel to our line of flight. This would have forced me to waste my bombs out in the open harbor to my left, so I dropped down and moved ahead of Chris and took the lead, forcing our formation to the right over the docking area with its stacked supplies and many warehouses. "Bombs away." I immediately banked left and headed south toward the Rabaul channel and away from the exploding docks, thinking Herron and Kersting would hang onto my right wing until we were clear and I could slide back into position. Chris apparently went his own way, but in my left turn I couldn't see where he was. Not wanting to roll back into him, I continued my hard turn yelling to my co-pilot to try and spot the formation. I was now heading back around toward the east rim of the harbor with anti-aircraft flak popping all around us and some of it starting to explode much too close.

I twisted my Marauder back and forth to foil the A/A gunners until I was back across the harbor east rim and above an active smoking volcano. In spite of this fast moving action, I was fascinated by the volcano's shimmering silvery walls as I pushed over and dipped down inside the crater itself. I banked again changing course back to the right and then flew up and over the volcano's western lip.

There below, streaking out through the Rabaul Channel at deck level, were Herron and Kersting, so I winged over and swooped down to join up. We were back in three ship "V" formation just as the Japanese Navy Zeroes jumped us. It was touch and go for about 20 minutes when straight ahead loomed a sheer wall of thick clouds, black with torrential rain. We spread out and plunged into the weather, very happy to wipe off the swarming enemy fighters. Tropical fronts were not new to the pilots of our bomb group, but never before had we encountered anything to equal the intensity of this storm.

Within minutes our 2000 horsepower radial engines started to run roughly because of the excessive cooling of the heavy rain. The rain water was also driving into the magnetos which are mounted up forward on the Pratt and Whitney engines. We closed our oil shutters and cowl flaps but that didn't seem to help much. In most South Pacific rain storms, we found there was usually a clear gap for your aircraft to fly between the ocean and the bottom layer of the weather front. But not this time. In order to see, so I could stay above the waves, I was aided in flying by opening my side window. After about 25 tense minutes I flew out of the extremely turbulent storm clouds and made a climbing circle to see if we could pick up the other two B-26s. The skies were empty, and with no radio response to our many calls, we headed for home.

My co-pilot was Lt. I.B. (against my sense of justice I withhold his full name). He hadn't been overjoyed with my maneuvers in dodging the Japanese A/A flak back at Rabaul. He was particularly unhappy when I had to whack him across the mouth with the back of my hand to get him off the controls during my in-and-out-of-the-volcano caper. He was sulking as we gained altitude to clear the Owen-Stanley Mountains once more. The weather was now clear with some broken clouds. I told I.B. to "take it" and to make sure to clear the mountains by at least 1000 feet, then within minutes I fell dead asleep. I awoke a short time later. We had cleared the mountains and were in a gradual descent but my co-pilot was definitely not relaxed at the controls. Instead he was staring straight ahead with a strange look on his face. The cockpit was in shambles with scattered papers, maps, and manuals strewn everywhere. I turned around to check the guys in the navigator's compartment and they were ashen-faced. "What the hell happened?", I asked, quickly figuring out that he had skimmed the mountain too low and had gotten into an awful thump of a turbulent downdraft. Suddenly the right engine quit, starved for that 45 minutes of fuel that had siphoned overboard on our climb-out. I quickly lost the right prop. We were very light by now and had good altitude so we easily made our 7-Mile Airfield home base. While still on the landing roll our left engine quit, also out of gas. I was able to coast off far enough to one side to clear the runway and wait for a tow. George Kersting's Marauder made it home shortly after us, but no sign of our lead B-26.

Within hours we learned that Chris Herron had lost an engine because of the heavy downpour in that tropical storm. Chris' co-pilot, an Aussie officer who was a former airline pilot, advised that they fly due south. The Aussie co-pilot knew of a small island with a landing strip. Herron opted to land with their gear down. Tragically, the B-26's nose wheel folded and the aircraft flipped over on them crushing the cockpit. Chris and his co-pilot were killed. The bombardier and navigator, Lt. Barnhill and Lt. Wright, survived the crash, as did the two crewchief/gunners. Chris Herron was truly one of the great ones, a natural leader who earned the praise and affection of his crew and all of his colleagues in the 22nd Group.

A day or two later I flew my B-26 "Kansas Komet" back to Australia. As I chopped our engines on the ramp at Townsville Airfield, my co-pilot, I.B., was the first one out and on the ground. When I hit the ground he snarled, "I'll never fly with you again, and I'll never fly in that airplane again!" I told him he was breaking my heart. And what did outstanding Group leadership do with this disgruntled lieutenant? Why they let him hang around group operations for several weeks assisting in the combat briefings for the rest of us who were flying missions, while the colonels found somewhere else to transfer him. A General Jimmy Doolittle would have ripped off his wings, stripped him down to his jockstrap and had him tethered to a mule harness to start hauling supplies over the Owen-Stanleys.

Several weeks after that first incendiary mission, Capt. Al Fletcher, our 22nd Group intelligence officer, told me that a Japanese diary had been recovered from a crashed enemy aircraft. In the diary the writer told of an incendiary raid on Rabaul by three B-26 Marauders that had caused many fires, all of which had been contained except for the fires caused by incendiaries that had fallen into the open hatch of a moored freighter. Those fires onboard the ship could not be controlled. They reignited the dock and the warehouse area, burned fiercely for hours and came within a fraction of torching off a large ammo dump. I'm sorry I never saw that captured diary that described the impact of Lt. Chris Herron's final mission for his country. Yes sir, he was one of the very best.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. JOSEPH L. THOMPSON

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Sgt. Joseph L. Thompson of the Chicago Police Department. Attached is a proclamation I issued Sergeant Thompson commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Sergeant Joseph L. Thompson is a native of Chicago, Illinois, reared on the Southside of Chicago, he is a family man, married to Beverly Thompson for forty years, they are the proud parents of two children, Jayon and Lori; and

Whereas Sergeant Thompson matriculated at Wilson Jr. College, Chicago, Illinois, Olive-Harvey College, Chicago, Illinois, and Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois, he joined the Chicago Police Department in 1956, after completing the Police Academy he was assigned to the 11th District, Beat Patrolman, Patrol Division; and

Whereas Sergeant Thompson has served in a number of assignments over the past thirty-seven years with distinction, in 1958 he was detailed to the O'Connor-Phelan Task Force, known as the Ryan Raiders, 1961 in the 3rd District he organized the only Police-Community based teenage Drum and Bugle Corps in the Chicago Police Department, promoted to Detective, Detective Division in 1970, Supervisor, Patrol Division 1980, supervised a Tactical Team in high crime areas, promoted to the rank of Sergeant in 1980, Supervisor, Detective Division 1983 to the present, served as Acting Lieutenant for Violent Crimes, and as Acting Commanding Officer in Violent and Property Crimes; and

Whereas Sergeant Thompson has received numerous awards and honors for his faithful service to the citizens of Chicago, two Unit Meritorious Performance Awards, two Department Commendation Awards, many Honorable Mentions and Letters of Appreciation, he is a true role model in our community, and truly one of Chicago's Finest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America, wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of Sergeant Joseph L. Thompson, by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of The One Hundred and Third Congress of the United States of America.

SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH INSURANCE CHOICE ACT

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation that would give small businesses in my district and across America the ability to pool together, the right to choose their own health insurance policies, a 100-percent tax deduction for health insurance premiums for the self-employed, an elimination of pre-existing conditions in all health insurance policies, and the needed relief from antitrust laws.

The health insurance system of today creates expensive barriers by mandating certain State benefits, with the ability to deny insurance coverage to certain individuals with pre-existing health conditions. With these costly mandates, and the inability to purchase insurance because of a pre-existing condition, small business owners and employees opt out of coverage because it is too expensive to obtain.

Mr. Speaker if small businesses like the town barbershop, with 3 employees, the hardware store with 15 employees, and the pet store with 8 employees try individually to obtain insurance coverage, each of them will find that the coverage is too expensive because they do not have the purchasing power of larger businesses. The Small Business Health Insurance Choice Act will provide the incentive these small businesses need to group together. Then the barbershop, hardware store, and the pet shop will have 26 employees for a stronger purchasing power for less expensive coverage. These small employers can

join with hundreds of employers to increase the number of insured.

My bill will permit employers the freedom to bypass these costly benefit mandates. Every small business will have the power, without mandates, to voluntarily develop the best insurance policy for all its employees. Moreover, with the repeal of the pre-existing condition clause, employers and employees will no longer fear high premium costs and rejected health coverage. My health care reform proposal will, in turn, increase the availability of coverage, and will produce a sharp reduction in health care costs to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will also give the self-employed the same tax breaks as large organizations by allowing the self-employed to deduct 100 percent of all health care insurance costs. A simple change to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 would add tens of thousands of currently uninsured sole-proprietors and self-employed to the ranks of the insured.

Furthermore, with the removal of costly antitrust barriers, health care costs will be radically lower. With the removal of antitrust laws, two or more health care providers can apply to form a joint venture. These joint ventures will lower unnecessary and redundant purchasing of large and expensive medical equipment and treatment areas.

In conclusion, the Small Business Health Insurance Choice Act will aid small businesses as soon as this legislation is passed. It is a step that we can take today to improve the health care delivery system of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all Americans are in agreement that something needs to be done to lower health care cost and increase access to health care providers. This legislation answers that call, but does so by promoting the importance of choice, quality, and availability of excellent medical care.

I am eager to work with the administration and with my colleagues of both parties to achieve the important goal of health care reform. I strongly believe that the Small Business Health Insurance Choice Act will aid in reaching this goal, and it is my hope that other Members of Congress will join me in supporting this legislation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BRUCE COLES

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Bruce Coles on his election as chief executive officer of Stone & Webster, Inc., of New York, one of the world's leading engineering and construction firms.

A graduate of the University of Maine, with a B.S. in civil engineering and an M.S. in structural engineering, Bruce joined the company's engineering subsidiary in 1968, serving many years in the Denver office as senior construction manager, assistant manager, and vice president. Since 1990 he has served as president of the parent organization.

Bruce Coles' predecessor, Mr. Bill Allen, steps down having served many years as CEO, but will continue in his role as chairman of the board. Thanks to his leadership, Bill has ensured that Stone & Webster will continue its 105 year tradition of outstanding professional service in the international engineering and construction community.

The promotion of Bruce Coles is well-deserved recognition of his exceptional talents and outstanding achievements in the fields of engineering, international management, and administration. My best wishes are with him as he assumes the global challenges of leading the respected Stone & Webster organization into the 21st century.

THE HONORABLE HENRY B. GONZALEZ—PROFILE IN COURAGE

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, recently an honor was bestowed on a Member of Congress that deserves the attention of the body. This Member wants to extend his personal congratulations to him for this honor. On April 25, 1994, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ received notification that he had been selected as the recipient of the 1994 John F. Kennedy Profile in Courage Award.

The distinguished gentlemen's nomination was one of more than 100 that were reviewed by the Profile in Courage Award Committee, which seeks to honor contemporary leaders who take principled stands on unpopular positions as illustrated by President John F. Kennedy, in his book "Profiles in Courage." In his book, President Kennedy wrote,

> The stories of past courage can define that ingredient—they can teach, they can offer hope, they can provide inspiration. But they cannot supply courage itself. For this each man must look into his own soul.

Our colleague, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ was chosen for his inspiring career and leadership, which have been examples to the Nation. Furthermore, the Profile in Courage Award Committee granted this award with the following statement:

> At age 78, and with 41 years in public office, Henry B. Gonzalez, the Democratic Congressman from the 20th District in San Antonio, TX, has distinguished himself as an outspoken voice for the voiceless, a battler for the embattled, and a politician of unwavering honesty, principle, and integrity. With his well-known insistence on ethical conduct, tireless pursuit of the truth, respect for the Constitution, and opposition to special interests groups, Congressman Gonzalez personifies the high purpose and value of public service.
>
> Often referred to as a maverick, Gonzalez has demonstrated political courage on many occasions by standing firm for causes he believes in, and risking the wrath of his colleagues in both parties with his refusal to "go along to get along."

WISHING GAIL GIBLIN WELL AT TURNER BROADCASTING

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all too often, those of us in this body fail to adequately express our appreciation to the men and women who help us serve the men and women of our congressional districts. For staff, working on Capitol Hill frequently means long hours, cramped quarters and never enough time to do everything that needs to be done. But it also offers young men and women tremendous opportunities to advance as far as their hard work and intelligence can take them.

Today, I want to recognize a member of my staff whose hard work and intelligence have led to a major—and, I might add, well-deserved—career advance. Her name is Gail Giblin, and I appreciate this opportunity to salute, thank, and extend good wishes to Gail for all that she has done to help me, my constituents in Texas' 8th Congressional District and our Nation for the last 9 years. During those years, as a result of her hard work and dedication, Gail has been promoted from receptionist, to legislative correspondent, to legislative assistant, and then to legislative director in my congressional office.

Gail, who has served as my legislative director for the past 4 years, will leave my staff effective this coming Tuesday to assume the position of assistant vice president for government affairs at Turner Broadcasting here in Washington. While her departure will represent a tremendous loss to my staff, it represents a tremendous gain for Turner Broadcasting. It seems that once again, as he has so often throughout his broadcasting career, Ted Turner has made a very, very smart move.

As my legislative director, Gail has worked closely with me on issues in the areas of telecommunications, securities, energy, and taxes. Over the years, as a member of my legislative staff, Gail has handled many other issues, including reauthorization of the Clean Air Act, Superfund reauthorization, and RCRA reauthorization.

On all of those issues, and in each of her legislative positions, Gail has demonstrated an uncommon ability to work effectively with Members and staff of both political parties to help fashion legislation that balances conflicting interests and that benefits our country. Her ability to simplify often complex technological issues, and her extensive knowledge of telecommunications issues, will serve her well at Turner Broadcasting.

Gail is a 1985 cum laude graduate of Georgetown University, where she majored in marketing. Her parents, Gerry and Charlotte Giblin of Washington, are rightfully proud of her success at Georgetown University, her advancement on Capitol Hill, and her upcoming move to Turner Broadcasting. Her success demonstrates their success in raising a remarkable young lady. As I'm fond of saying, "The apple doesn't fall far from the tree."

Those of us who will remain here on Capitol Hill following her departure will sorely miss

Gail's good humor, her dedication and hard work, her unquestioned fashion judgment, and her extraordinary command of those issues that have shaped, and that will continue to shape, the future of the State of Texas and our Nation. Nonetheless, everyone who has worked with her—including many of my Republican and Democratic colleagues, her fellow staff members, the professional staff of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and others with whom she has worked closely on so many issues—are confident that she will do an outstanding job in her new and exciting position at Turner Broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you join with me in thanking Gail Giblin for her many years of dedicated service to this institution and to our Nation, and in wishing her continued success in her new position as Turner Broadcasting's representative on Capitol Hill.

IN HONOR OF MSGR. RICHARD A. YOUTZ

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few brief remarks to the many already expressed in honor of Msgr. Richard A. Youtz. By his service to community, Monsignor Youtz has earned the respect and admiration of many central Pennsylvanians.

For 10 years, Monsignor Youtz has ably served the Harrisburg area as pastor of St. Patrick Cathedral. Under his leadership, St. Patrick's has increased its number of parishioners threefold, as well as financed major building improvements to the cathedral itself.

However, perhaps Monsignor Youtz's most notable contribution has been his efforts through the St. Vincent de Paul Society to distribute food, clothing, and household items to the less fortunate of the Harrisburg area.

I congratulate Monsignor Youtz on a lifetime of success and accomplishment. The Harrisburg community is profoundly richer because of his work.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JESSE STRONG

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, the Reverend Jesse Strong of the Greater Canaan Missionary Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Reverend Strong commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Reverend Jesse Strong was born in Moohead, Mississippi, he is married to Loretta J. Strong for thirty-two years, he graduated from Wendell Phillips High School in 1953; and

Whereas Reverend Strong matriculated at Chicago Bible College, Chicago Baptist Institute, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago University, receiving the Bachelor of Biblical Studies, and the Doctor of Divinity degrees from Universal Bible Institute; and

Whereas Reverend Strong was elected Pastor of the Greater Canaan Missionary Baptist Church February 20, 1958, during the past thirty-five years of service Almighty God has blessed him to help many people, lead many souls to Christ, enduring peaks and valleys along the way; and

Whereas under the leadership of Reverend Strong the congregation has purchased and liquidated the mortgage on two churches, today the Church has a Hunger Outreach Ministry, Scholarship Fund, Back to School Luncheon, Little League Baseball, Youth Ministries and many more; and

Whereas the Lord sent Reverend Strong many faithful helpers past and present to whom we also pay tribute: Loretta Strong, Elbert Lumpkins, Deacon Sherman Triplett, Deacon Franklin Mack, Clyde Nevels, Ruby Norris, Georgia Brewer, Veertreasa Edwards, Mary Woods, Rodgers Holmes, Earlean Ferguson, Zella Barnes, Joe Hardrick, Deacon James Tyson, Johnnie Mae Jennings, Deacon John Jennings, Deacon Tommy Ward, and Mother Carter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Jesse Strong and the Greater Canaan Missionary Baptist Church by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the One Hundred and Third Congress.

THE AMERICAN DREAM AT WORK

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the illustrious career of Eugene O'Hara of New Jersey. Gene will soon retire from The Prudential Insurance Co. Gene is a prime example of the American dream at work. He began his 39-year Prudential career as a $37-a-week mail clerk in the audit department. He was a 17-year-old young man who had just graduated high school, the St. Benedict's Prep School, a few blocks from his place of employment.

Gene went to college at night, receiving his bachelor's degree in accounting from Rutgers University in 1962 and doing graduate work in accounting at City College of New York for an additional 6 years, also at night. As Gene became more qualified, he was given opportunities to do more and more work in the financial areas. In 1982, at 45, Gene was named comptroller of the Prudential. He was the company's senior financial officer. In 1991, Gene become Prudential's first chief financial officer.

Gene is a very caring individual and it shows. He has made a commitment to the development of our young people. He has proved this time and time again through his work with St. Benedict's Prep School and the members of his staff. Gene has stated that he had many mentors at Prudential, but I know there are many Prudential employees, including many executives, who acknowledge Eugene O'Hara as their mentor.

I am sure Gene's retirement years will be full of activities that will continue to benefit the New Jersey community. He is a member of the board of trustees of St. Benedict's Prep, Rutgers University; treasurer and board member of the New Jersey Ballet and a member of the New Jersey Council on the Arts.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will want to join me in congratulating Eugene O'Hara on his retirement and wish him godspeed.

TRIBUTE TO SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY JUDO TEAM

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding achievements of the San Jose State University Judo Team. These student athletes have won the university's 30th National Collegiate Judo Championship in 33 years, a feat that is unprecedented in collegiate athletics. They are to be commended for this accomplishment.

It is indeed rate to see such dominance by one university in any sport. The judo team at San Jose State University has proven over the years that it is our Nations best. The commitment, dedication, and hard work displayed by these young athletes should serve as an inspiration to us all.

Since 1946, the judo teams at San Jose State University have been under the tutelage of Yoshihiro Uchida. "Yosh" is a businessman and humanitarian known around the world. Over the years, Yosh has built a dynasty of not only successful athletes, but successful students as well. He is certainly a model of individual contribution and devotion.

Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL served as Yosh's team captain in 1956 and 1957. The Senator captured a gold medal in the 1963 Pan American games, and was a member of the first United States Olympic judo team for the Tokyo game sin 1964. He helped begin a tradition of excellence in judo at San Jose State University which endures today.

Again, I offer to the San Jose State University Judo Team my sincere congratulations for more than 30 years of unparalleled success and best wishes for the future.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE ELIGIBILITY FOR SPACE AVAILABLE TRANSPORTATION ON MILITARY AIRCRAFT TO CERTAIN FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR WITH 100 PERCENT SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES, H.R. —

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the Memorial Day weekend, I am honored to introduce important legislation that will directly benefit our Nation's veterans, whom have given so much for the freedom that we, as Americans, enjoy.

The legislation that I am introducing today provides that former prisoners of war, who are also deemed 100 percent service-connected disabled, are eligible for space-available transportation on military aircraft.

I believe that the message that this bill sends to our Nation's veterans is extremely important.

Through the years, thousands of Americans have left their families, their businesses, and their homes, to fight for the liberty, justice and the freedom that our Nation embodies. It is because of their many sacrifices that we are able to enjoy the fruits of democracy today.

From the battlefields of Vietnam to the Persian Gulf, our Nation's veterans have sacrificed of themselves to halt tyranny and aggression. We relied on their unique skills, their courage and their readiness to serve.

Based upon their valiant service, I ask you to join me in supporting this legislation. Allow our Nation's veterans, whom are former prisoners of war, and determined to be 100 percent service-connected disabled, to be eligible for space available transportation on military aircraft.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ELIGIBILITY FOR SPACE-AVAILABLE AIR TRANSPORTATION ON MILITARY AIRCRAFT FOR DISABLED FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR.

The Secretary of Defense shall provide that former prisoners of war (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code) shall be eligible for space-available transportation on military aircraft to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces.

THE ROSE MASS

HON. SONNY CALLAHAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share the sermon of a great friend of mine, Archbishop Oscar H. Lipscomb. I believe all who read this will find it as uplifting as I have.

The third annual Rose Mass was celebrated on March 13, 1994, at St. Patrick's Church in Washington, DC. The principal celebrant was His Eminence, James Cardinal Hickey, the Archbishop of Washington. The homilist was the Most Reverend Oscar H. Lipscomb, the Archbishop of Mobile. Named the "Rose Mass," this annual celebration takes place on the fourth Sunday of Lent, a Sunday when the vestments worn by the celebrant are rose-colored. The rose has also come to symbolize life whose precious care is entrusted to the healing profession.

The Rose Mass is organized by the John Carroll Society to invoke God's blessings on the medical, dental, nursing, and allied health care workers and the many health care institutions in the archdiocese of Washington. In addition, the mass provides an opportunity to give thanks for the splendid work of the volunteers of the Archdiocesan health care network. This network is composed of a multitude of dedicated workers of all religious persuasions infused with an ecumenical spirit in their care of the sick.

The John Carroll Society, named after the first Catholic bishop in the United States, was founded in 1951. Composed of 880 members, the primary purpose of the society is the enhancement of spiritual, intellectual, and social fellowship among lay men and women dedicated to the service of the Archbishop of Washington. The society draws its members from all areas of professional and business life in the metropolitan Washington area.

The enclosed homily was delivered at 10 in the morning in Washington on March 13, 1994, at the third annual Rose Mass at St. Patrick's Church by the Most Reverend Oscar H. Lipscomb, the Archbishop of Mobile. The same day—in the afternoon—at the Cathedral of Mary Our Queen in Baltimore, MD, the archbishop delivered this same homily as a part of the first Rose Mass in the archdiocese of Baltimore.

HOMILY FOR MASS ON ROSE SUNDAY, MARCH 13, 1994

(By Oscar H. Lipscomb, Archbishop of Mobile)

We are truly his handiwork, created in Christ Jesus to lead the life of good deeds which God prepared for us in advance.—Eph. 2,10.

Father Benedict Ashley, O.P., whose name conjures up the brightest and best in our current medical-moral theology, offered us a remarkable resource for the healing arts in his work, Theologies of the Body: Humanist and Christian, published in 1985. As preliminary to his comprehensive and penetrating presentation, Father Ashley asked the question: "Can we create ourselves?" Later in the text as part of a complex tapestry woven from pre-history, history, philosophy and theology that reaches to the present, this author gives an answer that is both startling and full of challenge to all persons of faith. It has special meaning for the health-care professional who, as one with Christ Jesus through word, sacrament and work is invited to share in the work of creation.

With a vision of "the whole human community across space and time" offering a framework for universally valid ethical and moral norms as points of reference, Father Ashley responded:

"This universal morality, far from negating our human capacity to create new cultures and to advance technological control of nature, is what makes it possible for us to form such cultures in ways that will meet basic human needs. Hence, to answer the question * * *: 'Can we create ourselves?', it must be affirmed that we can truly create ourselves if we understand this 'creation' to be neither the destruction of nature nor the forgetting of history, but a perfecting in new ways of what has already come to be by constructive natural processes and a purification and incorporation of historical cultural achievements into our present and future selves."

In a later important specification for our purposes today, and in keeping with the words of our Scripture reading on Rose Sunday, the learned Dominican noted: "The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Father of Jesus, however creates the world freely. It wholly depends on him for every aspect of its being and he in no way depends on the world, yet he is present to it not merely by his power but by a personal presence of knowledge, love and providence."

The personal empowerment and invitation that Jesus gives to his disciples makes the task of such "creation" a real and compelling one for each of us. Ourselves re-created by the gift of God's Spirit in Christ, we are truly called to re-create the world around us. "I am the vine, you are the branches. He who lives in me and I in him will produce abundantly * * *. As the Father has loved me, so I have loved you. Live on in my love." And even more explicitly in St. Paul, "You, then, are the body of Christ. Every one of you is a member of it."

There is a special likeness to Christ in doctors, nurses, indeed, in all who fill a place in the profession of health care. Christ's gift from the Father is life, life in abundance, life to the full, This life that is destined never to see death is joined intimately to that life and health that is your province: fragile, joyful, mysterious in its opportunities and dangers, mortal in its outcome—but is not its real end. You, by your skill and art enhance this life as it waits upon and works toward the Christ-gift of life. Your role is played out in faith confident of God's final loving but often unable to gasp its meaning and presence at a given moment. Such moments of wonder and worry, skin to doubt, are not unlike the seventy years of exile in Babylon until King Cyrus, an unlikely instrument, helped Israel to re-create itself as the people of promise. He uses us, too, as his instruments, unlikely as we seem to be.

Truly, "creation" anew in Christ gives us a crucial part to play in "the life of good deeds which God has prepared for us in advance." What an unmistakably "good deed" it is to reach out to those who need help in the special circumstance of illness. The many faces of sickness, and its many stages, have one universal characteristic: the one who suffers, who needs help, is confronted with his, or her, utter lack of self-sufficiency. They need others. And those who would truly serve them well must be, again in configuration to Christ, persons for others. Such a configuration is not easily come by. Our society and its values militate against it as part of our emphasis on self, individualism and personal needs. It is sad that a quality, selflessness, which many experienced, and still experience as a hallmark of the healing arts is today so badly at risk.

An article in America last January cited Dr. Lawrence Ronan, himself a primary-care specialist at Harvard who directs a residency program at Massachusetts General and is severely critical of training that erodes the "quality of mercy" in medical practitioners.

"Dr. Ronan thinks that unless medicine and those who pay for it change, even fewer will choose the intimacy of primary care. 'The kids see this 15 minutes with a patient and the chaos of insurance forms and they say, "That's not why I went to medical school." And that's sad, because when these kids write essays for admission they all use the word "service". They say, "I'm going to care for you." In some sense, the generalist spirit runs in everyone who comes into medicine, and yet we turn out very few generalist.'"

The America article went on to state that medical schools are at least trying to instill compassion in their students. It listed such elements as courses in medical humanities, ethics and behavioral modifications as well as earlier exposure to patients and even role playing on the part of students "to put themselves in the skins of the sick." I would suggest, again for persons with faith and a more than casual encounter with the Lord, that a primary resource remains underdeveloped. We sacrifice for those whom we love.

And we who are loved by Christ are empowered to love those to whom we are sent, for whom we are responsible, because they are there to be loved. They need it. Jesus would give it. And so must we if we have been created in Christ to do the handiwork of God. And the sick will sense and respond to loving care as a dimension well beyond care that is therapeutic or custodial.

It is this love of Christ of which St. John speaks in the Third Chapter of his Gospel that offers us light amid the gathering darkness that clouds questions of human life in our society at its origins and when it runs its final course. For it is the Son of Man, lifted up by the will of the Father, who offers us the promise of eternal life and victory over death itself. So much does He love us and at so great a cost. It is not right, reason and rhetoric unaided that will convince a mindset reaching out today with increasing conviction for euthanasia. A powerful example of such persuasion was offered by Richard M. Doerflinger last year at the twelfth bishops' workshop on medical-moral problems in Dallas. He said:

"The vision of life as a gift of the Creator is shared by Catholics, Protestants, Jews and many others, and is reflected in the founding documents of our nation. But I understand that it is not shared by all. To those who find it unappealing I would say this: If life is not a divine gift, it is at least the most basic and fundamental of the human goods which societies like ours are established to protect. And it is precisely an ethical devotion to this good that makes the physician a member of a profession, rather than just another technician with a good-paying job. Life is basic because it is the pre-condition for every other human good and human right, even freedom. You cannot enhance someone's freedom by taking his life, because corpses have no freedom. Freely taking your life, like freely selling yourself into slavery, is the ultimate self-contradiction of freedom, not its ultimate triumph."

Imagine the mysterious power added to such reasons offered to a person considering euthanasia by one who could say and show to the person in pain, and beyond hope: "Please don't choose to die. You mean so much to me. I love you." They are God's words and we need to find the strength to make them our own.

At the other end of the spectrum, where life begins, I heard such words in a first-person narrative of a local Mobile columnist. Jay Grelen, with his wife, Cindi, shared with our community the wonder, pain and mystery of God's gift of life:

"The second time, I understood the french fries.

"The first time Cindi learned she was pregnant, two days after Valentine's Day 1989, she telephoned and invited me to lunch. She told me her news. I sat there stunned, she says, and inhaled the fries.

"So it's a week after Valentine's Day in 1992. We had moved from Denver to Lexington, KY. Cindi had gone to the doctor, who diagnosed a sinus infection. And something else.

"Instead of antibiotics, she came home with a bag of french fries for me and a huge grin on her face.

"This time, our 2-year-old daughter helped inhale.

"The Friday that Cindi learned she was pregnant, we began to dream and plan. Where to put the new baby? When to tell Samantha? We couldn't have loved this new member of our family more if the baby were already in the crib.

"Four days later, on Tuesday, Cindi went for an ultra-sound, which confirmed our happy news.

"On Wednesday, she began to bleed and cramp.

"We went to the doctor's office. Cindi sat there thinking, 'I'm losing my baby.' All the while, from another room, came a strong, regular 'ka-thump': It was a monitor, picking up and broadcasting the heartbeat of another body in its mother's womb.

"But our news was good. No dilating. Uterus slightly swollen. Blood test better than expected.

"'I'm still off my feet,' Cindi wrote in her journal that day, 'but ever so much more hopeful.'

"Thursday, 9 p.m. Cramps and bleeding worsen.

"Half-past midnight. 'I'm in great pain—physically and in my soul', Cindi wrote. 'I'm losing my baby.'

"Friday, 6:30 a.m., one week after the positive pregnancy test. Suddenly, the pregnancy was over, the baby was gone.

"'Guilt and horror sweep over me,' Cindi wrote later of that moment, 'and I can't fathom what to do.'

"Cindi endured that dark night alone. I slept through it. And for many days, she felt she was alone, that I was emotionally asleep.

"I had my cry later that morning, in the rocking chair in our first-born's room, and then I was through.

"But Cindi knew, in a way that only a mother can know, what had been inside. She had felt the new life sprouting, the hormonal surge, the joy. And Cindi knows, in a way that only a mother can, what we lost.

"But joy and life do return. Three months later, Cindi was pregnant again. Now, our second daughter nears her first birthday. We have seen life come, we have seen it go. We see life running—or in the baby's case, crawling—circles around us. Because of what we can cradle, and because of what we can't, we understand more fully the miracle of life, whatever the stage."

We are truly his handiwork, created in Christ Jesus to lead the life of good deeds which God has prepared for us in advance.

REMEMBERING THE GOLDEN TEMPLE TRAGEDY

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, June 3 through 6 marks the 10th anniversary of a dark chapter in India's history. On those dates in 1984, Indian troops launched a vicious artillery attack on the holiest shrine of the Sikh religion, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, and 38 other Sikh shrines throughout Punjab. During this massacre, 20,000 Sikhs were killed by Indian military and paramilitary forces. Since that tragedy, over 115,000 Sikhs have been killed in India.

India may be democratic in form, but it is not in practice. In Indian-occupied Punjab—known to Sikhs as Khalistan—basic human rights do not exist. The Indian regime continues to station 500,000 troops in Punjab to brutalize the people. The five black laws, such as the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act [TADA], allow the Indian Government to detain anyone indefinitely without charge, shoot civilians on sight, and torture civilians with impunity. It was recently reported that torture centers have been established in virtually every city in Punjab. When a Sikh dies of torture, he is listed as having died in a fake encounter with the police. The State Department reports that from 1991 through 1993, 41,000 bounties were paid to police officers for killing Sikhs. Disappearances are routine.

When Prime Minister Rao came to Washington last week, he spoke to Congress about democracy and civil rights. He even cited Thomas Jefferson and Martin Luther King. If these two men were alive today, they would condemn the Indian Government for its crimes against the Sikhs, the Muslims of Kashmir, and the Christians of Nagaland. I really regret that the Prime Minister chose not to be more candid with us about India's brutal human rights record.

Mr. Speaker, there is a growing independence movement seeking an independent Khalistan for the Sikh nation. Every murder India commits, every rape, and every act of torture will only strengthen this movement. If one thing is absolutely clear, it is that you cannot hold an entire people captive forever at the point of a gun. This has been proven in East Germany and the Baltic Republics. If the Sikhs truly desire freedom, one day they will be free, despite India's brutality.

I am enclosing a letter to the Sikh people from Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, marking the 10th anniversary of the attack on the Golden Temple. Dr. Aulakh is the most resolute and articulate advocate in the United States of freedom and dignity for the Sikh people. I encourage all of my colleagues to read his remarks.

COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN,
Washington, DC, June 1, 1994.

DEAR KHALSA JI: We have suffered for ten years, but we don't have to suffer for ten more.

On the occasion of India's desecration of our holy Golden Temple, I ask you to remember and gain strength from the sacrifice of our martyrs. I ask you to remember our young men who were tortured. I ask you to remember our women who were raped. I ask you to remember our children who were jailed. I ask you to remember our leaders who were murdered. I ask you to remember Sikhs who have 'disappeared.' I ask you to remember police faked 'encounters' which killed tens of thousands. I ask you to remember everyday police harassment and humiliation inflicted on our nation. I ask you to remember oppressive laws such as TADA. I ask you remember police extortion, bribery, and black mail. I ask you to remember India's broken promises. I ask you to remember the 115,000 Sikhs who have died since 1984.

Khalsa ji, after thinking about the past, I ask you to look to our future: Can we afford to live under the Delhi government for 10 more years?

As President of the Council of Khalistan, I have observed a great deal over the past ten years. I have thought long and hard about how Khalistan can be liberated. I have seen the suffering, the ebbs and flows of our liberation struggle. Ten long years later, one thing stands clearly in my mind: India cannot withstand a shantmai (peaceful) morcha for the liberation of Khalistan.

Liberation is in our own hands, nobody else's. Raise the slogan of India Quit Khalistan.

Khalsa ji you are the Lions of Guru Gobind Singh Sahib. If the feeble Mahatma Gandhi could raise the slogan of British Quit India, then you can raise the slogan of India Quit Khalistan. We must immediately begin to peacefully fill India's jails and block its roadways. From June 4 through 6, in remembrance of our martyrs and to demonstrate our determination to see Khalistan free, the Sikh masses should fill India's jails. If even 1,000 Sikhs peacefully block the roadways with the sole and stated intention of liberating Khalistan, world headlines will be made the next day. If this continues, the international community will soon get involved. India cannot withstand the shantmai morcha of the Sikh nation. The power is in the Khalsa's hands.

In order to achieve quick liberation, our movement must remain peaceful.

We can achieve liberation quicker through non-violent mass agitation, rather than through indiscriminate violence. The moment we become violent, is the moment that the Indian government portrays the Sikh nation as terrorists. Violence will allow the Indian government to brutally crack down on the Sikh nation and have an excuse for it. Agents of the Indian government will be able to infiltrate our movement and defame it. Under no circumstances should we engage in violence. We must remain resolute but peaceful. Freedom will then follow.

It is time for the Khalsa Panth to remain true to its heritage: Khalsa Bagi Yan Badhshah.

Khalsa ji, our own Gurus gave their lives in order to preserve Sikh sovereignty and resist governing tyranny. Our history is rich with the stories of martyrs who gave their lives in order to establish Sikh Raj. Baba Deep Singh, Bhai Mani Singh, and Sardar Hari Singh Nalwa all held our Nishan Sahib high in the air. They fought and died and suffered so that Sikh Raj could exist in the Sikh homeland. We must now look to their sacrifice and gain strength: Khalsa Bagi Yan Badshah.

If the leadership vacillates, then the masses should take the lead.

I am pleased by the recent efforts at Akali unity. Unfortunately they have come ten years too late and come too short in their stated goals. The Akalis must remember: Khalistan is the only issue facing the Sikh nation. The problem is not with the masses, it is with the Akalis. If the Akalis are clear and unequivocal in their call for Khalistan, then the masses will follow. The more the Akalis waver, the more the masses will suffer—this is guaranteed. Many Indian agents have infiltrated the Sikh leadership. I ask the masses to find those leaders and reject them. Raise only the slogan of 'India Out of Khalistan'.

Khalistan will be free by 1999.

India is simply not viable. It is the last of the world's super-states. There is no other country in the world that has so many official languages. There is no other country in the world which employs its own troops so extensively against its own people. Through peaceful agitation, even India's army will not be able to suppress the Sikh nation for too long. Because of the pressure from Sikhs outside Khalistan, the international community will immediately object to any suppression of peaceful agitators. Khalsa ji, the power is in your hands. We must make a future that is safe for our children and future generations. As a tribute to our martyrs, to those who have died in the past ten years, I ask the Sikh nation to launch a shantmai morcha for the liberation of Khalistan. Only then will Khalistan be free. Raj Karega Khalsa. Khalistan Zindabad.

Panth Da Das,

Dr. GURMIT SINGH AULAKH,
President, Council of Khalistan.

[From The Washington Times, May 16, 1994]

RAO IN THE LIONS' DEN

(By James Morrison)

When Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao addresses a joint session of Congress this week, he will find he has many hostile critics in the audience.

Thirty-eight members of Congress wrote President Clinton and 42 members signed a letter to Indian Ambassador Siddartha Shankar Ray last week, complaining about Indian mistreatment of its Sikh minority, which is fighting for a separate homeland.

Both letters were signed by House Armed Service Committee Chairman Ron Dellums, California Democrat, and many members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The letter to Mr. Clinton urged him to discontinue aid to India.

"We believe the world has turned its back on the Sikhs * * * long enough," the letter said. "Without the right of self-determination, all other rights in the Sikh homeland are effectively denied."

The missive to the ambassador expressed congressional concern "over mounting tensions in the Sikh homeland, Punjab, Khalistan." Mr. Ray could not be reached for comment.

The letter to Mr. Ray said, "Last year the House of Representatives voted unanimously to cut $4.1 million in developmental assistance to India because of its gross human rights violations. * * * Since that time * * * the situation has only gotten worse."

The letter said the State Department's latest human rights report on India "painted a bleak human rights landscape." The report condemned police in the Punjab for "extrajudicial killings" and torture. It cited the Indian government for paying bonuses to police officers for killing suspected Sikh militants.

Both letters cited the case of Kanwar Singh Dhami and his family who "have endured 10 months of harsh imprisonment."

Mr. Rao is due in Washington on Thursday to meet Mr. Clinton and address Congress.

BIG RED ONE

HON. PAT ROBERTS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the following remarks from Senator BOB DOLE, regarding the 1st Infantry Division, the "Big Red One" based at Fort Riley, KS, and the Senator's salute to Gen. Joe Robles, commander general of the 1st Infantry Division, who is retiring after 28 years of service to his country on June 1 of this year. The Big Red One's history includes D-day, which American veterans and their European counterparts will remember in Normandy, France in the days ahead. I thank General Robles and the people of the Big Red One for their dedication to their country.

[Floor statement of Senator Bob Dole]

SALUTE TO GENERAL ROBLES

Mr. President, on June 1, 1994, Major General Joe Robles, commanding general of the 1st Infantry Division—the Big Red One—will retire after more than 28 years of service. I would like to take a moment to recognize this outstanding leader and to thank him for his dedication and sacrifice to the Army, to Kansas, and to the Nation.

While growing up, Joe Robles never dreamed that he would make the Army a career, much less command a division. General Robles never went through ROTC or attended West Point; he was drafted into the Army in 1966. He received his commission through artillery officer candidate school in Fort Sill, OK, and worked his way up through the ranks. His service in the Army has taken him from Korea to Fort Knox; from Vietnam to Germany and from Southwest Asia to Kansas. General Robles has never forgotten what it's like to be an enlisted man, and because of that, General Robles has always been able to identify with his soldiers. I have been impressed by his constant concern for his soldiers and their families.

While commanding the Big Red One, General Robles has added to the division's long and illustrious history. As the division commander, he has ensured that the 1st Infantry Division stands ready to preserve our freedom and advance the ideals of democracy. As post commander, General Robles has worked extremely well with the people of Kansas, building a strong relationship with the communities around Fort Riley.

As Major General Robles turns over command of the 1st Infantry Division and Fort Riley, I am certain that he will be missed by those who have served with him. I wish him, his wife, Patricia, and his children all the best as they embark together on new endeavors.

[Floor Statement of Senator Dole]

1ST INFANTRY DIVISION

Mr. President, as we look forward to the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of D-Day and the invasion at Normandy, I want to take a moment to recognize the contributions of one of the finest divisions in the U.S. Army, the 1st Infantry Division, the Big Red One, headquartered at Fort Riley, Kansas.

Formed in 1917, the Big Red One was the first American unit to go overseas in World War I, the first to enter combat with the Germans, and the first to invade Germany itself. Since those early days, the division has continued to serve our country with honor and distinction.

On June 6, 1944, the Big Red One was the first unit ashore at Omaha Beach on the Normandy coast. The 1st Infantry Division's successful assault punched a hole in Hitler's "Fortress Europe," and began the liberation of Europe and the end of the Third Reich.

The division's long history of service and sacrifice continued through Vietnam and Operation Desert Storm. In 1965 the Big Red One was the first division-size unit deployed to Vietnam, where its soldiers honorably served until 1970. During the gulf war, the Big Red One was the first division to breach Iraqi defenses. In less than 100 hours the division attacked through 260 kilometers of enemy held territory and defeated elements of 11 Iraqi divisions.

Throughout its history, the soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have always exemplified courage, dedication, and sacrifice. Through their service, the Big Red One has advanced the cause of freedom and protected the ideals on which our Nation is built. No doubt about it, they have always lived up to their motto: "No mission too difficult, no sacrifice too great. Duty first."

As the senior Senator from Kansas, I am proud to have this unit based at Fort Riley, in my home State. As we commemorate the historic events of 50 years ago, let us also express our thanks to the soldiers and families of the Big Red One for all they have done for us.

RECOGNIZING BRIDGET A. GOODMAN, STUDENT COMMENCEMENT SPEAKER, WHITTIER COLLEGE, CLASS OF 1994

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, May 27, 1994, a former intern in my district office, Ms. Bridget A. Goodman, will deliver the student commencement address at the graduation of Whittier College's Class of 1994.

Bridget's speech, entitled, "Agents of Change," reflects on the changes her class has seen during its education at Whittier and it reminds the class of the changes it will have to make in the years to come.

Bridget is the daughter of Carol Goodman of Valencia and Stacy Goodman of Reseda. She has one brother, Phillip, 17, who will graduate from Saugus High School next month and will attend Johnson and Wales University in Rhode Island.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of Bridget's speech be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Bridget well in her future endeavors.

Dr. Ash, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, fellow graduates, family, and friends, today we celebrate the commencement of the Whittier College Class of 1994. It is a time for beginning and a time for change and no one is more familiar with change than the students at Whittier.

Think back, fellow graduates, on the transformation of Whittier College that we have witnessed. Four years ago, we were eating in a tent, living three to a room, and awakening at 6 a.m. to the sounds of bulldozers and buzzsaws. As we leave, we can say we ate in the Campus Inn, lived in Turner Hall, enjoyed speakers and dinners in the faculty masters houses, and received our parking tickets from the re-staffed and re-equipped Campus Safety.

Of course, not all changes at Whittier have been so positive. society housing was virtually eliminated; campus housing became compulsory and more restrictive; some of our best faculty and staff sought opportunities elsewhere; and we discovered our Club was built for storage, not for dancing.

More important than these events, however, is the fact that by attending Whittier, we have learned to be more than witnesses to change—we have become agents of change. At Whittier, we reformed student government. We founded organizations that increased social awareness. We participated in school policy and appeals committees. Beyond Whittier, we helped clean up and rebuild Los Angeles after the riots. We gave money and counseling services to victims of the Northridge earthquake. We became politically active, working on election campaigns, initiative coalitions, and voter registration drives.

As we depart Whittier College, we must remember these achievements because our work as agents of change has only just begun.

Our generation has inherited numerous social and economic problems which must be dealt with in our time. The environment, the economy, education, housing, and the health care system are all in crisis. While we cannot spray the rain forests with Whittier's quick-grow fertilizer, nor ask the AMA to adopt the Student Health Center's slogan "prescribe erythromyacin for everything," we can work through these seemingly insurmountable tasks because the faculty have given us the tools to do so.

Our professors showed us how to listen and to treat individuals with respect. They taught us how to conduct research and to establish networks in our chosen fields. And they provided informal yet crucial support, sharing their homes, a meal, or a good cry with us as we struggled through the changes of post-adolescence.

As students of Whittier College, we have all been given the power to make a difference. As alumni of Whittier College, it is our duty to use this gift to the best of our abilities. Good luck.

TRIBUTE TO ELDER CORNELIUS SOUTHERN

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Elder Cornelius Southern of the Grace Apostolic Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Elder Southern commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Elder Cornelius Southern is the Founder and Pastor of the Grace Apostolic Church, Chicago, Illinois and through faithful service has been elevated by God to the office of District Elder; and

Whereas under the pastoral leadership of Elder Southern Grace Church has increased in membership, in ministry, in evangelistic outreach, celebrating twenty-five years of service; and

Whereas Elder Southern is Chairman of the Illinois District Council of the International Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, a member of the Rainbow Beach Coalition Advisory Board, past president of the South Shore Ministerial Association; and

Whereas District Elder Southern is a true Role Model, a family man married to Gussie Southern for thirty-five years, God has blessed them with six children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of District Elder Cornelius Southern by entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and Archives of the one hundred and third Congress of the United States.

FERENC KOSZORUS: A HERO OF THE HUNGARIAN HOLOCAUST

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Hungarian holocaust. I rise today to recognize one of the great heros of the Hungarian holocaust. Ferenc Koszorus, who at great personal sacrifice to his own life, saved thousands of Hungarian Jews from deportation to Nazi death camps.

During the turbulent time in the summer of 1944, advancing Allied forces were closing in on Berlin while Hitler was racing to implement the final solution, the destruction of the Jewish race. There were many acts of heroic compassion and humanitarianism during this period. I would like to recount the story of Col. Ferenc Koszorus, one of the most remarkable examples of bravery and courage of the time.

By June 1944, the Nazis had incarcerated and liquidated most of the Jewish population of Europe. In the capital of Hungary, Budapest, there remained approximately 250,000 Jews still alive. Budapest was still under control of the Hungarian police force. The Nazis believed that this force was not ruthless and brutal enough to deal adequately with the complete destruction of the large remaining Jewish population of Budapest.

Ferenc Koszorus was a colonel in the Hungarian Army in charge of the First Magyar Armored Division stationed in and around Budapest. He learned that Laszlo Baky, Secretary of State and director of all security forces, with the exception of the army, had planned a coup d'etat to install a police force completely subservient to the Nazis. They would see to it that Hungary was purged of all remaining Jews.

With the help of the Gestapo, Baky formed several battalions of "gendarmerie" forces loyal to him. Orders from the Regent to disband the gendarmerie went unheeded. Colonel Koszorus controlled the last remaining active army unit in Hungary. At a time when few others would stand up to the Nazi occupation, Colonel Koszorus took the initiative to resist.

Realizing the severity of the situation, Colonel Koszorus consulted with the Regent and began preparations on his own to stop Baky and the gendarmerie battalions. On July 5, 1944 at 11:30 p.m., Colonel Koszorus ordered the units of the 1st Armored Division to take up positions at strategic points in Budapest, sealing off all roads leading into the city. By 7 a.m. on July 6, 1944 all the units were in place and Colonel Koszorus informed Baky that if his gendarmerie did not leave and disband they would be destroyed. On July 7, 1944 Baky capitulated and evacuated his forces.

Colonel Koszorus' unparalleled action was the only case known in which an Axis power used military force for the purpose of preventing the deportation of the Jews. As a result of his extraordinarily brave efforts, taken at great risk in an extremely volatile situation, the eventual takeover of Budapest by the Nazis

was delayed by 3½ months. This hiatus allowed thousands of Jews to seek safety in Budapest, thus sparing them from certain execution. It also permitted the famous Raoul Wallenberg, who arrived in Budapest on July 9, 1994, to coordinate his successful and effective rescue mission.

In October 1944, after the Germans had taken Budapest, Colonel Koszorus was forced into hiding to avoid certain execution by the Gestapo. While alive, Colonel Koszorus never received recognition of his actions. In 1991, Ferenc Koszorus was posthumously promoted to the rank of general by the Hungarian Government. His memory is honored with a plaque placed in the famous Dohany Street Synagogue in Budapest.

Therefore it is with great honor and pride that I rise today in recognition valiant, patriotic efforts of Ferenc Koszorus. Many thousands of families are alive today as a result of the heroic actions of one man who stood up for his beliefs in a very uncertain and dangerous time. His loyalty to his country and love of humanity are an inspiration to all who struggle against oppression and the vile bigotry of racism.

Too often the efforts of those who struggle against the Nazi oppression go unrecognized. This year, the 50th anniversary of Hungarian holocaust, the world reflects on the lessons learned. I am proud to honor Colonel Koszorus, a patriot, a humanitarian, and a hero.

MICROENTERPRISE AS A MEANS TO ALLEVIATE POVERTY

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, more than one billion people in the developing world live in absolute poverty. According UNICEF's, State of the World's Children, mortality for children under age 5 averages 104 per 1,000 in developing countries. In the least developing countries, that figure rises to 179 per 1,000; in Africa it rises still further to 181 per 1,000.

It is difficult to read these statistics and not to respond with a pro-active policy to stem this loss of children—the world's most vulnerable citizens. Six Members of Congress join with me today in introducing the Microenterprise Development Act of 1994, a bill designed to reduce poverty dramatically. This bill formally authorizes a microenterprise development program within the U.S. Agency for International Development [AID]. The bill includes a strong poverty lending component, loans of $300 or less. For those that follow this issue, you may note that this is not the first time I have introduced language on microenterprise development. It is the first time, however, that the language has been supported by the Administrator of AID. Brian Atwood and his staff have worked with me for months to craft a bill that can not only be implemented effectively by AID, but be supported by this administration.

We believe that the very poor, particularly women, can lead the fight against hunger and absolute poverty through the development of self-sustaining microenterprise projects. It is an unfortunate fact that women in poverty generally are less educated and have less access to economic opportunity than their male counterparts. Therefore, directly aiding women in the developing world will have a positive effect on family incomes, child nutrition, health, and education.

Microenterprise development offers the opportunity for the poor to play a central role in undertaking strategies for small scale, self-sustaining businesses that can bring them out of poverty and into a world of self-sufficiency and dignity. The World Bank estimates that there are over 400 million self-employed poor in the developing world and projects that by the year 2020, 95 percent of African workers will be employed in the informal sector. For many people, the lack of credit creates an obstacle to the development of self-sustaining enterprises. Projects like those developed by ACCION International, Care, FINCA, Catholic Relief Services, and Save the Children, to name a few, have lent money directly to the world's poorest. Repayment rates in these programs average 95 percent, indicating that it is possible to bank on the poor. Because these institutions charge interest for these loans, over time the programs themselves become self-sustaining—saving foreign assistance dollars.

The Members joining me in introducing this bill, Representatives MCKINNEY, CANTWELL, KENNELLY, LOWEY, GILMAN, and BEREUTER, recognize that the Agency for International Development had been a leader in small and microenterprise development for over 20 years. This bill, which will strengthen AID's current program, as well as increase the agency's work in poverty lending, is the result of extensive negotiations between the Congress, AID, and the many private organizations that implement these programs. A great deal of credit must be given to the Microenterprise Coalition, a coalition of private voluntary organizations, credit unions and cooperatives, which has kept this issue alive and on the front burner for several years.

It is my hope that microenterprise will continue to be a major weapon in AID's arsenal in fighting poverty and malnutrition in the developing world.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, National Tourism Week was designed to highlight tourism's contribution to the American economy. It is important to note, however, that the American economy is not confined to the 50 States but also includes the territories of the United States. In any discussion of the role of tourism on the Nation's economy, the territories are of vital importance.

My island home, the territory of Guam, for example, has a tourism industry which boasts an annual revenue of over $1 billion and this year's visitor arrivals are expected to approach 1 million. The vast majority of our tourists are from Japan, but recently the Guam Visitor's Bureau has begun to target other Asian countries—most notably Korea and Taiwan—so that others may share in the splendor of our Pacific paradise. This billion-dollar economy represents a significant contribution to redressing the balance of payments problems the United States has with Japan. Guam's contribution in this regard should not go unnoticed.

Sir Yu'os Ma'ase to all those in Guam's travel industry who show our visitors the warmth and hospitality of our beautiful island. It is only because of the efforts of those in the industry that we are able to celebrate the positive impact of tourism on the economy of Guam and the Nation.

THE PAY FOR PERFORMANCE ACT

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as we start our annual appropriations cycle, one thing is very clear—it is business as usual on Capitol Hill. Once again, one of the first appropriation bills to be brought on the House floor is Congress' own spending legislation, H.R. 4454. Why should this matter to anyone?

Everyone knows that Congress is required to pass 13 appropriations bills before the start of the new fiscal year. Yet, we rarely meet this long-established deadline. In fact, in the last 20 years, we have only succeeded in meeting that deadline twice—1977 and 1989.

Therefore, it would not surprise me if later this year we are on this floor debating another continuing resolution to keep the Government operating while we finish working on the appropriations bills. However, if 1994 is like any other year, the conference report for H.R. 4454 will become law sometime this summer. This means that come October, when the rest of the Government is teetering on the edge of insolvency, Congress will be fully funded.

For a number of years, I have been arguing that the funding requirements of Congress should only be considered after the needs of all other Americans are met to the best of our ability. In the 103d Congress, I have once again introduced legislation, H.R. 1922, which would force Members of Congress to earn their own paychecks.

Like every other wage earner and salaried employee, I propose that Congress only be paid when it has completed its most basic work—to approve the general budget for the Federal Government, to discharge fully its responsibility over the Nation's pursestrings.

To accomplish this end, I would withhold our own paychecks and the money to run our offices and staff until action is completed—on time—on all other general appropriations bills for the next fiscal year. Thus, instead of securing its own funding well in advance, Congress would be dead last in line of Federal spending.

My bill would effectively outlaw continuing resolutions, the huge spending bills that have been subject to widespread abuse. I also believe the proposal would help to prevent the

possibility of Government grinding to a halt, Social Security checks being threatened, and other programs held in limbo until appropriations bills are finally approved in the dead of night.

H.R. 1922 will not cure all institutional flaws or tackle broader ethical concerns, but I believe it would be a step in the right direction. I believe it would represent a change in thinking and attitude. I think the American public would prefer to see Congress step to the back of the line for a change.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK ANTHONY THOMAS

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work done by a great leader in my congressional district, Dr. Frank Anthony Thomas of the New Faith Baptist Church. Attached is a proclamation I issued Dr. Thomas commending him for his work.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Doctor Frank Anthony Thomas was born in Gulfport, Mississippi, a loving husband married to Joyce Scott Thomas, they are the proud parents of Anthony William and Rachel Sojourner; and

Whereas Reverend Thomas is a pastor-scholar having matriculated at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana earning the Bachelor of Arts degree in Philosophy, Chicago Theological Seminary, Master of Divinity, Northern Illinois University, Master of Arts in African-Carribean Studies, Chicago Theological Seminary, Doctor of Ministry, United Theological Seminary, Doctor of Ministry; and

Whereas Doctor Thomas serves as Adjunct Professor of Homiletics and Church Administration in the Masters and Doctoral programs at McCormick Theological Seminary, North Park Theological Seminary, and the Association of Chicago Theological Schools; and

Whereas Reverend Thomas was ordained on February 22, 1981 by Trinity United Church of Christ in Chicago, serving there as Student Minister 1978–1981, he was elected Pastor of New Faith Baptist Church, Matteson, IL in 1981, God has Blessed the congregation to grow in faith and in numbers from less than fifty to over two thousand:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of The Reverend Doctor Frank A. Thomas, entering these accomplishments into the Congressional Record and archives of the one hundred and third Congress.

TRIBUTE TO VIVIAN SHIMOYAMA

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, many women in public office and many prominent supporters of women who run for office wear glass ceiling pins.

Designed by Vivian Shimoyama, a talented friend and constituent, these pins, earrings, pendants, and paperweights are individually made from broken glass and a blunt shard of metal. The unmistakable message: Women can and must break the glass ceiling.

Vivian's jewelry has become a sort of shorthand for this critical issue. And it has created a sisterhood determined to sit and promote others to sit at the tables where public policy is debated and decided.

So it is fitting that this friend and constituent from Manhattan Beach, CA, will receive a special first Annual Glass Ceiling Award from Women Construction Owners and Executives [WCOE] in Los Angeles on June 9, 1994.

Mr. Speaker, Vivian L. Shimoyama has also written her "Vision Beyond The Glass Ceiling." I am pleased to close my statement with Vivian's words:

We strive for excellence,
Yet, at times we may not see
that invisible barrier to our advancement
* * *
The Glass Ceiling!
It takes belief in ourselves and
a leap of faith.
For then we make a difference and
reach our vision of
Breakthru! * * * Beyond the Glass Ceiling!

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA YEAGER

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Barbara Yeager on the occasion of her retirement from government service.

Many of my colleagues know Barbara Yeager from having worked with her. If you have not worked with her directly, I am confident that your staff members have had the pleasure of working with her.

Barbara Yeager has honorably served as a devoted employee of the U.S. Government for the last 33 years. She has worked for every service in the Department of Defense. Barbara worked for the U.S. Navy in Morocco; for the U.S. Army at Camp Detrick, MD; for the U.S. Marine Corps at Camp Lejeune, NC; for the U.S. Air Force in Dover, DE; for the U.S. Navy in Lewes, DE; for the U.S. Army Personnel Command in Alexandria, VA; and most recently, for the U.S. Army in the House of Representatives liaison office in Washington, DC.

Barbara Yeager's dedication to her country is second only to her love and dedication for her family. She was married at age 19 and accompanied her Navy husband, Stephen, to Morocco where their first child was born in 1952. Over the next 6 years, they were blessed with three more children. Then in 1967, her husband died suddenly. At age 34, Barbara was left to raise four children alone.

Despite this adversity, Barbara continued serving here country. She earned an associates degree while attending college on a part-time basis. She opened her home to a French exchange student. In addition, Barbara Yeager generously volunteered her time with a local hospital's drug crisis hotline. Through all of this, she raised here family in a loving atmosphere and is now the proud grandmother of six.

Mr. Speaker, Barbara Yeager has distinguished herself as a reliable and dedicated public servant and a genuine role model in her private life. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking her for her service to our country and wishing her well on the occasion of her retirement. We will all miss here.

PROTECT AMERICAN PROPERTY RIGHTS FROM EXPROPRIATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, over the past 1,500 years, a coherent and consistent body of admiralty law has evolved that has guided the conduct of nations and sailors on the high seas.

Adherence by the nations of the world to this international body of admiralty law has been remarkable. The relative tranquility between nations over disputes arising out of admiralty law is due in large measure to the recognition by all nations that only when such rules are recognized and followed by all can trade and commerce prosper, and chaos be avoided, on the high seas.

In the main, admiralty law has worked so well that few have paid it any notice. Unilateral, flagrant, and arbitrary defiance of well-recognized and long-established rules of conduct have been rare.

The maintenance of well established rules of admiralty was considered so important by our founding fathers that it is the only jurisdiction specifically conferred on our Federal court system by the U.S. Constitution. As the world's leading shipper of goods on the high seas, the U.S. has an important interest in seeing that admiralty law, which has served trade so well in the past, continues to do so in the future.

Arbitrary disregard of well established rules of the high seas by any nation weakens the integrity of the system, and repeated often enough, could lead to a total breakdown of the system that has served us and the whole community of nations so well for so long.

To underscore the importance of maintaining the integrity of the system of international law governing conduct on the high seas, I have today introduced legislation, which provides that no preferential trade benefits may be extended to any nation that has unilaterally expropriated from U.S. citizens legitimate rights in property clearly conferred upon them under admiralty law. Property rights here specifically include the long-recognized rights of ownership and of maritime lien under the ancient laws of finds and salvage.

My bill is modest in that it does not compel the U.S. Government to take extraterritorial action against nations that have defied the laws of admiralty. It merely provides that where expropriation has occurred, no reward or preferential treatment may be extended to the offending nation. That is the very least that can be expected on behalf of an international

system to which most of the nations have scrupulously adhered most of the time. My bill does not require a resolution of expropriated disputes, it merely requires the President to make a finding that such disputes have been addressed in an appropriate manner before a reward of preferential treatment can be bestowed on another nation. Certainly U.S. citizens whose legitimate rights have been expropriated can expect at least that much from their Government.

As a case in point, way back in the early 1980's a U.S. company called the Sea Search Armada [SSA] discovered the long-lost Spanish treasure ship, the *San Jose*, off the coast of Colombia. Historians estimate the gold and silver on board to be worth $2 to $3 billion, some as high as $10 billion.

A distinguished panel of Colombian jurists found that under centuries old unquestioned international and admiralty law, SSA as the finder was entitled to a preferential right to salvage the long-lost ship, and to the customary half of the recovered treasure.

After first recognizing the validity of their own judicial panel's finding, the Colombian Government passed an after-the-fact law that the finders fee for the discovery of treasure would be limited to 5 percent and that the Colombian Government would tax half of that. This year Colombia's own constitutional court declared that act to be unconstitutional under Colombian law, just as our own courts have consistently found the retroactive taking away of rights and property conferred by admiralty law in similar cases are clearly unconstitutional.

In spite of their own court's findings and in defiance of clear international and admiralty law governing the finding of lost treasure, the Government of Colombia persists in claiming total and exclusive ownership of the long-lost *San Jose* and denying any and all rights of the discoverer in the treasure. The Colombian Navy has prevented the discoverer from coming near its find for over a decade and even as I speak is in final preparation with a private contractor to salvage the *San Jose*.

Such conduct should not be tolerated, but at the very least, such conduct should not be rewarded with preferential treatment by the United States. To do so would not only leave American citizens vulnerable to exploitation and expropriation, but would seriously undermine the precious system of admiralty law so carefully nurtured over so many centuries by so many nations. To reward such action would tell U.S. citizens who have invested $10 million and risked 2 years of their lives in order to earn rights in a treasure, that the U.S. Government is indifferent when those rights are expropriated by a foreign government. Of course we don't want to do that. It is to prevent such injustice that I have introduced this legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF LONG TERM CARE ACT OF 1994

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Long Term Care Act of 1994, cosponsored by my colleague from Connecticut, Congresswoman JOHNSON. This bill represents a comprehensive and bipartisan approach to one of the most pressing dilemmas facing American families—how to provide necessary care for loved ones during periods of illness and disability that may last for years.

All of us are familiar with the kind of difficulties—and sometimes tragedies—caused by the present system. Long-term care is expensive and can bankrupt a family, raising difficult financial issues at a time when people are already preoccupied with dealing with a prolonged illness. We have heard of families who face enormous financial and emotional strain trying to provide needed care; of assets accumulated over a lifetime being consumed unbelievably quickly; of individuals who must leave much-loved homes because there is no one to provide care there. All of us know we can do better.

This is not to say it will be easy. But we believe that we should, at the very least, take a first step toward addressing the problem of long-term care.

Working together, we have crafted a moderate bill which provides real assistance, while keeping costs at a reasonable level. The bill contains the following provisions:

Home care: The bill establishes a new home care program predominantly financed by the Federal Government and administered by the States. This program would provide needed home care to individuals unable to purchase private coverage;

Consumer protection: The bill calls for uniform Federal standards for long-term care insurance policies;

Tax incentives: It would establish tax incentives to individuals to encourage them to purchase long-term care insurance and for employers to provide this coverage in their health plans;

Asset protection: Patterned on the Connecticut model, the bill would promote State asset-protection plans which allow individuals to keep more of their assets, while still qualifying for Medicaid nursing home coverage;

IRA's: It would allow individuals to make penalty-free early withdrawals from individual retirement accounts to purchase long-term care insurance;

Death benefits: The bill would provide preferential tax treatment for accelerated death benefits for the terminally ill; and

Hospitals: It would improve Medicare payment limits for long-term and rehabilitation hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, as our society ages and as medical technology improves, long-term care is something that many of us will confront, for a family member or even for ourselves. We should not delay the debate on this issue any longer. As we debate health care reform, we must not overlook the importance of long-term care.

THE WELFARE TO WORK ACT OF 1994

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Welfare to Work Act of 1994. The purposes of this legislation are to provide an incentive for employers to hire current AFDC recipients, to reward work over welfare, and to create new jobs.

I developed this legislation because I am convinced that a vital element of welfare reform is for Government to provide business with the necessary tools to create enough jobs to employ everyone who is trained and qualified. My bill would give employers a 1-year refundable tax credit of up to $4,500 against the gross wages of a new employee hired off AFDC. A 50-percent credit applies to the first $6,000 of wages, and a 25-percent credit applies to the second $6,000 of wages, for a total of up to $4,500.

By subsidizing an AFDC recipient's wages for 1 year in a full-time job that pays well enough to live on, we can save hundreds of millions of dollars over the long run, ending the cycle of low-wage jobs and welfare dependency for tens of thousands of families. Many AFDC beneficiaries combine work with AFDC, but they cycle on and off welfare because the only work available is seasonal jobs or occasional jobs in which they work a few days at a time. Many more are in sectors of the workforce which are not covered by unemployment insurance, and AFDC provides a substitute safety net. The bill supplies a tax credit for employers who get someone off welfare, not for those who occasionally employ AFDC recipients in temporary, low-wage jobs. The Targeted Jobs Tax Credit already provides up to $2,400 for such hires. Thus, the welfare to work tax credit would replace TJTC for permanent, full-time hires.

The Welfare to Work Act can reduce the average stay on welfare by reducing the need for anyone to stay on it long term, through its double incentive approach for employers to hire AFDC recipients and for them to accept jobs at higher incomes. Further, the Welfare to Work Act will contribute to stabilizing families by helping people become self-reliant.

The State of Minnesota enacted a pilot program very similar to the Welfare to Work Act, called the Minnesota Emergency Employment Development Program [MEED]. The program gave direct cash subsidies every week to employers for wages of people they hired off the State's welfare program. The State paid employers $4 per hour of the employee's wage.

Minnesota's findings were impressive. The 2-year pilot program and 125,000 applicants from State welfare for 30,500 places. The program created 14,000 new jobs in the private sector and served as a powerful economic development tool. By its own account, the state recouped its entire investment in the program in 3 years, while it increased tax revenues and decreased welfare expenditures. Originally, the 2-year pilot program's goal was to place 40 percent of the participants in private sector

jobs; the rest were to be in Government. Private sector response was so positive that during the second year the private sector target was increased to 60 percent, and the actual private sector placement was 70 percent. At the end of the pilot program, more than 83 percent of the workers in the private sector stayed on the job—they were permanently employed, many for the first time. And the others did not all go back on welfare—many returned to school, or found other jobs.

The small business results were just as impressive. Of the businesses which employed people under the MEED program, 79 percent expanded their operations, and 52 percent invested in new equipment. More than 4,000 small businesses participated. Economic development was promoted by creating new jobs in small businesses for unemployed and displaced workers.

Reinvesting dollars which were formerly used for welfare as a temporary, 1-year wage subsidy creates an economic development "domino effect" through which businesses first expand their workforce and then require more raw materials, contributing to indirect employment of workers in other industries. The newly employed former welfare recipients buy more goods and services from their wages than they could from welfare payments, becoming better consumers as well as taxpayers.

In Connecticut, the maximum annual AFDC benefit for a family of three is $6,972. The Welfare to Work Act would save taxpayers the difference between the welfare payment and the tax credit: $2,472. In addition, there would be savings from reductions in food stamp benefits and Medicaid.

The Welfare to Work Act stipulates that an employer may only take the tax credit once per employee, to avoid creating a cycle in which employees are laid off and rehired so the employer can take the credit again. Further, the credit is only available for hiring an employee whose employment has not generated more than 24 months of such credit for any previous employers. This limitation effectively gives each AFDC recipient up to 2 years of work under the credit for different employers, if needed.

Of course, additional steps are needed to fully implement welfare reform, such as day care, health care, and job training. The Welfare to Work tax credit is an important part of helping to create the new jobs that will be necessary to end welfare dependence. With Welfare to Work, everybody wins: employers get a tax break to expand their business; AFDC recipients get more income and a brighter economic future; States and Federal Governments reduce expenditures for long-term welfare and realize increased revenues from expanded economic activity.

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE U.S.A. GOLD AWARD HONOREES

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute some outstanding young women who have been honored with the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. Gold Award by the Chautauqua Area Girl Scout Council in Jamestown, NY. They are Alice Harper, Elizabeth McIntyre, Renee McIntyre, Amberly Noble, Airani Sathananthan, and Tina Taby.

They were honored on May 22, 1994, for earning this highest achievement award in Girl Scouting. The Girl Scout Gold Award symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development and can be earned by girls aged 14 to 17 or in grades 9 to 12.

To receive the award a Girl Scout must fulfill five major requirements and a plan for fulfilling the requirements created by the Senior Girl Scout and is carried out through close cooperation between the girl and an adult Girl Scout volunteer.

The earning of the Girl Scout Gold Award is a major accomplishment for these girls, and I believe they should receive the public recognition due them for this significant service to their community and their country.

IN MEMORY OF HELEN ATTEBERRY

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, today I stand before you and this Congress to thank one of this country's unsung heroes, Helen Atteberry of Citrus Heights, CA, who passed away May 21, 1994.

Like many volunteers around the world who go about doing great deeds with no desire to be recognized, Helen Atteberry spent her life giving to others with the only thanks often being the smiles she received and the hearts she filled with love.

Not only did Helen Atteberry raise five wonderful children with her husband, Bob, but she impacted the lives of thousands of youths. As a high school teacher she taught young men and women the valuable skills of managing life. She later taught special education classes and, until recently, substitute taught up to 5 days a week.

At the same time she relished her work as a Campfire Girls leader and an international host for the American Field Service. Helen believed that hosting youths from other countries and helping them assimilate to American culture was the first step in creating international peace. Her spirit, love, and kindness will live on in all of these lives forever.

Like many volunteers, Helen Atteberry had a special knack for finding the right thing to say or do at exactly the right time. With a smile always on her face, she could light up the eyes of any child.

Perhaps it is the children that will miss her most, for they are the ones she so deeply cared about. Her memory, and her strength, however, will always be with us, to guide others who wish to give hope and love to all of the children of the world.

So let me close by reminding you of a scene from a very famous movie, in which it was said that, "For every bell that rings, an angel gets its wings." Today, when you hear a bell, know that Helen Atteberry, a devoted mother, wife, and volunteer, has received her wings.

RECOGNIZING TROY TECH HIGH SCHOOL

HON. JAY KIM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to take this opportunity to recognize the excellence and accomplishments of an outstanding school, Troy Tech High School. Troy Tech is a magnet school that draws students from a three-county area—Orange, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino Counties—and has demonstrated its commitment in its pursuit of educational excellence by participating in the Science Olympiad every year, and for the last 8 years has been runnerup for the California State title.

I am proud to inform you that Troy Tech earned their first trip this year to the Science Olympiad's national competition by placing first in California. Though the competition was tough and highly competitive, with 46 State teams participating—the Troy Tech team drove to a fourth place finish overall.

Troy Tech's first ever appearance in the national competition is made even more special since their successful overall finish was a result of exceptional teamwork, maturity, and many outstanding individual efforts. The Troy Tech team consisted of 17 students—15 regular plus 2 alternates—whose experience ranged from sophomore year all the way to senior year, two coaches, and Troy Tech's principal. Additionally, about half the team garnered individual medals for either first, second, or third place.

The competition lasted all of Saturday, May 21, 1994 from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and consisted of 25 rigorous events. The students were made aware of the subject areas that they would have to be familiar with, but they were not informed of the specific questions in advance.

Programs such as the Science Olympiad offer our students the opportunity to interact with other students who show similar potential, and therefore expand their knowledge of these critical subject areas. I am proud to see that there are institutions like Troy Tech which participate in these activities, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Troy Tech and the following participating students: Lindsey Atkinson, Dan Epstein, Melanie Everett, Walid Gardezi, Cory Griffin, Jaideep Iyengar, Margaret Keig, Charity Kruidhof, John Makevich, Joyce Matsumoto, Sid Padmanabha, David Ross, Billy Shih, Jim Southard, Jason Van Norman, Kirsten Zeydel, and Kublai Shive; and faculty, coaches: Kurt Wahl, and Dan Jundanian, and principal Jerry Atkin, for a job well done.

MONSIGNOR ALEXANDER KULIK HONORED FOR 40 YEARS IN PRIESTHOOD

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Monsignor Alexander Kulik, who on June 5, 1994, will celebrate his 40th year in the priesthood and service to the Roman Catholic Church.

Monsignor Kulik was ordained in 1954, and after serving as assistant pastor in several different churches in the area, he began his duties as pastor of the Corpus Christi Church in Montdale in 1971. In 1977, Father Kulik assumed the pastoral duties of St. Mary's Church of the Maternity in Wilkes-Barre. A year later, he was elevated to the rank of Chaplain to His Holiness by Pope John Paul I, with the title of monsignor. In 1990, Father Kulik was made Prelate of Honor to His Holiness, Pope John Paul II.

Monsignor Kulik has faithfully served in northeastern Pennsylvania for these many years. His list of affiliations over the years is endless. Currently, he serves on the board of pastors for Bishop Hoban Schools and is the chaplain of the Polish American Congress, and the General Pulaski Society, to name but a few.

I am pleased to bring the long and successful career of Monsignor Alexander Kulik to the attention of my colleagues and to wish him well as he begins yet another decade of service to the church and to our community.

A TO Z SPENDING CUTS NEEDED

HON. WILLIAM H. ZELIFF, JR.

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise because this House has been shut out of the legislative process.

The legislation before us—the legislative appropriations—is being brought up under a closed rule. That prohibits real debate and real votes on real spending cuts from A to Z.

This House has not, and will not, be allowed by its leadership to have any real input on spending priorities for America.

This is precisely why we need the A to Z spending cuts plan. Members would be able to offer spending cuts, have them fully debated, and receive a roll call vote on each spending cut.

Under A to Z we could have real votes on real spending cuts that the Rules Committee has bottled up.

The Rules Committee refused to allow us to debate or vote on 31 amendments:

For example, the Rules Committee prohibited a Boehner amendment to cut committee funding by $2.2 million.

Mr. Boehner represents 571,000 people whose voices cannot be heard because the leadership's gag rule turns down their Representative's amendment.

These spending cuts were worthy of consideration, but the Rules Committee has chosen to ignore them.

The Rules Committee has chosen to ignore elected Members of this House, and the millions of Americans they represent. This is unacceptable.

We need the A to Z spending cuts plan because it would allow us to trim the fat from the budget.

ANN-MARIE ADKER, PUBLIC SERVICE ROLE MODEL

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in celebration of the life, legacy, and many contributions made by Ann-Marie Adker, a matriarch of our community and unofficial mayor of Overtown.

For nearly five decades, Ann-Marie served the residents of her community and waged many battles on their behalf. Through her efforts, Miami's first police substation was established in Overtown, and a neighborhood center and health clinic soon followed.

Ann-Marie was an ardent warrior for the citizens of Overtown, and the poor. The works of few people in our community have captured the hearts and stirred the souls and imaginations of Miamians like those of Ann-Marie Adker.

No one could speak for the people of Overtown like Ann-Marie. She lived there. She knew the people. She knew the problems. And, she knew the solutions.

I've worked with Ann-Marie on dozens of projects and was always impressed by her energy, personal integrity, intelligence, and intense passionate concern for her friends and neighbors and even for people she never met.

Mr. Speaker, it's people like Ann-Marie that make our communities work, for they ensure that the tasks that need to get done are done, and that attention is paid to neighborhoods that are too often overlooked.

Ann-Marie understood that the quality of life centers around home and the neighborhood. Though she often worked on big projects with far reaching implications, she never lost sight of the fact that the success of even the largest projects must be measured by how they improve the lives of individuals and families.

I encourage young people to get involved in government service, but clearly Ann-Marie was every bit as effective as most civil servants, and far more effective than many. She was as familiar at City Hall as any elected official, and certainly as respected. Ann-Marie was a true public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in extending deepest condolences to Ann-Marie's family: her daughters Williene Adker, Barbara Adker, and Karen King; sons Winfred Young, Willie Everette Adker and Keith Adker; brother Claudell Young; former husband Willie Adker; 20 grandchildren and 12 great-grandchildren.

Overtown, and indeed, all of America, has suffered a great loss.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN UZBEKISTAN

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Uzbekistan's regime continues to flout CSCE commitments by cracking down on opposition activists and violating their human rights. Even more alarming, Uzbekistan's security agencies have reached beyond the country's borders to attack and intimidate Uzbek human rights activists abroad. The United States must communicate to Uzbekistan that such behavior is intolerable.

Under President Islam Karimov, Uzbekistan's democratic opposition has been terrorized out of existence. Erk and Birlik, the two largest political groups, have been shut down and their leaders hounded into exile. Mohammad Solikh, the chairman of Erk, now lives in Istanbul, after going underground in his homeland to escape the security services' dragnet. Also in Istanbul is Abdurrakhim Pulatov, the chairman of Birlik, who was nearly killed when he was beaten on the head with metal rods in Tashkent, Uzbekistan's capital.

Pulatov's brother Abdumannob, a member of Birlik's leadership, received special attention from Uzbekistan's coercive apparatus. While attending a human rights conference in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, in December 1992, Uzbek security agents kidnaped him and forcibly brought him to Tashkent, where he stood trial on trumped-up charges of "insulting the dignity of the president." Fortunately, a groundswell of international publicity and interest in the case saved him from prison: the court convicted him, but he was amnestied and now lives in the United States.

Apparently undeterred by the international condemnation connected with that incident, Uzbek security, it seems, last week tried the same tactic. Uzbek agents went to Almaty, Kazakhstan, to inquire about Uzbek human rights activists assembled there for a conference organized by the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews. Informed about the Uzbeks' presence and likely purpose, Kazakhstan's authorities promptly deported them, for which they deserve credit.

No Uzbek activists suffered harassment in Kazakhstan. In Uzbekistan, however, two members of the opposition group Birlik were reportedly detained to prevent their travel to Kazakhstan for the conference.

What underlies this behavior was an attitude that Uzbek Government officials recently made explicit at a CSCE-sponsored Seminar on the Human Dimension in Almaty. They argued that, as Uzbekistan is not a European state, perhaps Western concepts of human rights were not applicable there.

Mr. Speaker, Uzbekistan in 1992 voluntarily joined the CSCE, by which act it freely obligated itself to fulfill CSCE commitments. The very basis of the CSCE—and of modern, civilized countries—is the belief that human rights are inalienable and universal, regardless of history, cultural traditions or values. If Uzbekistan's president and government do not subscribe to this belief, maybe they should reconsider their membership in CSCE and the benefits it confers. Meanwhile, they should expect continued criticism of their repressive

policies, which are impeding the improvement of United States-Uzbek relations.

THE "JEREMIAH O'BRIEN"

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as America prepares to honor its war dead this Memorial Day, and as we prepare to honor those brave Americans who gave the ultimate sacrifice on D-day 50 years ago, let us also pay tribute to those who survived to ensure that their sacrifices have not been forgotten.

This Monday last, the *Jeremiah O'Brien*, the last seaworthy Liberty ship of World War II, completed its 32 day, 7,894 mile voyage from its berth in San Francisco to Portsmouth, England. From Captain George Jahn, the 78-year-old World War II Liberty Ship captain; to 75-year-old chief engineer Richard Brannon; to Mary Steinburg, a former Navy secretary who worked in the sweltering engine room; to Carl Nolte, a San Francisco Chronicle reporter by trade; and, last but not least, retired Adm. Thomas Patterson, who rescued the *O'Brien* from mothballs in 1979 and led the efforts that restored its seaworthiness, the *O'Brien*'s 55-strong all-volunteer crew turned a labor of love into a voyage of history.

The *Jeremiah O'Brien* will be the only surviving ship of the 5,000 vessel-strong D-day armada to participate in the 50th anniversary commemorative ceremonies. If anyone doubts that the American spirit of adventure has subsided, or that American patriotism is a thing of the past, let them speak to the men and women who restored and sailed the *Jeremiah O'Brien*.

Mr. Speaker, let us offer the congratulations of the Congress to the sterling crew of the *Jeremiah O'Brien* and our thanks for their contributions to remembering our Nation's heroes on this Memorial Day weekend.

CONTINUITY OF CARE WEEK

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, whereas, the concept of Continuity of Care is an essential component of today's health care delivery system; and

Whereas, the professionals responsible for Continuity of Care comprise a variety of disciplines, educational backgrounds, and practice in diverse settings; and

Whereas, Continuity of Care professionals function as facilitators, caregivers, and advocates to ensure that patients receive quality, cost-effective health care services;

Therefore, in recognition of these individuals' dedication and commitment to health care, Congressman BOBBY L. RUSH endorses the week of September 18–25, 1994 as "Continuity of Care Week."

REV. VALENTINE PLEVYAK HONORED AS MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rev. Valentine Plevyak. On June 5, 1994, Father Plevyak will be honored as Man of the Year by the Lackawanna County Friends of Poland Society. This is the 49th year for this event, and it marks the 202d anniversary of Poland's Constitution.

Father Plevyak was 1 of 11 children born to Joseph and Catherine Stoklosa Plevyak. Educated in Lackawanna County schools, young Valentine left the area to attend St. Bonaventure University in New York, which he graduated from in 1940. He stayed at St. Bonaventure to further his studies at the seminary there. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1944 by the Most Reverend Bishop Hafey of Scranton. Father Plevyak never forgot his days at St. Bonaventure and has been honored several times by the Alumni Association for his outstanding contributions to his alma mater. Father Plevyak has a long list of parishes that he faithfully served in his 50-year career. He is still a aboard member of the Mercy Health Care Center in Nanticoke.

In addition to his professional attributes, many of Father Plevyak's friends have lauded his athletic ability as a baseball player, noting his performances on high school and semipro teams. In the 1950's he played on the Wyoming Valley League All-Stars against the Wilkes-Barre Barons. A natural and acclaimed athlete, Father was an outstanding bowler and golfer.

I am pleased to join with the community in honoring this distinguished man for his 50 years of dedicated service to northeastern Pennsylvania. It is very appropriate that Father Plevyak be honored for his long-time devotion to his church and to the community it serves.

IN OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in 1944, Milwaukee community leaders founded the War Memorial Corp. "To Honor the Dead by Serving the Living." In February of this year, Secretary of Defense Perry designated the Milwaukee County War Memorial Center as a Commemorative Community for its support of the 50th anniversary of World War II. The War Memorial's efforts over the past 50 years to advance civic pursuits, culture, education, and art and to draw attention to the contributions of our Nation's veterans, which have made Milwaukee a better place to live. For this we are grateful.

In observance of the 50th anniversary of the "D-day" invasion of Normandy, which heralded the beginning of the end of World War II; in memory of the patriots who fought and fell in that battle; in honor of the men and women who have served before and since, during peacetime or war; and in observance of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Milwaukee County War Memorial, I recommit to our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a prayer offered by President Franklin Roosevelt to an uncertain people on the evening of June 6, 1944:

"Almighty God: our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity.

Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

They will need Thy blessings. Their road will be long and hard. For the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again: and we know that by Thy grace, and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph.

They will be sore tried, by night and by day, without rest—until the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken with the violences of war.

For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and good will among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home.

Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them. They heroic servants, into They kingdom.

And for us at home—fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters and brothers of brave men overseas—whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them—help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice.

Many people have urged that I call the Nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer. As we rise to each new day, and again when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips, invoking Thy help to our efforts.

Give us strength, too—strength in our daily tasks, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and the material support of our armed forces.

And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail, to bear the sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons wheresoever they may be.

And, O Lord, give us faith. Give us faith in Thee; faith in our sons; faith in each other; faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters of but fleeting moment—let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose.

With They blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogancies. Lead us to the saving of our country, and with our sister nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace—a peace invulnerable to the schemings of unworthy men. And a peace that will let all men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil. Thy will be done, Almighty God. Amen.

IN MEMORY OF DR. LISA BECHTEL

HON. JAMES H. BILBRAY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the lifetime of dedication of an outstanding Las Vagan. Throughout her life, Dr. Lisa Bechtel served as an inspiration to all those who knew her. As a young girl battling with a serious childhood lung disease, she dreamed of the day when she would be able to touch the lives of others as a physician. To all those fortunate enough to know her, Lisa showed those special traits of true self-sacrifice and love for her fellow human beings which are so precious and so rare.

The pride of her family, Dr. Bechtel grew up in Las Vagas and graduated from Las Vegas High School in 1977. After college, she attended Fordham University School of Medicine in New York City and completed her residency in family practice as Shadyside Hospital in Pittsburgh. In a world where young professionals are all too often caught up in career advancement and financial achievement, Dr. Bechtel dedicated each day to selflessly serving her fellow Nevadans in need. To repay her student loans, she took an unglamorous position as a family practitioner in rural Caliente, NV. Early in 1992, she began working with AIDS patients in Las Vegas, where she spearheaded new programs for women and children suffering from the ravages of that disease.

Dr. Bechtel was recognized by all segments of our community as a dedicated healer, a true exemplar of those who serve others according to the Hippocratic oath. The compassion she brought to her work will long be remembered by all who were touched by her care.

And so I ask my colleagues to rise with me today in memory of a truly great Nevadan, her accomplishments and her committed spirit.

TRIBUTE TO WATCHUNG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. HERB KLEIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise today to announce that the prestigious Blue Ribbon Schools Award will be given to the Watchung School of Montclair, a public elementary school in my district. As an answer to President Clinton's call to move the Nation towards achieving national education standards under Goals 2000: Educate America, the Blue Ribbon Schools Program initiates the action to fulfill its letter and spirit by pushing our educational system to perform at its best. The Blue Ribbon Schools Program identifies and recognizes a diverse group of public and private schools which display a number of qualities of excellence that will be necessary in tomorrow's schools.

The Watchung School is a model public elementary school that is paving the way for a bright and productive future for our community by educating our children with more than numbers and the alphabet, but by teaching our children "can-do" attitudes, leadership, and values that contribute to the growth of their souls as well as their minds. The teachers and administrators at Watchung inspire the students to not only learn, but to excel.

By fulfilling the criteria used by the Blue Ribbon Schools Program review panel, Watchung School demonstrated excellence with high quality teaching; appropriate, up-to-date curriculum; policies and practices that ensure a safe environment conducive to learning; strong parental involvement; and an environment that conveys the message that all students can learn and achieve.

The Watchung School's positive learning environment, visionary curriculum, and strong community leadership make it the ideal recipient of the Blue Ribbon School Award. I congratulate the staff, students, and parents of the Watchung School on their outstanding achievements.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE SAM HALL OF TEXAS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in life, the happy man is the man who is happy doing what he does. The happiest person is the one who enjoys his work in this life. That is more important than making money or obtaining high status.

During Judge Sam Hall's service here as Congressman, he was happy being the Congressman from that district. He liked the challenge. He was comfortable serving on the Judiciary Committee, and he thoroughly enjoyed the comradery and friendship of his colleagues. Here in this hall, Sam Hall made lifelong friends, and I believe Sam Hall was happier here than anybody in the House. Of course, there were stern and difficult decisions, but that was a normal challenge.

Most of all Sam Hall enjoyed working with people and liked working out solutions without compromising his principles. Sam Hall came by this naturally. His family had been involved in legal and political matters for years, and he was an apt replacement for Wright Patman.

Those of us who served with Sam and Madeleine had the highest respect for him—and for her. He was a tough legislator, but he understood that each Member had to meet the challenge. I believe Sam Hall fell in love with the House of Representatives. Even after he went back to Texas and became a U.S. District judge, I really think his heart was in the House and those of us who served with him felt that same deep warmth of feeling.

Mr. Speaker, we loved Sam Hall. He was one of us. He loved this institution because it represented the people—and Sam Hall was of the people.

THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the students, faculty, and administrators of the Los Angeles County Regional Occupational Program [LACROP]. Through extensive partnerships with business and industry, the LACROP offers classes in a variety of formats which include classroom-only training, unpaid on-the-job training, and paid cooperative vocational education classes for students who are employed.

There are 21 participating school districts which contract with the Los Angeles County Office of Education in order to provide school-to-work transition programs for high school students and adults. The program offers approximately 300 classes in the following areas: agriculture, business, health-related occupations, home economics, marketing, trade and industry. In addition to the courses offered by the school districts in Los Angeles County, specialized occupational training is also offered by the private post-secondary schools under contract with the LACROP. These advanced programs include: airframe and power plant technology, barbering and cosmetology, medical, dental and pharmaceutical assistance, and graphic design.

The LACROP also provides specific on-the-job training through the apprenticeship and journeyman programs offered in conjunction with the California Apprenticeship Council and the local Joint Apprenticeship Committees. The classes offered through the apprenticeship programs include: air-conditioning and refrigeration, electrical, roofing, plumbing, and sheet metal apprenticeships.

As a result of the efforts of the Los Angeles County Regional Occupational Program, its students have been provided with marketable skills in an area hit hard by a depressed economy, massive layoffs, increases in violent crime, base closures, and a string of environmental disasters. I applaud the efforts and commitment of Bob Armor, coordinator in charge, of the Los Angeles County Regional Occupation Program, and all of those involved who have made this program such a success.

THE BLOOD OF 3,244 MEN ON NIXON AND KISSINGER'S HANDS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I speak today about the murderous actions of the late former President Richard Nixon and his national security advisor Henry Kissinger in the early 1970's.

The Nixon administration, elected with a pledge of having a secret plan to end the Vietnam war, took credit in the 1972 elections for the withdrawal from Vietnam and the wind down of the war.

The just-published "Haldeman Diaries," however, reveals that the withdrawal was delayed for raw, gross political reasons—to look better in the 1972 elections. According to a December 21, 1970 dairy entry in Haldeman's book found on page 223, Kissinger . . .

* * * argues against [an early] commitment . . . to withdraw all combat troops because he feels that if we pull them out by the end of '71, trouble could start mounting in '72 that we won't be able to deal with and which we'll have to answer for at the elections. He prefers, instead, a commitment to have them all out by the end of '72 so that we won't have to deliver finally until after the elections and therefore can keep our flanks protected.

Each day that we delayed our withdrawal, American servicemen died needlessly. Kissinger advised against early withdrawal for election reasons in December of 1970. According to Department of Defense statistics, 2,412 men died in 1971, another 767 in 1972, and 65 more in 1973. In total, 3,244 men died while the withdrawal was delayed for the purposes of ensuring the re-election of Richard Nixon and the sinecure of Henry Kissinger.

One hundred and forty slabs of stone carry the names of 58,191 dead servicemen at the Vietnam Memorial. If Nixon and Kissinger had considered the lives of their fellow Americans instead of their own political victories, 7 stones would not have been needed. The next time you visit the Wall, think about it—1 out of every 20 names would not be there if we had pulled out quickly and decisively when Kissinger first discussed it. One out of every 20 names is there to help win an election for CREEP.

The blood of 3,244 servicemen is an enormous burden on the soul to take to your grave.

Following are more full quotes from the "Haldeman Diaries:"

[Kissinger] thinks that any pullout next year would be a serious mistake because the adverse reaction to it could set in well before the '72 elections. He favors, instead, a continued winding down and then a pullout right at the fall of '72 so that if any bad results follow they will be too late to affect the election. (p. 221)—December 15, 1970

This new action in Laos now would set us up so we wouldn't have to worry about the problems in '72, and that of course is the most important. (p. 239)—January 26, 1971

The President emphasized that all foreign policy initiatives are going to have to be completed by July 1972 because after that there will be a Democratic nominee and they'll insist that he be taken along on any trips and brought in on any discussions. (p. 293)—May 26, 1971

[President Nixon] this morning got into a discussion of how we're going to have to make a shift, as of now, throughout our entire shop to begin a totally oriented commitment to relating everything we do to the political side, without appearing to do so. The question to be asked in weighing every answer is, "Does this help us politically?" (p. 298)—June 10, 1971

TRIBUTE TO ROTARY CLUB OF ORANGE, TX

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request inclusion in the RECORD some information about Rotary International and particularly about an outstanding Rotary Club in my district that is celebrating their 75th birthday on June 1, 1994. A club who truly epitomizes the Rotary Club motto of "Service Above Self."

The Rotary Club of Orange, TX, was founded on June 1, 1919, as the 487th club in the world organization that now numbers more than 25,000 clubs. For 75 years, Orange Rotarians have demonstrated the motto of "Service Above Self" in their work in the community and beyond. Current membership stands at 120 business and professional leaders from the Orange community.

H.J. Lutcher Stark was the organizer and first president of the Orange Rotary Club with the Beaumont Rotary Club serving as the sponsor. Since its organization, the Orange Rotary Club has sponsored two other Rotary Clubs: Vidor and Bridge City.

Rotary International was founded in 1905 by Paul P. Harris of Chicago, who decided to start a new kind of businessmen's club. The initial group consisted of a lawyer, a tailor, a coal merchant, and an engineer who rotated their meeting places from office to office. From such humble beginnings, Rotary has grown to a membership exceeding a million. The concept of Rotary is to encourage and promote high ethical standards in business and professions, the recognition of the worthiness of all useful occupations, and the dignifying by each Rotarian of his occupation as an opportunity to serve society.

Among the many programs of Rotary International is PolioPlus, a massive effort to immunize the children of the world against poliomyelitis. It is part of a global effort to protect the children from five other deadly diseases as well, the "Plus" in PolioPlus. by 1992, Rotarians of the world had raised over $240 million in cash in support of PolioPlus.

Within the Rotary structure, the Orange Club has provided four district governors over the years. These individuals oversee the administration of all clubs within their assigned district.

The Orange Club has issued 111 Paul Harris fellows. Each Paul Harris fellow represents a $1,000 contribution to the Rotary Foundation which services many programs that build good will and understanding in the world.

The Orange Rotary Club has long been a contributor to many worthwhile causes including local youth programs—Help One Student To Succeed, Junior Achievement, YMCA basketball, Youth baseball programs, Youth soccer programs—and other community programs—DARE, Orange County Association for Retarded Children fishing rodeo, et cetera. The club has been active in sending youth to Rotary youth leadership awards camp. For many years, the club has provided scholarships to graduating seniors from the local high schools, Little Cypress and West Orange-Stark.

As it celebrates its 75th year, the Orange Rotary Club looks to the future with pride and determination to continue its tradition of "Service Above Self."

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID COVERAGE DATA BANK

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to postpone the implementation of a provision of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 relating to the Medicare and Medicaid coverage data bank.

Under current law, businesses are required to provide the data bank with information relating to the health insurance status of their employees and their employees' dependents. The catch is that the Health Care Financing Administration, the agency responsible for operating the data bank, has yet to issue regulations stating the specific information each business should be collecting. Under this law, firms could be fined for failure to comply with yet unspecified requirements.

Following is a summary of the bill:

The penalty for failure to report would be suspended until the first day of the first calendar year beginning 90 days after the Secretary of Health and Human Services has promulgated regulations regarding which information is required to be collected.

The bill would be effective as if it had been included in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

WHIRLPOOL CORP., LAVERGNE DIVISION: PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Whirlpool Corp. in LaVergne, TN, on receiving the 1993 Partners in Progress Award. Only the top 1 percent of Sears' suppliers receive this award which is based on market performance, service, product quality, and customer responsiveness.

Whirlpool puts American ingenuity to work every day as they manufacture the best in air control products. They have been recognized in recent years as leaders in environmental technology and continue to set the standard for performance.

I applaud the employees at LaVergne for their commitment to quality. Their attention to product innovation, marketing, and value certainly shows in the final product.

As division vice president, Doug Hutchins wisely stated, "People truly make the difference. High quality doesn't just happen; it's a result of a lot of hard work and dedication, and a real team effort."

Please join me in congratulating Whirlpool, and just as importantly, its workers in LaVergne, TN, who are the backbone of this continuing success story.

TRIBUTE TO UKRAINIAN VETERANS OF AMERICA

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian Veterans of America [UVA] must be commended today not only for the distinguished service they provided to the United States in wartime, but also for their tireless commitment to keeping the spirit of democracy alive in America. The UVA reminds us all of the importance of freedom and democracy by commemorating their fallen comrades and gathering to mark the anniversary of D-day.

The Ukrainian-American soldiers who fought for the United States with honor and pride have often been fighting for their adopted country. This fact underscores the allegiance of the Ukrainian people to democracy and freedom. Indeed, the UVA mandates respect for the ideals of American democracy, and commitment to the preservation of their Ukrainian heritage. To this end, the UVA actively supports a peaceful transition of Ukraine to a free and democratic society.

Michigan Post 101 is a model of unity and action among Ukrainian veterans. Since their formal installation in 1984, members of Post 101 in Warren have worked to expand membership and become more deeply involved in community and Ukrainian affairs. In 1988, as the largest UVA post in America, Post 101 reached out in support of Ukrainian human rights activists, working closely with other veterans' groups and human rights organizations in their efforts.

I am proud to have such an active and hardworking group in our district. This year, they are hosting Ukrainian-American veterans who served in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf as they gather for the national convention in Warren. Post 101 of the Ukrainian Veterans of America has grown into a tremendous source of unity and patriotism to all citizens in our community. I commend the members of Post 101 and the members of the ladies' auxiliary for their success in upholding the ideals of democracy and promoting a patriotic spirit.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN TA CHUAN FANG

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I spoke of the passing of a great American John Ta Chuan Fang. John was more than a close personal friend; John was the embodiment of all that is best about America. He was an immigrant who brought with him the values of hard work academic achievement, and family. He started as a reporter and built a publishing empire. He was a gentle spirit, warm, generous, and loyal. A refugee of communism, John embraced the freedoms of America which gave him the opportunity to succeed, and he returned that opportunity a thousandfold through his community work and his leadership on human rights issues throughout the world.

Today, appropriately on the date of his birth, Florence, his widow, and the Fang family will permanently enshrine a tribute to John at the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco. The Fang family gift is a handcrafted duobaoge, a treasure case which will become the "great treasure wall" of the Asian Art Museum's Gruhn Court. Modeled on a treasure case within the forbidden city, the great treasure wall is a moving testimonial to John and a fitting gift the city and country which he loved.

TRIBUTE TO GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. DAN HAMBURG

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute an outstanding young woman who has been honored with the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. Gold Award by the Napa-Solano Girl Scout Council in Napa County, CA. She is Lisa Rowe of Girl Scout Troop 270.

She is being honored on June 2, 1994 for earning the highest achievement award in Girl Scouting. The Girl Scout Gold Award symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development. The Girl Scout Gold Award can be earned by girls aged 14 to 17 or in grades 9 to 12.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., an organization serving over 2.6 million girls, has awarded more than 20,000 Girl Scout Gold Awards to Senior Girl Scouts since the inception of the program in 1980. To receive the award, a Girl Scout must fulfill five requirements: earn four interest project patches, earn the Career Exploration pin, earn the Senior Girl Scout Leadership Award, earn the Senior Girl Scout Challenge, and design and implement a Girl Scout Gold Award project. A plan for fulfilling the requirements of the award is created by the Senior Girl Scout and is carried out through close cooperation between the girl and an adult Girl Scout volunteer.

As a member of the Napa-Solano Girl Scout Council, Lisa Rowe began working toward the Girl Scout Gold Award in 1991. She worked with the St. Helena Women's center to prepare packets of material on women's health issues by gathering information on the importance of mammograms, the risks related to osteoporosis and other health concerns to women.

The earning of the Girl Scout Gold Award is a major accomplishment for Lisa Rowe, and I believe she should receive the public recognition due her for this significant service to her community and her country.

FCC REAUTHORIZATION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce, along with the ranking minority member, JACK FIELDS, legislation reauthorizing the Federal Communications Commission for fiscal year 1995 at $188.4 million. This figure reflects the resources the Commission needs to carry out its mission under the Communications Act. In particular, the Commission is working overtime in recent months to implement legislation this subcommittee has passed, the 1992 Cable Act and the 1993 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, which directed the Commission to establish rules for spectrum auctions and for personal communications services. These rulemakings are historic and demand great care and attention by the Commission. Because of this tremendous burden, I believe this funding level is needed to enable the Commission to fulfill its congressional obligations.

SIKHS MASSACRES REMEMBERED

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observance of the 10th anniversary of one of the most savage massacres in recent history. From June 3, 1984, through the 6th, Indian troops launched a vicious attack on the Sikhs' holiest shrine, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, and on 38 other Sikh shrines throughout Punjab, Khalistan. During the 4 days of slaughter, 20,000 Sikhs were killed by troops of the regime that claims to be the world's largest democracy.

The intense religious persecution and the intolerable human rights abuses against the Sikhs continue in Punjab, Khalistan. The Indian Government currently stations 500,000 heavily armed troops in Punjab, Khalistan. Detention without charge or trial, a shoot-on-sight policy, and torture are the tools the Indian Government uses to maintain its brutal grip on the Sikh nation.

I urge the American people, in the spirit of our Nation's longstanding record of supporting human rights and freedom around the world, to join the Sikh nation in remembering the brutal attack on the Golden Temple.

END INDIAN TYRANNY IN KHALISTAN

SUPPORT FREEDOM FOR THE SIKH HOMELAND

Today the Sikh nation faces merciless oppression at the hands of the Indian government. The man pictured above, Avtar Singh, was tortured to death with hot irons and electric shocks by the Indian police. Unfortunately, Avtar Singh is only one of thousands of Sikh men, women and children who have suffered torture, murder, rape and humiliation under the brunt of Indian government brutality.

UNTOLD HORRORS

In the Sikh homeland, Punjab, Khalistan, Indian security forces possess wide powers to

make arrests, jail people without trial, and shoot to kill. Indian security forces in Punjab, Khalistan kill 20 to 30 Sikhs everyday in extrajudicial killings and faked encounters. Last year, over 41,000 police officials received cash rewards for killing Sikhs.

Since 1984, over 115,000 Sikhs have been murdered by Indian security forces. According to the Movement Against State Repression, 60,000–70,000 Sikhs are in Indian jails without trial under laws declared "disturbing" and "completely unacceptable" by the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Regrettably, Amnesty International has been banned from conducting human rights investigations in India since 1978.

In the face of such oppression, the Sikh nation declared independence on October 7, 1987 forming the sovereign country of Khalistan. Like all nations, the Sikh nation desires freedom, democracy, humans rights, self-determination and rule of law.

AVERAGE PEOPLE SUFFER: SARABJIT SINGH THE MAN "TWICE KILLED"

On the morning of October 30, 1993, believe it or not, young Sarabjit Singh Waltoha was killed two times by the Indian police. Claiming that Sarabjit Singh was caught in the crossfire of a police "encounter," officers brought his supposedly dead body to Patti hospital in Punjab, Khalistan and order a postmortem examination.

Doctors at the hospital, however, found that Sarabjit was alive and transferred him to another ward. By the time Sarabjit Singh regained consciousness, word of his recovery had spread. Police, learning of their blunder, returned to the hospital, abducted Sarabjit Singh and reappeared three hours late with this dead body. Thus Sarabjit Singh as "twice killed." After doctors performed the postmortem, Sarabjit Singh's body was cremated by the police without returning it to his relations. Sadly, in Khalistan, such excesses are an everyday reality.

SIKHS ARE UNIQUE

Many members of the Sikh religion are recognizable by their colorfully turbans, and steel bracelets. Founded in 1469, the Sikh religion believes in one all powerful loving God, It requires full equality for women and rejects the caste system. Truth is held as the highest virtue, but still higher is truthful living. Sikhism preachers against pride, greed, anger, lust, and worldly attachment. Sikh belief holds that no intermediaries should stand between the creator and creation.

INDIA: NIGHTMARE OF MAJORITY TYRANNY

The popular conception of India as the "world's largest democracy" must be set aside when dealing with India's minority nations. India's political structure provides no safeguards for minorities, there is no American-style Bill of Rights, and so long as the Indian government can appeal to the over 80 percent Hindu population, accountability to minorities is neither required not politically advisable. For Sikhs and other minority nations, such as the oppressed Christians of Nagaland and Muslims of Kashmir, there has never been a secular India, there is only Hindustan—a country created by Hindus, for Hindus, with the goal of making the entire subcontinent Hindu.

SOME POLITICAL HISTORY

Many are unaware that the state called "India" was never historically one nation. When the British took the subcontinent in the mid 1800's, they conglomerated what is today called "India" simply for administrative purposes. In fact, the word "India" is not indigenous to its natives. It is a western term for the subcontinent. In actuality, India is a conglomerate of Nations held together by the nexus of oppression. It has as many as 18 official languages.

Directly before the era of British colonial rule, the Sikh nation ruled Punjab (in the Northwest corner of India) from 1765 to 1849. In British history books from the era, references to negotiations with the "Sikh nation" abound. In 1947, when Britain left India, the British again recognized Sikh sovereignty by negotiating the transfer of power to three nations: the Hindus, the Muslims and the Sikhs. The Muslims got Pakistan and the Hindu took India. The Sikhs, though they had ample opportunity, did not opt for a separate country.

Instead the Sikhs joined India with their homeland, Punjab, conditioned upon the solemn assurances by Indian leaders that the Sikhs would enjoy "the glow of freedom" and that no constitution would be adopted that was not expressly ratified by the Sikhs. But instead of the "glow of freedom," the Sikh nation has only suffered the shadow of oppression in India. When India's constitution was framed, it was so inimical to Sikh interests that Sikh representatives refused to append their signatures to the document. To this day no Sikh leader has ever signed India's constitution.

THE GOLDEN TEMPLE ATTACK: THE STRAW THAT BROKE THE CAMEL'S BACK

From June 4–6, 1984, the Indian government led an all out military attack on the Golden Temple, the holiest of Sikh shrines, and thirty eight other Sikh shrines throughout Punjab. The magnitude of this attack cannot be underestimated. It is comparable to an attack on the Vatican or Mecca.

The death and destruction inside the Golden Temple and throughout Punjab was disastrous. Over twenty thousand people were murdered, most of them innocent worshippers. The Indian army took pains to burn and destroy the Sikh library which contained countless original, holy and historic manuscripts. Newspaper reports chronicled mass executions of worshippers who were shot at point blank range. Even worse, after the attack, one hundred children between the ages of eight to twelve were lined up on the grounds of the Golden Temple and asked if they supported a free Khalistan. As each one answered in the affirmative, Indian security forces shot them dead.

THE COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN

When the Sikh nation declared independence on October 7, 1987, it named Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh as the President of the Council of Khalistan to lead the Sikh struggle for independence. Based in Washington, D.C., the Council of Khalistan has brought the Sikh freedom struggle to the attention of world leaders. The Council advocates liberating Khalistan through peaceful, non-violent means. Because of its efforts, numerous forms of legislation have come before the U.S. Congress in support of Sikh independence.

POLITICAL MILESTONES ACHIEVED BY THE COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN

1. On December 27, 1993, President Clinton wrote to Members of Congress, telling them he supports a 'peaceful solution' to the crisis in Punjab, Khalistan that 'protects Sikh rights.' He also said that human rights 'abuses still occur' in the Sikh homeland.

2. On November 17, 1993, 24 Members of Congress wrote to President Clinton, asking him to "diplomatically resolve the crisis in Khalistan."

3. On October 1, 1993, President Clinton signed the Foreign Aid Appropriations Bill. The bill included a $4.1 million cut in developmental aid to India in protest of its ongoing human rights violations against the Sikhs, and the freedom seeking Muslims of Kashmir.

4. On August 5, 1993 Congressman Pete Geren introduced House Concurrent Resolution 134. The resolution calls for a U.N.-sponsored plebiscite in Punjab, Khalistan so "Sikhs" may determine for themselves, under fair and peaceful conditions, their political future. It has the bi-partisan support of 16 influential members of the House of Representatives.

5. On January 24, 1993, Khalistan was admitted as a full member of the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO), a world wide body dedicated to advancing the freedom aspirations of its member nations.

KHALISTAN: A NATURAL ALLY OF THE WEST

A sovereign, democratic Khalistan will be the West's strongest ally in South Asia. Freedom for Khalistan, which would neutralize India's military power, will be a stabilizing force in South Asia. Free Khalistan will encourage India and Pakistan to sign the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and will work for a nuclear-free South Asia. Furthermore, Khalistan will trade with the rest of the world in an open market economy. Lastly, all people, Sikh and non-Sikh, will have full democratic rights and liberties in Khalistan.

WHAT YOU CAN DO TO HELP THE SIKH NATION TO LIBERATE KHALISTAN

You can help end the murder, rape and torture in Khalistan by contacting your local House Representatives and Senators.

Tell them:

1. Not a single U.S. tax dollar should go to fund the brutal Indian regime.

2. In the interests of lasting peace in South Asia, they should support freedom for Khalistan and specifically House Concurrent Resolution 134.

Contact:

The U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515. (202) 225–3121

The U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. (202) 224–3121

THE SIKHS WANT INDEPENDENCE

In light of our suffering, the Sikh nation demands outright independence from India. The Sikh nation feels that the only way it will be able to enjoy "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" is in a free and sovereign Khalistan. After reading this we hope you will support independence for Khalistan. Thank you for your support. God bless you.

For Further Information write to: Council of Khalistan, 2025 Eye St., N.W. #922, Washington, D.C. 20006. Telephone: Dr. G.S. Aulakh (202) 833–3262. Fax: (202) 452–9161

INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ENTREPRENEURIAL MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation at the request of the National Park Service to provide expanded authority for the collection of entrance and user

fees at National Park System units and to give greater flexibility to the National Park Service to establish partnerships and seek donations from the private sector.

The National Park Service Entrepreneurial Management Reform Act was drafted by the National Park Service. A number of the elements in the bill were recommended in the administration's National Performance Review. While I do not support several elements of the bill, I nevertheless believe it is important for Members to be able to review and debate the proposal and for the administration to have the opportunity to make its case for the legislation.

The fee portion of the bill would eliminate the current caps on entrance fees and give the Secretary of the Interior the discretion to set reasonable entrance, recreation, and special use fees. The current practice of charging entrance fees per vehicle would be replaced by a per person fee, and current statutory prohibitions on entrance fee collection would be eliminated. Fee revenue would be available to pay for the costs of collection and 50 percent of any additional receipts over the amount collected in fiscal year 1994 would be available for use in units of the National Park System without appropriation by Congress.

The bill also contains several entrepreneurial management elements. First, it would authorize the Secretary of the Interior and certain National Park Service employees to seek donations of money, property, and services from foundations, corporations, and other potential donors, subject to certain guidelines. Second, it would authorize the Secretary to recover restitution on account of damage to park resources or property resulting from vandalism or accidental damages. Settlement money would go to the National Park Service for park purposes. Third, the bill expands the current challenge cost-share program to allow any funds appropriated for the operation of the National Park Service to be used to carry out challenge cost-share agreement.

I appreciate the Clinton administration's effort to seek methods of increasing revenues to help pay for the preservation of the natural and cultural resources of the National Park System. I look forward to working with the administration and other Members in reviewing and refining this proposal.

TRIBUTE TO GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. DAN HAMBURG

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, today I salute an outstanding young woman who has been honored with the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. Gold Award by the Napa-Solano Girl Scout Council in Solano County, CA. She is Becky Moeser of Girl Scout Troop 349.

She is being honored on June 2, 1994 for earning the highest achievement award in Girl Scouting. The Girl Scout Gold Award symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development. The Girl Scout Gold Award can be earned by girls aged 14–17 or in grades 9–12.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., an organization serving over 2.6 million girls, has awarded more than 20,000 Girl Scout Gold Awards to Senior Girl Scouts since the inception of the program in 1980. To receive the award, a Girl Scout must fulfill five requirements: earn four interest project patches, earn the Career Exploration pin, earn the Senior Girl Scout Leadership Award, earn the Senior Girl Scout Challenge, and design and implement a Girl Scout Gold Award project. A plan for fulfilling the requirements of the award is created by the Senior Girl Scout and is carried out through close cooperation between the girl and an adult Girl Scout volunteer.

As a member of the Napa-Solano Girl Scout Council, Becky Moeser began working toward the Girl Scout Gold Award in 1993. She coordinated free swimming lessons for non-English speeking children in Vacaville.

The earning of the Girl Scout Gold Award is a major accomplishment for Becky Moeser, and I believe she should receive the public recognition due her for this significant service to her community and her country.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ONCE AGAIN TURNS HIS BACK ON CAMPAIGN PROMISES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, he's done it again.

The President of the United States a few minutes ago—after delivering a tough trade/human rights ultimatum to the Chinese dictatorship in Beijing 1 year ago, has not only shied away from adhering to his own Executive order but has turned his back on the oppressed in China.

In a test of wills with Beijing, Mr. Clinton not only blinked but he closed his eyes to the pain and suffering of millions of people. By delinking human rights and trade, Mr. Clinton is signaling surrender to the hardliners.

Mr. Speaker, for the past year his administration has been like the Tower of Babel, speaking with many tongues, sending mixed messages, floating trial balloons and suggesting that a whitewash or reversal was being cooked up.

As a candidate, Mr. Clinton chided the Bush administration for its policy toward China—saying that "our Nation has a higher purpose than to coddle dictators." As president, and with great bravado, Mr. Clinton conditioned the renewal of MFN on clear, internationally accepted human rights standards.

Mr. Clinton once said that in foreign policy, one had to have "great personal strength to make the right decision." However, it takes little personal strength to turn your back on millions of prisoners forced into slave labor.

It takes little personal strength to close your eyes to the millions of women and children victimized by draconian population control policies which include forced abortion and sterilization, and the brutal murders of babies who are born but don't meet standards of health, ability, or are just not the right sex.

It takes little personal strength to ignore the millions who are denied the right to practice their faith freely and are detained, imprisoned, tortured and even put to death.

It takes little personal strength to not hear the cries of those who support democratic reform and languish in the prisons for expressing their opposition to a government who would resort to anything to stay in power.

It takes little personal strength to watch while the cultural heritage of millions in Tibet is being destroyed and relegated to history.

What does take great personal strength? To stand up to the repressive Chinese Government which victimizes millions of its people each day in order to retain control and profit at their expense. Reports from human rights groups and from people who have recently been to China are filled with the cases of people of great personal strength.

Just last week, Harry Wu returned from China with documentation about the continued use of prison labor used to manufacture products for export—much of it for export to the United States. The 1992 MOU, a flawed agreement from the beginning, calls for prompt investigation of any claims that forced labor products were being exported to the United States. Customs and State Department officials have said that the Chinese have done nothing promptly. A new agreement, signed in March, allows the Chinese a full 60 days from the time the United States asks for an investigation to allowing an investigation. That is enough time not only to clean up the prisons but to outfit them with karaoke nightclubs. Who are the Chinese trying to fool? Well, they fooled Mr. Clinton who today has suggested that sufficient progress has been made in this area. What nonsense.

Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, the Puebla Institute have all issued reports in the last month detailing the renewed repression of religion, listing priests, ministers, monks, and nuns who are imprisoned or under some other type of detention. All of them have said that religious repression has gotten worse in this past year, and especially since January. Just 3 days ago a 30-year-old Catholic priest was arrested for administering sacraments to an elderly priest.

Of the nearly 1,500 prisoners of conscience listed by Human Rights Watch, only a small fraction have been released, and little new information has been obtained. And this list of 1,500 prisoners is probably only a fraction of those who are victims of the Chinese prison system.

China has not made significant progress in any condition outlined in the Executive order. To reward them now is a scandal. To say now that there is overall significant progress or to take an action that can be construed to suggest this, is a whitewash. Mr. Clinton has succeeded once again in turning away from his campaign promises, turning his back on the victims of repression, and this time—not just coddling dictators—but kneeling down with the Beijing dictators in worship of the almighty dollar. What President Clinton has done is to invite every regime in the world to test our word and to call our bluff. This is scary.

TRACKING COACH DOYLE

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. BARCIA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in appreciation of the exceptional dedication exhibited by Coach James T. Doyle during his 14 years of tireless service to our youth as the varsity girl's track coach for John Glenn High School.

The Bangor Township Board of Education, among his many friends and neighbors, this Friday will recognize Coach Doyle's lasting contributions to both school and community with the designation of the "James T. Doyle Track" at John Glenn High School. James Doyle has been a teacher of life's lessons so often found in athletic competition.

As a coach, Mr. Doyle's accomplishments are many. Led by Coach Doyle, the John Glenn team was crowned Bay County champions 11 of 14 years, won 41 invitationals, and were White Pine Conference champions 8 times. Having coached 2 State champions and 60 other State qualifiers, Coach Doyle continues to transform enthusiastic runners into great athletes.

I urge all of my colleagues to wish Coach Doyle, his wife Carol, and daughters Kelly and Sharon our very best as he continues to profoundly affect the lives of our youth, developing attributes of friendship, discipline, and commitment with a track named in his honor worthy of President Clinton's own passion for running.

JUNIOR ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL SOCIETY OF WARREN AREA HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL CHAMPIONS IN THE TESTS OF ENGINEERING APTITUDE, MATH AND SCIENCE COMPETITION, WARREN, PA

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the members of the Junior Engineering and Technical Society [JETS], of Warren, PA who recently won first place in the nationwide tests of engineering aptitude, math and science competition.

The following eight young men: Joshua Anderson, Matthew Lewis, Justin Peterson, Sean Smith, Craig Williams, Ryan Bailey, Paul Giannine, and Jason Ritter, should be commended for their ability to work well as a team and to conceptualize solutions to very difficult problems. Truly, these students exemplify the brilliant young minds that will lead America into the next century.

It is also important to recognize the outstanding job of the JETS coach, Beth Otterbein. Her support and guidance led the JETS, from Warren Area High School, in their mission to defeat 70 high schools from across the country, and eventually claim victory at the TEAMS test.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize the JETS of Warren, PA for having earned the title of National Champions at the TEAMS competition. These fine young men personify "commitment to excellence" in all of their academic pursuits. It is my privilege to congratulate the JETS for their hard-earned and well-deserved victory.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LONG-TERM CARE ACT OF 1994

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to cosponsor a long-term care proposal with my colleague from Connecticut, Mrs. KENNELLY, because I believe it will help to move the important issue of long-term care to the forefront of the health care reform debate. This proposal shows that there are bipartisan solutions to the very real world problems that thousands of Americans face regarding their long-term care needs.

For far too long, long-term care services have been viewed as separate and distinct from health care services. It is time to recognize that long-term care is in fact part of the continuum of services that should be incorporated into any health care reform proposal this Congress enacts. The legislation we introduced today will do several things to ensure Americans have access to long-term care insurance so that they may better plan for their individual needs and that individuals with limited resources have access to long-term care services that will allow them to maintain as great a degree of independence as possible through the use of home and community based care.

Long-term care insurance is a rapidly growing market that offers the best option for providing greater coverage for nursing home and home care. Unfortunately, it is expensive to purchase long-term care insurance and policies don't always deliver what they appear to promise. Some insurers have designed long-term care policies that limit their liability in ways purchasers don't suspect. Many policies are medically underwritten to exclude persons with certain illnesses or contain fine print benefit restrictions that limit access to what one would assume was covered care. The legislation we are introducing today will help to develop a public-private partnership which will guarantee individuals who purchase at least 1 year of insurance coverage will be protected against catastrophic long-term care costs.

Although the National Association of Insurance Commissioners has taken steps toward establishing standards for regulating long-term care insurance, most States have been slow to adopt them. This proposal rectifies the inconsistencies in the long-term care insurance market by standardizing policies and the sale of insurance.

In addition, the legislation provides a series of tax changes that will help people afford this important coverage. The bill treats long-term care insurance the same as health and accident insurance, allowing premium deductibility. States could be required to develop asset protection programs that will provide individuals with a certain level of asset protection based on the level of insurance protection they purchase. By rewarding those taking responsibility for some of their long-term care costs, we can create the kind of partnership necessary to provide affordable security for seniors against the catastrophic costs of institutional care.

Finally, this bill will provide a broader range of options to individuals with limited means—below 250 percent of poverty—to ensure they have access to those long-term home care services which best meet their needs. Specifically, this proposal provides grants to States for the development of home and community based care programs to complement the nursing home care that is currently covered under the Medicaid program.

Taken in its entirety, this proposal provides an outline of the policies which should be included in any reform proposal to provide Americans with the peace of mind they deserve when it comes to protecting themselves and their families. I am proud to cosponsor this proposal.

STATEMENT HONORING CAPT. STEVEN C. WIEGERS

HON. THOMAS W. EWING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to applaud Capt. Steven C. Wiegers who was raised in Pontiac, IL. Captain Wiegers, along with 27 outstanding young officers, will be presented the General Douglas MacArthur Leadership Award at the Pentagon by Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan, Army Chief of Staff, and retired Gen. Alexander M. Haig, Jr. Captain Wiegers will receive a bronze bust of the late General MacArthur. The General Douglas MacArthur Leadership Award recognizes young officers who demonstrate the ideals for which General MacArthur stood—duty, honor, country.

Capt. Steven C. Wiegers represents the U.S. Army Materiel Command. He was assigned as commander, Headquarters and Military Support Company, U.S. Army Combat Systems Test Activity, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, when selected.

Maj. Gen. Richard W. Tragemann nominated Captain Wiegers for this prestigious award. To quote Major General Tragemann:

> As Commander, Captain Wiegers has made an immeasurable contribution to the quality of life of his assigned soldiers and significantly impacted numerous test programs. His diligence, leadership, and technical expertise have played key roles in the outstanding performance of his company, enhancing the mission of this command and promoting the ideals General Douglas MacArthur represented.

Those who supported Captain Wiegers' nomination cite his initiatives which provided the continued success of the developmental testing mission while ensuring the welfare of his soldiers. Through his innovation, enthusiasm, and personal devotion for his soldiers, Captain Wiegers has built and maintained high

levels of unit morale and loyalty. Captain Wiegers' nominators also note that his unquestionable integrity, trustworthy demeanor, and unselfish attitude are examples for other soldiers to emulate.

Outside of his official duties, Captain Wiegers volunteers at the Disabled American Veterans Thrift Shop, successfully coordinates fund raising events and coaches little league baseball.

I welcome Captain Wiegers and his family, including his mother Mrs. Shirley Wiegers of Pontiac, IL, to Washington, DC, for the award ceremony at the Pentagon. Congratulations on your outstanding accomplishments. Your home State of Illinois and your country are proud to be served by such a fine individual.

FOCUSSING MFN FOR CHINA ON UNITED STATES INTERESTS

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days, President Clinton is going to make an announcement regarding our Nation's economic and political relations with China. Namely, he will decide whether to maintain normal trade relations with the most populace country in the world, and the third largest economy.

The China MFN debate has now raged for 5 years. During that time, China's economy has roared ahead, placing it squarely in the center of the Asian growth region. In addition, the bipolar cold war ended, dramatically changing the political and security environment in Asia. Finally, there has been a growing recognition here in the United States that economic and strategic relations with the countries of Asia and the Pacific rim are increasingly critical to our future prosperity and security.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a short essay by Amos A. Jordan, president of Pacific Forum CSIS, which touches on the different national interests that must be weighed if a sound decision is to be made regarding relations with China.

MAY 16, 1994

FRAMING THE CHINA MFN QUESTION SENSIBLY

As the June 3 deadline approaches for deciding whether or not China's Most Favored Nation (MFN) trade status should continue, the rancorous debate is increasingly off the point. The matter is being wrongly cast as a choice between our commercial interests and human rights ideals. This not only unnecessarily forces an impossible choice, but also evades the real point.

The real issue is whether denial of normal trading relations with China (and normality is what MFN amounts to) will advance or weaken vital American interests. Congressman Lee Hamilton rightly identified the relevant key question: will China "move toward adherence to international norms of behavior—whether the issue is trade, nonproliferation, or human rights—and be a force for stability in East Asia; or become the hegemonic power in East Asia, enforcing its will with military threats and playing a dangerous balance of power game in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the Middle East." Our policies can influence the choice.

Of course, United States policy on MFN will not determine China's future, despite continuing illusions of American omnipotence in some quarters—indeed, rather than isolating China by our unilateral actions, there is a greater likelihood we will isolate ourselves. Nevertheless, in the short run at least, China's economic and political prospects will be powerfully influenced by American policy. We need, therefore, to think carefully about the nature of our overall relationship with China as we make the MFN decision. As former Secretary of State Vance and others have said, we cannot let the extraordinarily important and complex Chinese-American relationship be dominated by a single factor.

Looking at the totality of our interests in China, it is clear that the international security ramifications of our relationship with Beijing are important, perhaps vital; yet these are seldom even mentioned in the hubbub about the supposed economic interest-human rights tradeoff. China is already a major regional actor with increasing power projection capabilities and a military modernization effort that profoundly worries its neighbors. Beijing's cooperation on a number of issues is important such as the North Korean nuclear problem, missile proliferation, nuclear weapons testing, proliferation of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, etc. Thus, the whole complex U.S.-China relationship—with its global ramifications—needs to be placed on the balance beam, not just our commercial interests, important as those are.

Revoking China's MFN status will undoubtedly hurt China, for the U.S. is its largest market; it will particularly damage the modernizing elements in Southeast China and Hong Kong that are the leading exporters and the best hope for building a less repressive China. Retaliation by China is certain, with a resultant downward spiral in the overall relationship clearly predictable. In the current era of economic interdependence, the cost to the United States will also be substantial—the World Bank estimates it will cost American consumers about $14 billion a year. Revocation could cost some two hundred thousand U.S. jobs and entail foregoing major opportunities for American trade and investment for years to come.

We might usefully ask why it is that most Asians take China's side in the matter of human rights. Perhaps it is in part because other nations resent American preaching. As Singapore's Lee Kuan Yew put it in the context of the caning incident, the United States should not be moralizing about human rights in other nations, when American citizens have to cope with "drugs, violence, unemployment and homelessness" because Washington will not recognize that the "government must protect society." In part, Asian's may also align themselves with China because they understand the extraordinary challenge of leading a country of 1.2 billion people, of averting unrest by the hundreds of millions of unemployed or underemployed and the additional hundreds of millions that have been hit heavily by the shift to a market economy. Given such a challenge, they may reason, a Jeffersonian approach to governing is likely to produce chaos with spills-over into its neighbors' territories; Tiananmen was indefensible, but not inexplicable.

As long as China's human rights record remains poor, we can and should continue to press for improvements, preferably in multilateral channels and by diplomatic means. The most promising strategy lies not in sanctions but in broadening China's opening to the West. We have a major stake in not choking that opening and in seeing that China's reforms succeed—in part because, as Senator Baucus has argued, "the most significant human rights developments in China have come as natural results of economic reform rather than from American pressure."

The threat of revocation has resulted in some limited success in the past, but the Chinese now appear ready to call our hand. Since actual revocation serves no one's interests, the time has clearly come for President Clinton to delink MFN from human rights—he can rightly claim that there has been some progress but that the linkage has served its purposes and is now outmoded. Then, he and the nation can turn to the needed fundamental reexamination of the entire US-China relationship and how best to advance the totality of our interests within that relationship.

AMOS A. JORDAN.

HONORING DR. AGIM LEKA

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 in my home borough of the Bronx, a health care center is being opened to serve the needs of the local Albanian American population.

The driving force behind this effort is Dr. Agim Leka, who has long dreamed of helping his fellow Albanians receive access to quality medical care. Together with Our Lady of Mercy Medical Center, Dr. Leka has forged a unique alliance that will make his dream a reality. I commend Dr. Leka for the dedication he has shown to his people.

Many Albanians, because of their long cultural history of oppression, hesitate to utilize modern health are services. They often rely on home remedies, or no treatment at all, instead of seeking medical intervention. The solution is placing doctors in the community who can communicate with and gain the trust of the people. this is exactly what Dr. Leka is doing by founding the Albanian American Health Center.

The administration of Our Lady of Mercy Medical Center also deserve commendation for reaching out to a community with specific health care needs. I foresee many good works coming from this innovative alliance, and I wish Dr. Leka and his associates much success in this important endeavor.

MAY IS NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS AND SPORTS MONTH

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, May is National Physical Fitness and Sports Month, conducted by the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports. Every American, young and old, should take this opportunity to celebrate and begin a fitness routine.

People who exercise regularly feel better, have more energy, are able to cope with stress better, look better, have toned muscles, and are less likely to be overweight. Those who are not physically active should also know that lack of exercise has been found to play a significant role in mortality and is a major risk factor for heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 killer.

Organizations like the American Heart Association promote regular physical activity to condition the cardiovascular system as part of a total program to reduce heart disease risk. Even low-to-moderate-intensity activities, when done for as little as 20 minutes, can bring benefits. Pleasure walking, climbing stairs, gardening, yardwork, moderate-to-heavy housework, and dancing are examples. More vigorous aerobic activities, such as running, swimming, bicycling, and jumping rope, are best for improving the fitness of the heart and lungs.

In order to raise physically fit children, I believe that children should be introduced to the principles of regular physical exercise and aerobic recreational activities at an early age. To help establish good health habits, the school physical education curriculum should not overemphasize sports and activities that selectively eliminate children who are less skilled. Schools should teach and emphasize that the development and maintenance of an exercise conditioning program provides rich benefits throughout ones life.

I strongly believe that physical education along with health education is an important part of our children's education. A complete education must address the whole child, body and mind. I am proud to say that I sponsored an amendment which was included in Goals 2000 and signed into law by President Clinton. It states:

All students will have access to physical education and health education to ensure they are healthy and fit.

In order to meet the high standards we have set in Goals 2000, children must master physical and health education along with science and math education.

These disciplines together will make U.S. students ready to learn.

I urge all Americans to challenge themselves this May, National Physical Fitness and Sports Month, to make exercise a regular part of their lives.

FREDERICK A. WALDNER'S RETIREMENT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the retirement of Mr. Frederick A. Waldner, P.E., from the Federal Aviation Administration's Harrisburg, PA Office.

Mr. Frederick A. Waldner retired on May 3, 1994, after over 30 years of distinguished service with the Federal Government, the last 20 being with the Federal Aviation Administration's Harrisburg, PA Airports District Office. A civil engineering graduate of Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA, Mr. Waldner began his Federal service career in 1963 with the Bureau of Public Roads, now known as the Federal Highway Administration, and worked on a variety of highway construction projects in Oregon, Louisiana, New York, and Pennsylvania. His civilian engineering career was interrupted by a 2-year assignment as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army, from 1964 to 1966, during which he served his country stateside and in Vietnam. In his capacity as an airport engineer, engineering section chief and project manager, Mr. Waldner was greatly involved in the administration of the FAA's Airport Improvement Program in the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware. In particular, he made notable contributions to the development of major airports at Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. During his tenure, he assisted in the development and execution of the annual FAA Airports Conference in Hershey, PA, the premier event of its kind.

Fred is a registered professional engineer in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and a member of the National and Pennsylvania Society of Professional Engineers. He is a past president of the Harrisburg, PA Chapter of the Pennsylvania Society of Professional Engineers.

Mr. Waldner's service to his country and dedication to duty have reflected credit to himself and the Federal Aviation Administration and thus is worthy of recognition for his job well done.

RU-486—SUNNY RHETORIC VS. BLOODY REALITY

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, why is Bill Clinton—the abortion President—so obsessed with pushing abortion here in the United States and overseas?

Why is he willing to use women as guinea pigs in testing RU-486—the newest fad in baby poison. A poison that has maimed and killed women as well.

I rise today to ask my colleagues to read a thoughtful inclusive Wall Street Journal op-ed entitled "RU-486—Sunny Rhetoric vs. Bloody Reality" by Charmaine Crouse Yoest.

Ms. Yoest is an adjunct fellow with the Family Research Council and a fellow in the department of government at the University of Virginia.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 25, 1994]

RU-486—SUNNY RHETORIC VS. BLOODY REALITY

(By Charmaine Crouse Yoest)

How many times will women be used as guinea pigs? We should have learned some lessons from the Dalkon Shield. DES and maybe even breast implants. But last week, the president announced that RU-486, the French abortion drug, will be coming to America. Thanks to back-door negotiations between the Clinton administration and Roussel-Uclaf, the patent-holder of RU-486, the patent will be donated to the Population Council, a liberal abortion-advocacy group.

Abortion advocates keep telling American women that this drug is "safe and effective"—and both foes and supporters of abortion argue that the abortion procedure is "easy." Yet all these claims are open to serious question.

Just how safe is the RU-486 abortion? It has killed at least one woman in France. In that case, the young woman was dead within an hour after receiving the prostaglandin injection that is the final stage of the four-step RU-486 regime. Abortion advocates keep claiming that RU-486 itself didn't kill her: it was the prostaglandin in the fourth step. That may be true, but it's not particularly relevant. RU-486 abortions without prostaglandin just don't happen.

As a result of that death, smokers and women over age 34 may not take RU-486 in France. Additionally, women are advised not to take the drug if they have any of the following very common conditions: high blood pressure, anemia, gynecologic infections and fibroids.

However, we don't really know just how dangerous RU-486 is. In one of the major studies of women using the drug, published in the New England Journal of Medicine, 75 of the 2,115 women in the study were not followed after receiving the final injection. Did any of them suffer severe, or fatal, complications? We simply don't know.

The record does show that RU-486 has also been responsible for two nonfatal heart attacks. And according to Roussel's own data, out of 950 women studied, 270 required narcotics for intense pain. Seven required blood transfusions.

Janice Raymond, associate director of the MIT-based Institute on Women and Technology—and a bona-fide abortion supporter—is opposing the drug after a thorough review of the scientific literature on RU-486.

So, at best, the jury is still out on "safe." Is the RU-486 regime "effective"? To a degree. But in the one out of 20 times that the unborn child is not killed, its deformities are so severe that Roussel-Uclaf, fearing litigation, requires women to sign an agreement to a surgical abortion. What if a woman changes her mind after taking the first dose of RU-486? Will she be forced, Chinese-style, into a surgical abortion?

The RU-486/prostaglandin regime effectively completes an abortion through inducing the contractions and hemorrhage that expel the unborn child. Supporters of the drug rhapsodize about the increased "privacy" of "taking the pill at home." But they are glossing over the reality that women are administered the drug in a clinic and then sent home to wait as the bleeding begins. The president of Roussel-Uclaf, Edouard Sakiz, says it is "an appalling psychological ordeal." In Europe there are support groups for women who have endured the procedure.

This raises the issue of informed consent. Having advocates like the Population Council bring this drug into the country presents a clear conflict of interest. When a woman comes to participate in the field trials, having heard in the media that RU-486 is easy, will she be told about the side effects and that MIT's Ms. Raymond has questiond the impact of RU-486 on her health? Will she know what she is getting into before it is too late?

It is very troubling that the groups that will be administering an experimental abortion drug with serious potential side effects are the same ones that have demonstrated their opposition to a woman's right to know all the information about surgical abortion. Pro-abortion groups have fought informed consent laws all the way to the Supreme Court.

And what about parental consent? Will 14-year-old girls be given RU-486 and sent home to hemorrhage without their parents' knowing anything about it? All too often, parents are not informed of their daughters' surgical abortions.

Surgical abortion is legal and accessible in the U.S. And, contrary to the hyperbolic pro-abortion rhetoric, RU-486—with its mandatory four doctor visits—is not easier and more private than surgical abortion. It's odd that the same people who say that a 24-hour wait to see a doctor for a surgical abortion is absolutely unacceptable would be promoting chemical abortion, which in its current state is a much more drawn out procedure. Shouldn't we be asking why this questionable drug is so important to them? And to the president?

Quick. Name something the president has done to address breast cancer, a disease that attacks one out of nine women. Name just one other drug for which the president has personally lobbied. What's going on here? Is it women's rights and women's health the president is concerned about—or just abortion at any cost?

USAID'S PLANS FOR STRENGTHENING WID EFFORTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1994

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in December 1993, the General Accounting Office released its report on the Agency for International Development's and the Department of State's compliance with the 1973 Percy amendment—section 113 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. The Percy amendment directed that U.S. foreign assistance efforts focus on integrating women into the economies of developing countries.

On March 16, 1994 I wrote to Administrator Atwood to request that AID report to the Committee on how the issues raised in the GAP report were being addressed.

On April 1 and May 16, 1994, Mr. Atwood provided letters responding to my inquiry. In Mr. Atwood's response, he expresses his personal commitment to addressing the issues raised in the GAO report and outlines specific steps which the agency is taking to insure consistent compliance with the Percy amendment.

The correspondence follows:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, April 1, 1994.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 16, 1994 requesting that the Agency for International Development (USAID) report to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on how the issues raised by the General Accounting Office (GAO) on women in development are being addressed.

In my response to findings in the report on USAID's and the Department of State's compliance with the 1973 "Percy Amendment," (Section 113 of the Foreign Assistance Act as amended), I outlined some steps that I will take to strengthen and accelerate the Agency's women-in-development program. These steps are summarized below.

By June 1, 1994, USAID Bureau Assistant Administrators will submit to me plans of action delineating steps to be taken by their Bureaus to address gender issues. The plans for both geographic and central Bureaus will be based on Bureau assessments of gender issues.

USAID will require our overseas missions to integrate gender concerns into country strategies and action plans. I have directed that the geographic Bureaus take the lead in establishing plans by July 1, 1994 for negotiating with Missions deadlines for reaching gender integration benchmarks.

Further, USAID will enhance coordination between the Office of Women in Development and USAID Bureaus to better monitor the integration of gender concerns in Bureau and Mission development strategies. To assist in this process we will assure the timely completion of our program performance monitoring system and will continue to explore ways to strengthen the capacity of this system to monitor women-in-development program performance.

I am taking steps to integrate women-in-development policy objectives into non-project assistance programming by directing that guidance be appropriately incorporated into Agency guidance documents, including USAID Handbook 4.

Finally, USAID will continue to explore and implement ways of providing our program managers with information to monitor women-in-development program performance.

I greatly appreciate your enclosing a copy of the letter of March 1, 1994, which you received from Congresswoman Schroeder and your March 16 response to her. As you state to Congresswoman Schroeder, we are taking steps at USAID to ensure that integration of women-in-development concerns in development assistance is a top priority. I believe our response to GAO reflects this effort.

Sincerely,

J. BRIAN ATWOOD,
Administrator.

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, May 16, 1994.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In a March 16, 1994 letter you asked me to report to the Committee on how we are resolving the significant issues raised in a recent General Accounting Office report on Women-in-Development (WID).

In an earlier response (copy enclosed), I summarized several of the steps we are taking to follow up on the recommendations in the GAO Report, and to otherwise comply with the provisions of Section 113 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (the "Percy Amendment"). In this letter, I want to elaborate on the actions I am taking to ensure WID issues are fully integrated into the mainstream of the U.S. Agency for International Development's (USAID) programming process.

As you know, the Percy Amendment has been law for two decades. It concerns me greatly that the GAO Report characterizes USAID's efforts to implement the amendment as "slow and inconsistent." I intend to take an aggressive approach to implementing the Percy Amendment, to ensure we incorporate women in all aspects of USAID's development efforts.

I want to make clear to the Committee, as I have to my USAID colleagues, my personal commitment that a focus on Women-in-Development is critical to our development efforts. I am working to break down the common perception in USAID that WID is either a narrow special interest or one more Congressional directive with which USAID has to comply. WID programs are both important in their own right and because without them we will not achieve our development goals.

Even the most clearly worded legislation on issues, such as women's empowerment and related WID, will not be translated into sustainable development activities unless we inculcate this commitment into the culture at USAID. As the last 20 years have demonstrated, this cultural change at USAID will be difficult, and can not be accomplished without leadership from the top. My Deputy, Carol Lancaster, and I are personally committed to providing the leadership necessary on WID issues throughout the ranks of USAID's political appointees and career employees.

Our commitment to strengthening USAID's WID program is demonstrated in the operational guidance that prefaces our recently issued strategies for sustainable development, of which the role of women is one of the most important cross-cutting themes. That document states:

"* * * the development process must focus on (the) social, political and economic empowerment (of women). We will integrate the needs and participation of women into development programs and into the societal changes those programs are designed to achieve * * *. The success of women—as workers, food producers, health providers and teachers of their children, as managers of natural resources and as participants in a democratic society—is essential to successful development * * * in their design and implementation, (USAID) programs must take gender issues into account and pay particular attention to the needs of women in poverty * * *"

Our policy is clear and I have instructed my Policy and Global Bureaus to monitor its implementation.

To make this mandate a reality will require that our WID office fulfill its potential as a center of expertise and as an instrument for change. In this regard, I am particularly pleased that the President has nominated Ms. Sally Shelton to direct the Bureau in which our Office of Women-in-Development is located, the Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research. Ms. Shelton has a strong commitment to WID issues in general and to strengthening our WID office and programs specifically. If she is confirmed by the Senate for this position, I am confident that she will bring leadership and energy to this program at the bureau level.

We are also conducting an exhaustive search to identify the best qualified individual to direct the WID office. I hope to announce that appointment soon. In addition, as part of our efforts to rightsize USAID, I am pleased to inform you that we will significantly expand the staff of the office of Women-in-Development, with eight full-time positions. We plan to hire permanent staff for these positions wherever possible, as opposed to contractors, to encourage continuity in our programming.

One of my first directives to the Global Bureau and to the new Director of the WID office, working with my Policy Bureau, will be to provide me with recommendations for how the Agency can more effectively monitor the way in which bureaus or missions are carrying out WID policies. As the GAO report underscored, there is a need for us to be able to

more consistently track our programs' impact upon women by, at a minimum in most cases, obtaining and analyzing gender disaggregated data. Further, I will ask for a plan for how the WID office can provide leadership to the agency of WID issues and address the inconsistent compliance with Women-in-Development directives at a field level, outlined in the GAO report.

In addition, I will ask the Assistant Administrator for the Global Bureau and the new WID Director to develop recommendations on how a system of incentives and accountability can be designed to reward initiative in incorporating WID concerns and to hold program managers accountable for results. I believe that a system which rewards results on WID issues will be vital to changing the culture of USAID.

Given the significant technical expertise on gender issues which exists outside USAID in the NGO community, it is important for the Agency to develop a consultative relationship with NGOs. I will encourage the new WID director to consult with these groups as they develop their recommendations and plans. Both U.S. and indigenous NGOs have expertise and experience which can help strengthen our WID efforts as we move forward.

Lastly, I will ask our Office of Women-in-Development to work with our Office of Food for Peace to ascertain if there are opportunities to strengthen the incorporation of women in our P.L. 480 programs.

I hope this letter assures you and the Committee that we are taking the GAO Report's findings seriously, and conveys my personal commitment to the Women-in-Development program. Please let me know if I can provide you with further information on this matter.

Sincerely,

J. BRIAN ATWOOD,
Administrator.