

RETIREMENT SAVINGS AND SECURITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-221)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for the consideration of the Congress the "Retirement Savings and Security Act." This legislation is designed to empower all Americans to save for their retirement by expanding pension coverage, increasing portability, and enhancing security. By using both employer and individual tax-advantaged retirement savings programs, Americans can benefit from the opportunities of our changing economy while assuring themselves and their families greater security for the future. A general explanation of the act accompanies this transmittal.

Today, over 58 million American public and private sector workers are covered by employer-sponsored pension or retirement savings plans. Millions more have been able to save through Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs). The Retirement Savings and Security Act would help expand pensions to the over 51 million American private-sector workers—including over three-quarters of the workers in small businesses—who are not covered by an employer-sponsored pension or retirement savings program and need both the opportunity and encouragement to start saving. Women particularly need this expanded coverage: fewer than one-third of all women retirees who are 55 or older receive pension benefits, compared with 55 percent of male retirees.

The act would also help the many workers who participate in pension plans to continue to save when they change jobs. It would reassure all workers who save through employer-sponsored plans that the money they have saved, as well as that put aside by employers on their behalf, will be there when they need it.

The Retirement Savings and Security Act would:

—Establish a simple new small business 401(k)-type plan—the National Employee Savings Trust (NEST)—and simplify complex pension laws. The NEST is specifically designed to ensure participation by low- and moderate-wage workers, who will be able to save up to \$5,000 per year tax-deferred, plus receive employer contributions toward retirement. The act would encourage employers of all sizes to cover employees under retirement plans, and it

would enable employers to put more money into benefits and less into paying lawyers, accountants, consultants, and actuaries.

- Increase the ability of workers to save for retirement from their first day on the job by removing barriers to pension portability. In particular, employers would be encouraged no longer to require a 1-year wait before employees can contribute to their pension plans. The Federal Government would set the example for other employers by allowing its new employees to begin saving through the Thrift Savings Plan when they are hired, rather than having to wait up to a year. In addition, the Act would reduce from 10 to 5 years the time those participating in multiemployer plans—union plans where workers move from job to job—must work to receive vested benefits. It would also help ensure that returning veterans retain pension benefits and that workers receive their retirement savings even when a previous employer is no longer in existence.
- Expand eligibility for tax-deductible IRAs to 20 million more families. In addition, the Act would encourage savings by making the use of IRAs more flexible by allowing penalty-free withdrawals for education and training, purchase of a first home, catastrophic medical expenses, and long-term unemployment. It would also provide an additional IRA option that provides tax-free distributions instead of tax-deductible contributions.
- Enhance pension security by protecting the savings of millions of State and local workers from their employer's bankruptcy, as happened in Orange County, California. The Act would (1) require prompt reporting by plan administrators and accountants of any serious and egregious misuse of funds; (2) double the guaranteed benefit for participants in multiemployer plans in the unlikely event such a plan becomes insolvent; and (3) enhance benefits of a surviving spouse and dependents under the Civil Service Retirement System and the Railroad Retirement System.
- Ensure that pension raiding, such as that which drained \$20 billion out of retirement funds in the 1980s, never happens again—by retaining the strong current laws preventing such abuses and by requiring periodic reports on reversions by the Secretary of Labor.

Many of the provisions of the Retirement Savings and Security Act are new. In particular, provisions facilitating saving from the first day on the job, in both the private sector and the Federal Government; the doubling of the multi-employer guarantee; and improving benefits for surviving spouses and dependents of participants in the Civil Service Retirement System and the Railroad Retirement System de-

serve special consideration by the Congress. In addition, many of the provisions and concepts in this Act have been previously proposed by this Administration and have broad bipartisan support.

American workers deserve pension security—as well as a decent wage, lifelong access to high quality education and training, and health security—to take advantage of the opportunities of our growing economy.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislative proposal by the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 1996.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 60

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 23, 1996, Friday, May 24, 1996, or Saturday, May 25, 1996, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 3, 1996, or Tuesday, June 4, 1996, 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 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 23, 1996, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 29, 1996, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent 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 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.

TURKISH STUDIES PROGRAM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my serious concern about what I consider a troubling case of the manipulation of historical fact under the guise of academic integrity. This is happening at a university in my

own State, Princeton University, an Ivy League university and one of the leading institutions of higher learning in the Nation and in the world.

As the New York Times reported yesterday, Princeton accepted \$750,000 from the Government of Turkey to endow a new Attaturk Chair of Turkish Studies in the Department of Near Eastern Studies and hired a professor, Heath W. Lowry, who worked for the Turkish Government as executive director of the Washington-based Institute of Turkish Studies. Professor Lowry has written and spoken extensively, questioning whether or not the Armenian genocide committed by the Turkish Ottoman Empire between the years 1915 and 1923 actually occurred.

Mr. Speaker, last month, on April 24, more than 40 Members of this body from both sides of the aisle took part in a series of special orders commemorating the 81st anniversary of the unleashing of this genocide against the Armenian people. It was planned and executed in the name of Turkish nationalism in the final years of the Ottoman Empire. Eventually, 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were murdered in this first, though sadly not the last, genocide in the 20th century. Although the word "genocide" had not yet been coined, genocide is what happened. It is a great and noble effort for this Congress to recognize that the genocide occurred. I will be working with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to enact a resolution officially recognizing the historic fact that the genocide occurred and urging Turkey, the recipient of millions of dollars in United States assistance, to finally end its deceitful policy of denying that the genocide ever took place.

While remembering the Armenian genocide is important in its own right from the standpoint of honoring the victims and providing future generations with an important example of what can happen when ethnic hatred goes unchallenged, one of the most important reasons for commemorating the genocide is to challenge the efforts of those who deny that it occurred.

Now we see this genocide denial has been given a platform at one of our most prestigious universities. Professor Lowry, who is recognized as one of the leading specialists in Turkish studies, does not necessarily deny that many Armenian people suffered and died during that period of time, but he claims that the word "genocide" is not the most accurate word to describe this tragedy. Coincidentally, this has been the line put out by the Turkish Government and its apologists.

The Turkish spin that has been put on the genocide is disputed by a large volume of documented evidence, much of it collected by American diplomats and journalists on the scene. There is also the testimony of the survivors. There was, in conjunction with the physical destruction of the Armenian people, the effort to erase all traces of

the Armenian presence in the areas now in Eastern Turkey by changing geographic names and destroying Armenian religious and cultural monuments. This was not a random violence, Mr. Speaker, but a concerted program to eliminate the Armenian people and culture. It was, as we now use the term, "a genocide."

While Professor Lowry and others have the freedom to publish, obviously, what they like, I question whether it sets a good precedent for a major university to accept funding from a foreign government to essentially promote its propaganda. Many scholars agree, and have sharply criticized Princeton because that is exactly what is happening. I would hope that Princeton would seriously reconsider taking money from the Government of Turkey for this purpose or, at a minimum, would somehow build into its program certain safeguards to prevent the Turkish Government influence over essentially what the professor or others might say.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this is just one example, if you will, of how the Turkish Government tries to influence what goes on in this country, not only here in Congress, but also through our institutions of higher education, but I think it is terribly important that Princeton University and other universities like it do not continue to let their academic programs be influenced because of the money that is being donated, in this case by Turkey, or other foreign governments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I could, to include the article that was in the New York Times on Wednesday, May 22, entitled "Princeton Is Accused of Fronting for the Turkish Government."

(By William H. Honan)

A group of prominent scholars and writers contends that Princeton University is allowing itself to be used by the Turkish Government as a center for propaganda about Turkey's role in the massacre of a million Armenians during World War I.

Three years ago, the university accepted \$750,000 from the Government of Turkey to endow a new Ataturk Chair of Turkish Studies in the Department of Near Eastern Studies and hired a professor, Heath W. Lowry, who had worked for the Turkish Government, as executive director of the Washington-based Institute of Turkish Studies.

Peter Balakian, a professor of English at Colgate University who has helped organize recent protests against the appointment, characterized Professor Lowry's scholarship as "evil euphemistic evasion" and charged that his appointment at Princeton was an instance of a foreign government buying credibility for its propaganda by endowing a chair at an American university and influencing the choice of who fills the post.

Princeton has defended the appointment of Professor Lowry through a terse statement by Amy Gutmann, the dean of the faculty, declaring that the university "does not permit donors of chairs to influence the outcome of its appointment process."

Debates on responsibility for the Armenian massacres in 1915 and 1916 have gone on for years, and have accelerated recently with the rising interest in Holocaust studies. The

Turks and a handful of American scholars, among them Professor Lowry, contend that the Armenian deaths were the unintended result of wartime deprivation, while the Armenians and many more American scholars consider it genocide centrally planned by the Ottoman Turks.

The attacks on Princeton erupted last year with a critical article in the academic journal *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* by the scholar Robert Jay Lifton. In February, a group of 100 scholars and writers published a denunciation of the Turkish Government and Professor Lowry in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a weekly journal; the signers included Alfred Kazin, Norman Mailer, Arthur Miller, Joyce Carol Oates, Susan Sontag, William Styron, David Riesman and John Updike. And a group of nearly 200 Armenian-Americans held a protest meeting last Wednesday night at the Princeton Club in New York City.

For his part, Professor Lowry says his skepticism about whether the deaths were centrally planned simply reflects adherence to scholarly rules of evidence.

"The Turkish Government is just as unhappy with a lot of my work as are some of the Armenians who attack me," he said. "I have never denied the terrible suffering and deaths of hundreds of thousands of Armenians during the First World War. But I object to the use of the word genocide until the relevant records are located, studied and have proved that genocide is in fact the most accurate term to describe this tragedy."

The furor over the appointment was prompted by an odd incident involving Professor Lifton, who teaches at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in Manhattan. In October 1990, the Turkish Ambassador to the United States, Nuzhet Kandemir, wrote to Professor Lifton, upbraiding him for referring in his latest book to the "so-called" Armenian genocide."

Professor Lifton was not surprised by the attack, but he was by a puzzling enclosure with the letter. It was a memo from Professor Lowry to the Ambassador that showed Professor Lowry had drafted the official Turkish Government protest to the Lifton book.

The memo said Professor Lowry was writing to Ambassador Kandemir "with an eye to drafting a letter for your signature to the author."

In the *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* article last year, Professor Lifton revealed the memo and branded Professor Lowry as an apologist for the Turkish Government.

In a recent interview, Professor Lowry acknowledged that his memo to Ambassador Kandemir was a mistake. "I was not a professor at Princeton when I wrote that," he said. "Looking back from where I am today, I goofed."

Professor Lowry, 53, received a Ph.D. in Turkish studies from the University of California, Los Angeles in 1977. In 1985, he was one of 69 specialists in Turkish studies who signed a petition urging that a House of Representatives resolution condemning the crime of genocide should not include the Armenian massacres. These crimes, the petition stated, were the result of "intercommunal warfare" complicated by "disease, famine, suffering and massacres."

"In my opinion," he said in an interview, "it was a total breakdown in civil authority on the part of a young, revolutionary government fighting a world war simultaneously on a number of fronts. That government's decision to relocate its Armenian citizenry into north Syria created a situation in which the deportees were subjected to attacks by marauding Kurdish tribesmen, starvation and the ravages of cholera and typhus epidemics."

The current scholarly debate over the Armenian deaths focuses on three principal sources of evidence: the memoirs of Henry Morgenthau, who was the United States Ambassador to Turkey from 1913 to 1916; a remark that Hitler reportedly made in 1939, and cable traffic and other messages from German diplomats stationed in Turkey during World War I.

Vahakn N. Dadrian, a sociologist who wrote "The History of the Armenian Genocide" (Berghahn Books, Providence, 1995), said that Ambassador Morgenthau's memoirs—published in 1918—provided "conclusive proof" that the Turks committed genocide.

"Morgenthau reported that when he complained to top Turkish leaders about reports that women, children and old people were being marched into the desert to be killed," Professor Dadrian said, "he was told: 'We can't make distinctions. Those who are not guilty today will oppose us in the future.'"

But Professor Lowry counters that official records he discovered show that Robert Lansing, the Secretary of State then, rewrote parts of the memoirs, and that the book—long considered a standard in the annals of diplomatic history—is filled with "outright lies and half-truths". His findings were published in 1990 by an academic press in Istanbul.

The remark by Hitler is another matter of contention among scholars. He is reported to have said in a private meeting with SS chiefs at Obersalzberg, on the eve of the invasion of Poland: "Be merciless in exterminating Polish men, women and children. Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

Professor Lifton said the quotation not only confirms the genocide of the Armenians but indicates that "if you don't confront genocide, the next group inclined toward it can see itself as carrying out the genocide with impunity."

Professor Lowry said he believes the Hitler quote is probably apocryphal and has been used to establish a false link between the tragic history of the Turkish Armenians and the Holocaust a generation later.

"The Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal discarded this version of Hitler's speech and relied instead on a version which does not contain any reference to the Armenians," he said.

The third source of evidence, German diplomatic traffic reporting the Armenian massacres, is considered particularly important by scholars, because Turkey was a German ally in the World War I and because in their confidential reports to Berlin, the German diplomats had no discernible reason to falsify what they saw.

Roger W. Smith, a professor of government at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va., who specializes in genocide studies, said the German cable traffic proves that the deaths were genocide.

In an interview, he said, "Hans Wangerhelm, the German Ambassador to Turkey, reported to Berlin in July 1915 that the Turkish Government 'is really pursuing the aim of destroying the Armenian race.'"

Professor Lowry said he still needed to be persuaded. "If this material and newly available archives from Russia, the Ottoman Empire and the various Armenian revolutionary organizations, points to genocide as an accurate description of what actually took place," he said, "I'll be the first to use the word."

NO BRIDGE TOO FAR

Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized

for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I signed up for 60 minutes, but my colleague from the beautiful adjoining Southern California district to the south, which has some of the most beautiful surf in the Nation, I am landlocked, Mr. DANA ROHRBACHER, will follow me. I gladly gave him 30 minutes of my time. He has some very important things upon which he will report to his district, the Nation, the Members of this House, all through you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just left Speaker NEWT GINGRICH's office, and he told us earlier that if he got 235 signatures on a letter to Mr. Clinton asking him in the name of duty, honor and country, to remove from his legal pleadings to get out of giving Paula Corbin Jones, the young lady who is claiming sexual harassment, alleging a case of something beyond sexual harassment, at the high end of it, that category where it is a crime, that he not have to give her her day in court, that he not appear in court, because, among many other frivolous reasons, that he should be considered an active duty military officer as the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

He refers to a not obscure, but not often used, act of this Congress in 1940, and it is called the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act of 1940, and that is what he is claiming through his lawyer, Bob Bennett, that is a Republican activist and good friend of mine, Bill Bennett's older brother, that Bob Bennett, the principal lawyer on what some people in the press are calling Clinton's dream team, hoping for the same impossible outcome as killer O.J. Simpson got, that they are claiming this 1940 act.

Back to Speaker GINGRICH. He said you get 236, of course I will be on there, make it unanimous. Well, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. BOB STUMP, who is the point man on this, I am flying tight wing on World War II veteran BOB STUMP, combat veteran, so this Korean peacetime fighter pilot is right there with him, and in two days we got all 235 signatures. I just left NEWT GINGRICH's office. He is 236. We picked up a couple of veterans on the Democrat side of the aisle, and we are off and running with 238 signatures.

I will read the letter, in a moment when it arrives, to the President, or the press release. The letter will be finally constructed tomorrow, delivered to the White House tomorrow afternoon, on this Memorial Day weekend, asking Mr. Clinton and company to take that example of a pleading out of his case, to delay until 1997 Paula Corbin's day in court, or if he were to win a second term, to delay it until the next century, 2001 is when Mr. Clinton would leave office, at noon on January 20 if he gets a second term, and then Paula Corbin Jones can have her day in court.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you, who was one of the first signers of the letter out of 238, I think you might have been so

busy today, you missed the inimitable Maureen Dowd, her column in the New York Times, America's paper of record. All the news that fits—I mean all the news that is fit to print. That was not deliberate. I have said it the other way so often that I did not mean to do that. All the news that is fit to print.

Maureen Dowd was going to title her column on Mr. Clinton "Hiding Behind the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act of 1940," and I will explain that in some brief detail, what it is and what it is not. It involves only civil cases, by the way, not criminal charges. It does not cover sexual harassment. But Maureen Dowd told me she was going to call her column "Sergeant Bilk." I said well, I would have called it "No Bridge Too Far." Cross my heart, that is what I said, Mr. Speaker, right in that Speaker's lobby. And guess what she calls her column? "No Bridge Too Far."

Above her name, which appears because she would be one of their senior columnists, above her own name Maureen Dowd appears "Liberties." It is kind of a top headline. And then a subject-headline says, I can hear the music, "He's in the Army now." And here is her column, dateline "Washington." That is where Maureen Dowd covers the whole wild scene inside the Beltway, from right here in the arena listening to the screams of the Christians and the roars of the lions.

She says, "As A society, we haven't preserved our sense of shame." Billy Graham signed off on that on May 2 in the rotunda.

□ 1630

We have not preserved our sense of shame. "But Bill Clinton is doing his best", his best—

To preserve our sense of shamelessness.

The President and his Rasputin, Dick Morris, have broken creative new ground in brazenness.

First they snatch Republican positions counting, not unreasonably, on the forgetfulness of voters and the expediency of Democrats who want their Republican in the White House to win. And now they are both embroiled in keruffles on Capitol Hill, where it takes a lot to be called shameless.

At my age, Mr. Speaker, when I come across a new word, it is a thrill. When I was a young college kid I used to read a Bill Buckley column and find five words I did not know. I now know that Bill Buckley and I are peers because I have not read a column of his in at least 2 years where I have not known every word in the column, but this one is a new one.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, would you do me a favor? As you prepare your succinct remarks and trenchant comments for tonight, would you go to the big dictionary and look up this word, K-E-R-F-U-F-F-L-E-S, keruffles. That is what Maureen Dowd says, and I will read this sentence again. I love to learn a new word, "And now they are both embroiled." the President and his people on the other side of the aisle, "in keruffles on Capitol Hill, where it takes a lot to be called shameless."