

Rardin, who served his country during World War II.

On the district level, Kathy was elected as district guard in 1985 and progressed through the district chairs to serve her first term as district president in 1989–90. Kathy is presently serving her second term as district president, having been elected in June 1994. With her positive attitude, she said, "The second time around will allow me to do a more perfect job."

From the beginning of her career with the V.F.W., Kathy Cole has set high standards for herself. Her record of service is characterized by self-motivation and mission accomplishment. She has served the Department of Ohio Auxiliary as National Home chairman and counsils the auxiliary's work through the youth of the organization as some of her favorite.

Mr. Speaker, this is a volunteer organization and sometimes the only compensation you get for the time and efforts put into the programs for the veterans and your communities is the thanks and appreciation you receive from community leaders. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending a special thanks to Kathy Cole and the example she has set for others.

CONGRESSMAN KILDEE HONORS  
UAW LOCAL 599 REUTHER  
AWARD RECIPIENTS

### HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1995

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay tribute to 14 members of UAW Local 599, who will be recipients of the Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award. On Sunday, March 19, 1995, these individuals will be honored at the Walter and May Reuther Twenty Year Award Banquet.

Local 599 has always had a special place in my heart because my father was one of its original members. Over the years, Local 599 has developed a strong and proud tradition of supporting the rights of working people in our community, and improving the quality of life for its membership.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to recognize these special individuals who, for 20 years, have diligently served their union and community. During this time, each one of these UAW members have held various elected positions in the union. And there is no question they have represented their brothers and sisters well.

It is very fitting that these 14 people be recipients of the Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award. Walter Reuther was a man who believed in helping working people, and he believed in human dignity and social justice for all Americans. The recipients of this award have committed themselves to the ideals and principles of Walter Reuther. They are outstanding men and women who come from every part of our community, and they share the common bond of unwavering commitment and service.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in honoring Robert A. Johnson, Charles Whitten, Kenneth Knauff, Bob Wright, Timothy M. Bank, Earl D. Oram, Daniel C. Neeley, Bryce Stanton, Ron Dodge, Mary Shumpert Coleman, Joseph D. Niedzwiecki, Dan Kiefer,

Butch O.L. Robinson, and Kenneth Kagen. I want to congratulate these fine people for all of the work they have done to make our community a better place to live.

JIM JOHNSON AND FANNIE MAE  
ARE SHOWING AMERICA A NEW  
WAY HOME

### HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1995

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 1 year anniversary of Fannie Mae's showing America a new way home initiative. One year ago Fannie Mae Chairman and CEO Jim Johnson launched Fannie Mae on a bold journey to help transform the American housing finance system. On March 15, 1994, Fannie Mae pledged to provide \$1 trillion in targeted housing finance by the end of the decade to help 10 million families achieve the American dream of home ownership. Fannie Mae has set an aggressive target and is steadily moving to meet its goal by the year 2000.

This initiative is already making a major impact on the lives of people throughout the nation. In Minnesota, Fannie Mae has sponsored a home buying fair, opened a partnership office, provided several grants to housing and home ownership counseling organizations and formed a community lending roundtable to help identify and remove barriers to home ownership. By working with local partners, Fannie Mae is opening the door to home ownership to many people who thought owning a home of their own was merely a dream.

I commend Fannie Mae and Jim Johnson for their vision and ability to get the job done.

I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the Minnesota media that outlines just one of the many examples of how Fannie Mae is reaching out to communities across the Nation:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, February 18, 1995]

HONG GET HELP, MAKE PROGRESS IN BUYING HOMES

(By Ann Baker)

The 30,000-strong Hmong community is making strides into home ownership, although the majority have been in the Twin Cities no more than six years.

An agency that started just one year ago to help Hmong families and other Southeast Asians navigate the mortgage market reported Friday that it already has helped 31 families cross the threshold from tenants to homeowners. Another 13 are awaiting mortgage approval.

A handful of the new homeowners are Cambodian, Vietnamese or Laotian, said Lengchy Lor, executive director of the People's Network of Minnesota Inc. But most, he said, are Hmong.

And a survey of nearly 400 Hmong families shows that 30 percent want to become home buyers.

"Home ownership brings stability," Rep. Bruce Vento told a gathering of Hmong people and supporters Friday at a gathering that announced the survey as well as a \$12,000 grant from the Fannie Mae Foundation for People's Network to hire Cambodian and Vietnamese housing counselors.

This marks a departure from most immigrant groups, who have waited a generation or two before buying homes, according to

Rich Thompson, lead housing inspector in St. Paul's city license and permits division.

"This group is becoming owners as quick as they can," he said. "It's a grass-roots movement, and it has triggered a spurt of redevelopment activity by other groups."

One reason may be Hmong family size—too big to squeeze into an average apartment. In a survey of 390 Hmong families, the People's Network reported that the median family size is six. Many families have eight or nine members, and a few have as many as 14.

Another reason many parents gave was wanting to live in a neighborhood where their children would not be exposed to gangs. Many favored neighborhoods on the East Side.

Thirty percent want to buy their own home, and most want a house with four bedrooms, as well as a basement for special events and a back yard for a garden as well as special events.

More than 90 percent also eagerly embrace the idea of forming a Hmong Village, something like San Francisco's Chinatown, as a place for strengthening Hmong culture, business opportunities and community leadership. One task for the village would be to address crime issues in the community.

Ninety percent in the survey also want to develop a Hmong soccer field for youth to develop professional athletic skills.

Most of the 390 families now live in public housing or large private complexes such as Maywood East and Omega Court.

But the survey stressed that it takes a lot of effort—and sometimes a lot of help—for Hmong people to move into home ownership, coming from a culture where banking, loans and check-writing—not to mention credit—were completely foreign.

"In the Hmong community, 'good credit history' means 'cash rather than financing as much as possible,'" states the report. "In the Western country, 'good credit history' means 'paid all bills off and on time.'"

WHY U.S. INDUSTRY BOUNCED  
BACK

### HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1995

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues the following column by Robert J. Samuelson from the opinion page of yesterday's Washington Post. The subject is the comeback of American manufacturing. Members would do well to consider the conclusions drawn by the author.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1995]

WHY U.S. INDUSTRY BOUNCED BACK

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Dial back your time machine about a decade. You'll find plenty of newspaper and TV stories warning of "deindustrialization." American manufacturers (it was said) were being pulverized. The Japanese were overwhelming our automakers, repeating their triumph in steel. Computer chip makers were rapidly losing ground. Americans had forgotten how to make things. It was only a matter of time before U.S. manufacturing sank into oblivion and we became a nation of "hamburger flippers."

None of these dire predictions came true; indeed, most were always silly (and this reporter at least said so). Yet the story of the comeback of U.S. manufacturing is still under-told and ill-appreciated, as economists Jerry Jasinowski and Robert Hamrin argue

in a new book. In 1994 the United States produced more cars than Japan for the first time since 1979. U.S. companies account for half of global shipments of fiber optic cable. The stunning manufacturing revival needs to be better understood. It is important in its own right and also teaches broader lessons.

Consider first some basic facts:

Between 1980 and 1994, U.S. manufacturing output rose more than 50 percent. In the past three years, it has increased 15 percent. It is now twice as high as in 1970 and five times as high as in 1950. Many things that didn't exist four decades ago (many drugs, most computers, commercial jets, much medical equipment, most anti-pollution devices) are produced in huge quantities, along with such traditional items as furniture and food. There has been no "deindustrialization."

In 1991 the United States regained its position as the world's largest exporter. In 1993 the U.S. share of global exports was 12.8 percent, compared with Germany's 10.5 percent and Japan's 9.9 percent. The American computer chip industry is again the world's leader. General Motors and Ford are still the first and second largest auto companies. American companies still dominate in aerospace, computer software and entertainment; they are strong in paper, chemicals and pharmaceuticals, among others.

Industrial productivity (efficiency) has increased at its fastest rate in decades. Since 1985, manufacturing productivity—output per worker hour—has risen about 3 percent a year. Since 1980 the man-hours to produce a ton of steel fell from about 10 to four. Quality is also increasing. In one survey, two-thirds of respondents felt product quality had improved in the past five years; only 14 percent felt it had worsened.

Obituaries for U.S. industry were inevitably wrong for two reasons. The first is that they mistook manufacturing's stagnant job base for stagnation. In 1970 about 19 million Americans worked in manufacturing; last year, the number was about 18 million. So? Rising production and falling employment merely signify higher productivity. Fewer people produce more; other people provide other things, from health care to software. This is the time-proven path to higher, not lower, living standards.

The second error was presuming that setbacks, once started, were irreversible. Companies couldn't defend themselves; economic conditions wouldn't change. In their book ("Making It in America"), Jasinowski—president of the National Association of Manufacturers—and Hamrin show that companies did fight back. Costs were cut, processes streamlined. Xerox reduced the time to bring a new product to market by 60 percent. AMP, a maker of electrical components, raised ontime deliveries from 65 to 95 percent. Cannondale, a manufacturer of mountain bikes, increased foreign sales from 5 percent to 40 percent.

What also changed were exchange rates. The dollar's steep rise in the early 1980s (up 63 percent between 1980 and 1985) was a basic cause of industrial distress. It made imports cheaper and U.S. exports more expensive. But the dollar had to drop, because trade deficits were unsustainably large. When foreigners had more dollars than they wanted, the dollar would decline. It did. In 1985, a dollar was worth 238 yen; now, it's worth 91. American exports more than doubled between 1985 and 1993.

American industry doesn't enjoy—and never will—preeminence in all areas. Japan still dominates consumer electronics and some computer chips. Japanese auto companies still make swell cars. In 1993 we imported 77 percent of our toys, 43 percent of our ceramic tiles, 56 percent of our TV tubes and 96 percent of our watches. Global mar-

kets mean just that; other countries will achieve comparative advantage in some products and technologies. But "globalization" is not pulverizing U.S. industry.

The first lesson of its revival is simple: Keep markets open. What forced U.S. companies to improve was competition, whether from imports, new technologies or deregulation. Some industries received modest government help, mostly as import restraints; but generally, companies created their own comebacks. No one likes to change, and economic change is often cruel and ugly. Bankruptcies, "downsizing" and "restructuring" all disguise the human toll. The alternative, though, is stagnation.

A second lesson: Keep foreign "success" in perspective. In the 1980s, the Japanese were celebrated. Their economic policies were wise; ours were foolish. They invested; we consumed. Now Japan doesn't look so good. In the late 1980s, its economic policies fostered a speculative real estate and stock market boom whose ill effects still linger. Protectionist policies have aggravated the yen's rise, which has hurt exports. Underconsumption also harms industry. Only 10 percent of Japan's households have personal computers, compared with 37 percent in the United States. Japan's computer industry suffers.

The largest lesson is the contrast between economic and political change. Economic change proceeds, often roughly. In politics, people argue over winners and losers. Change occurs slowly, if at all. Sometimes that is preferable, but often it isn't. Paralysis can mean that everyone loses. If government had decided to revive manufacturing in the mid-1980s, we'd still be arguing over who should be helped and why. In this case, the best policy was to insist that companies and workers help themselves.

## GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RECORD VOTES

### HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1995, the House adopted a new rule, Clause 2(l)(2)(B) of rule XI, which requires that committee reports on any bill or other matter include the names of those voting for and against on rollcall votes taken on any amendment and on the motion to report. During consideration of the rule on the first day of the 104th Congress, an explanation included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Chairman SOLOMON states:

It is the intent of this rule to provide for greater accountability for record votes in committees and to make such votes easily available to the public in committee reports. At present, under clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI, the public can only inspect rollcall votes on matters in the offices of the committee. It is anticipated that with the availability of committee reports to the public through electronic form the listing of votes in reports will be more bill-specific than earlier proposals to publish all votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD twice a year.

Upon examining the Rules Committee report to accompany H. Resolution 115, the rule for H.R. 1158—Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions, I found it lacking in the type of information which I believe is vital for public understanding of what

the Members of the Committee were actually voting on. The report under the heading of "summary of motion" gives so limited account as to be almost meaningless. While the rule does not explicitly require the report to contain a description of the motion and amendment being offered, the intent of better informing the public seems to have been lost. The lack of information will force the public to search in other publications for information vital to understanding what the issue is for which the votes are being cast. There is no way that the public, unless present at the Rules Committee markup, could understand what, for example, "Make in order amendments making new rescissions pre-printed in Record" means without going to the Rules Committee transcript. How else would anyone know what amendments are being offered here? There is no listing or description of the amendments that would have been allowed if this motion were adopted. Also, the public would never know which issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains the text of the amendments. The public would be better served if adequate information were included in the committee report.

With that in mind, I am, for the benefit of the public and the membership of this body, including the following summary of the rollcall votes which were taken in the Rules Committee on March 14, 1995:

#### COMMITTEE VOTES

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 83

Date: March 14, 1995.

Measure: Rule for H.R. 1158, Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: Make in order amendments to H.R. 1158 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10 or March 13, 1995 which make new rescissions. Those amendments are as follows:

- (1) Volkmer #4—restores funds for veterans' medical care and ambulatory facility construction with new offsets.
- (2) Andrews #8—substitute including new RTC rescissions and transportation and construction projects cuts.
- (3) Barr #9—restores funds for Community Planning and Development grants, rescinds an additional amount from Water Infrastructure/State revolving fund, and rescinds prior year funding.
- (4) Brown #15—protects certain veterans' construction projects.
- (5) DeLay #28—rescinds \$25 million from Public Health Service Act.
- (6) Foglietta #34—restores summer jobs with offsetting cuts in defense.
- (7) Furse #36—cuts an additional \$8 billion from defense.
- (8) Furse #37—cuts \$1 from defense procurement.
- (9) Gutierrez #41—cuts all unobligated balances from the Market Promotion program of the Commodity Credit Corporation.
- (10) Kennedy/Moakley #43—restores low income home energy assistance (LIHEAP) funding and offsets with cuts in the F-22 fighter program.
- (11) McIntosh #47, #48 and #49—makes additional cuts in fish and wildlife programs, including endangered species conservation fund.
- (12) Nadler #57—restores housing funds with offsets from defense.
- (13) Roemer #63—restores National Service funds with offset from space station program.
- (14) Roemer #64—includes new title VI rescissions.