open office to demonstrate their tolerance of human rights organizations. Now, even that Potemkin village has been pulled down by authorities bent on eradicating all criticism of Kurdish polices.

Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, seven leaders of the HRA chapter in Diyarbakir were arrested and charged with disseminating separatist propaganda. Prosecutors are seeking jail sentences of more than 10 years for these activists because of their publication which detailed human rights cases in 1992. One of those now in prison awaiting trail is Neymetullah Gunduz, an attorney who met with members of Chairman DeConcini's delegation and who visited the Helsinki Commission in 1993 while on a USIA grant. Mr. Gunduz is highly regarded and is considered a dedicated human rights lawyer and reliable source of information concerning rights abuses by both the Government and the PKK.

Mr. Speaker, just recently the Government abandoned a similar case brought against a group of well known Turkish activists. The move was widely hailed as a positive development in an otherwise bleak human rights picture. What this new case seems to indicate is that the recent acquittal stands merely as an aberration as opposed to a genuine effort to dismantle restrictions on free expression. I have said it before, and I reemphasize it now, Turkey cannot be considered a truly democratic nation as long as individuals like Neymettulah Gunduz, Mehdi Zana, Halit Gerger, former parliamentarians and other are jailed for exercising their rights to free expression.

Mr. Speaker, a recent commentary in a large Turkish daily purports that the Government has spent five times more money fighting terrorism than on the giant GAP water project supposed to be the cornerstone of development in southeast Turkey. Tens of billions of dollars have been used to institute policies which have left the region more devastated than ever and its population more resentful than ever. Meanwhile, Turkey continues to fact mounting economic and political crises tied directly to failed Kurdish policies. Unless Turkish leaders bit the bullet and seek political approaches to the Kurdish situation, there can be no hope for peace, prosperity or democracy in Turkey. As a friend and ally of Turkey, such a dismal prognosis can bring no happiness to anyone in this country either.

SALUTE TO A CIVIL RIGHTS PIONEER—ERNEST McBRIDE OF LONG BEACH, CA

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1995

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, during this week in which we commemorate the life and legacy of the Reverend Dr. Martin Lurther King, to honor a gentleman from my District, California's 38th, Mr. Ernest McBride, whose life and work embody the spirit and intent of Dr. King's message. Throughout his half century of residency in our community, Mr. McBride has been a crusader for civil rights and racial justice—and our community is a much better place for his dedication.

Mr. McBride, who is now 85 years of age, moved to southern California when he was 21 to seek a better life for himself and escape the racism and prejudice of his native South. Unfortunately, as an African-American, he did not find the California of the thirties much better. Arriving in a nearby community, he saw a sign that read, ''We don't serve coloreds here''. But instead of traveling on, Mr. McBride chose to remain. He recently told a Los Angeles Times reporter, ''I decided I had to stop and fight somewhere. And I decided Long Beach was where I was going to stop.''

Mr. McBride's determination to stay in Long Beach turned out to be a decision which has benefited many people. He fought prejudice and injustice wherever he saw it—not through violence and hatred, but with an attitude of determination and dignity. In 1932, he was hired as a grocery store janitor. Over the 8 years that he worked there, his requests for a raise were continually turned down—until he organized his fellow workers and eventually won a raise and a shorter workweek.

In the early 1940's, when a union at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard refused to allow African-Americans to join, Mr. McBride rounded up 180 people to petition President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The President responded by ordering the union to allow minorities to join or face losing its status as a bargaining agent.

As Dr. King began garnering national attention with his nonviolent efforts to end discrimination and prejudice, Mr. McBride led picketing against local grocery stores that refused to hire blacks and pressured Long Beach city leaders to open up more jobs for African-Americans. He organized a student revolt at a Long Beach high school that forced school officials to abandon minstrel shows and to drop a textbook that depicted African-Americans only as slaves.

Mr. McBride cofounded the Long Beach chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], and his house was often the chapter's gathering place where members discussed strategies for desegregating housing, ending discriminatory hiring practices, and ridding local schools of racially-biased textbooks.

Recently, Mr. McBride's home of many years—a modest bungalow which he purchased in the 1940's despite racially restrictive covenants and neighbors who petitioned to keep him out—was declared a historical landmark by the city council in honor of Mr. McBride's dedicated efforts to make our community a place that welcomes and encourages peoples of all races.

After the city council's unanimous vote, Long Beach City Council Alan S. Lowenthal, said, ''It's certainly too bad we can't designate Ernie and his late wife Lilly as a historic monument. He really is the landmark.''

Today I honor Mr. McBride and thank him. He stands as a model of the good that one man—with dedication and compassion—can accomplish for the generations to come.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY REQUIRES BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS BASED ON SOUND INTELLIGENCE

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1995

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy must be bipartisan. However useful or inevitable our internal debates or expressions may be for domestic issues, we simply cannot continue to apply many voices to foreign affairs. Our goal in foreign affairs is to positively influence and shape foreign situations to our benefit. That is so whether it is a trouble spot in Chechnya, North Korea, Bosnia, or Iraq. It is so for whatever type of situation—be it impending trouble or opportunity—that may arise somewhere else.

That influence cannot serve U.S. interests, however, if it is founded on, and bespeaks, divisive and often petty partisan agendas. This is especially so when those agendas derive from domestic interests having little relevance to the situation. So doing confuses us. It confuses our constituents. It confuses foreign leaders who look to what we say and do to formulate their own policies and reactions. Confusion about what we are doing, or are likely to do, simply from too many voices, can itself harm the situation, can increase the dangers. Ultimately, many voices confuse—and dissipate—our ability to shape our national future relative to other countries. I submit to you that the more we cast about in the eddies and swirls of partisanship, blown hither and yon by polarization and parochialism, the more we will seem to lack any overarching, unifying vision at all for what we want our own future to be. A ship that has no clear port of embarkation, no compass, no rudder, and no articulated destination—how can it ever arrive? How can we even begin to advance on our national goals of peace and security when they are not what we have set before us?

Colleagues, we must get beyond our partisan differences. Our higher order national interests and visions—spoken with one voice—must guide. Random undertow denies our choices, traps us. Our foreign goals, policies, strategies and objectives—indeed the effects of all those on our future national security—simply cannot be left to such chance. We cannot permit our end points to forever recede.

Instead, we must together do the hard work of shaping foreign policy, and decide our strategy, for the reasons that are relevant to the specific situations at hand. We must begin the process with accurate and expert estimates of those situations, and how they might be affected by various events and courses of action. Our support for this work must come not from vested parochialism, but from U.S. intelligence agencies that we fund for this very purpose.

An additional point may pertain here. These agencies, as we speak, are reviewing and adaption their own visions, goals, and the organizations and processes that should flow from those. They are doing so to more effectively meet requirements that we and others place before them. In envisioning their future uses, purposes, character, and attributes, these agencies surely are telling themselves ''if we don't know where we are to be, then we won't get there.'' Clearly, in better defining

their place in the coming decades, they are bound between funding realities and the quickly changing global situations we need them to monitor ever more astutely. Their leadership surely knows that to do this, any mere perpetuation of vested bureaucratic interests can no longer justify them. Circumstances are compelling them to thoughtfully chart their future. They must now navigate with the compass of a clear, overarching, well-articulated, and broadly understood vision of what they will be and what they will do to serve national security. They recognize that their success at relating their means to that end is the standard by which we ultimately will judge them.

My colleagues, can we fairly ask less of ourselves? I submit there is a lesson in some of this for how we carry out our own tasks in foreign affairs and national security. As is true for our intelligence agencies, our efforts must rise above our own bureaucracy. We must look beyond the affiliations and vested interests that are poised to cast us about without aim, reduce our successes, invite failures, trap us. So for us too, the context of our foreign policy pursuit can only be—must be—our larger, enduring goals. These are what unite us as one country. I submit that bipartisanship is absolutely essential to furthering those goals and attaining those attributes that make us one.

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1995

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. We all agree that Congress can no longer exempt itself from the legislation it passes. Compliance with such legislation by the rest of this Nation's citizens is mandatory. This congressional body moved forward to pass H.R. 1 on the opening day of legislative business for the 104th Congress by an overwhelming vote of 429 yeas. Now we are left to consider the Senate-passed version of this same bill. What a great opportunity for reform.

But do not let the Republican leadership fool you into thinking that the Congressional Accountability Act is a pillar of Republican reform. As a freshman Member, I must continually do my homework. I am fully aware that this reform effort was attempted in the 103d Congress. This legislation passed the House but was held up by the Republicans in the Senate. Why would the Senate block passage of this legislation in the 103d and pass it without reservation in the 104th? Because they did not want President Clinton to sign this reform into law, giving Democrats the credit for reform-oriented policies. We now know that the Republicans were working hard for 2 years to build a platform for the 1994 mid-term elections by halting action on important pieces of legislation in the Senate. Let us give credit to good ideas where credit is due.

And while we are revisiting this corrective measure, why not look more closely at a provision the Senate has added for itself concerning frequent flier miles? This issue has not received enough attention from this congressional body. I urge further dialog and consideration of these reform measures as well.

SUBMISSION OF BIPARTISAN BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR PRINTING

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1995

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the debate on the balanced budget amendment next week, we are submitting the text of House Joint Resolution 28, the bipartisan, bicameral balanced budget amendment that we have introduced with 143 other Members, to be printed in the RECORD for Members to review. House Joint Resolution 28 is identical to Senate Joint Resolution 1 introduced by Senate Majority Leader BOB DOLE. We are submitting our language both in the form of a substitute to House Joint Resolution 1, the balanced budget amendment reported by the House Judiciary Committee—authored by Representative SCHAEFER—and as a free-standing bill—House Joint Resolution 28.

This language is the product of years of hard work by numerous Members of the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle. Senator LARRY CRAIG had an instrumental role in developing this amendment when he was a Member of the House, and continues to play a leadership role in the Senate. Former Representatives Bob Smith of Oregon, Tom Carper, Jon Kyl, Jim Moody, Olympia Snowe, Jim Inhofe, as well as current House Members JOE KENNEDY, MIKE CASTLE, L.F. PAYNE, and NATHAN DEAL have made contributions to the effort. On the Senate side, Senators ORRIN HATCH and PAUL SIMON have provided leadership on this amendment. Senators STROM THURMOND, PHIL GRAMM, HOWELL HEFLIN, and PETE DOMENICI, as well as former Senator Dennis DeConcini have also been actively involved in developing this amendment.

The amendment has been improved over the years based on the advice of constitutional scholars, budget experts, other Members of Congress, and others. Changes were made in the amendment to address criticisms that were raised in the numerous hearings on the amendment. This review process has produced an amendment that is workable, flexible, and enforceable.

House Joint Resolution 28 meets the constitutional standards of simplicity and support by a broad consensus of the American public. It would require the President to submit and Congress to enact a balanced budget beginning in 2002, unless three-fifths of both Houses vote to authorize a deficit. A three-fifths vote would be required to raise the debt limit. The amendment would make it more difficult to raise taxes by requiring a constitutional majority to pass bills increasing taxes. The amendment would be waived in the event of a declared war, and could be waived in the event of a military conflict that posed an imminent and serious threat to national security. The amendment would allow Congress to use estimates in planning budgets, but would require a balance of actual outlays against actual receipts.

We understand that Rules Committee Chairman GERALD SOLOMON has indicated that the Rules Committee report a rule bringing House Joint Resolution 1 to the floor under a ''queen of the hill'' process in which the substitute that receives the most votes in the Committee of the Whole would be reported to the House. For this reason, Representative SCHAEFER is submitting the text of the bipartisan, bicameral amendment in the form of a substitute. We understand the Rules Committee may also consider reporting a rule that provides for consideration of House Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 28 as separate free-standing bills. This process would ensure clean votes on both proposals without forcing Members to choose between two popular amendments and maximize the chances of passing a balanced budget amendment. In this event, we are submitting the text of House Joint Resolution 28.

We look forward to the debate on the balanced budget amendment next week. We encourage all members to participate in this debate and vote to send the balanced budget amendment to the Senate and the States.

H.J. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission to the States for ratification:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1.—Total outlays for any fiscal year shall not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House of congress shall provide by law for a specific excess of outlays over receipts by a rollcall vote.

SECTION 2.—The limit on the debt of the United States held by the public shall not be increased, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House shall provide by law for such an increase by a rollcall vote.

SECTION 3.—Prior to each fiscal year, the President shall transmit to the Congress a proposed budget for the United States Government for that fiscal year, in which total outlays do not exceed total receipts.

SECTION 4.—No bill to increase revenue shall become law unless approved by a majority of the whole number of each House by a rollcall vote.

SECTION 5.—The Congress may waive the provisions of this article for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect. The provisions of this article may be waived for any fiscal year in which the United States is engaged in military conflict which causes an imminent and serious military threat to national security and is so declared by a joint resolution, adopted by a majority of the whole number of each House, which becomes law.

SECTION 6.—The Congress shall enforce and implement this article by appropriate legislation, which may rely on estimates of outlays and receipts.

SECTION 7.—Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government except those derived from borrowing. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government except for those for repayment of debt principal.

SECTION 8.—this article shall take effect beginning with fiscal year 2002 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later.