

Now, so often these things are mislabeled as a tax cut on the rich, but every shred of empirical evidence, Mr. Speaker, has demonstrated that it will in fact be beneficial in job creation and economic growth.

A capital gains tax cut will make more venture capital available for emerging technologies as we charge toward the millennium. We know how important that is. We know that job creation is emanating from the private sector and the small business sector of our economy.

□ 2045

We also need, in looking at the technological changes that are made, we need to make the research and development tax credit permanent so that this incentive that we need for encouraging innovation in new technologies is there.

We also need to do what we can to increase the skills of the workforce in this country, improving basic education through school choice, increasing local control and reducing the bureaucracy; creating tax deferred or tax-free education savings account similar to individual retirement accounts, something that this administration admittedly has talked about, but has not acted upon. And we have tried responsibly to move ahead with that and have not gotten much support from the administration. We have not cut spending on education, nor should we continue to throw money at what is a wasteful, broken system.

We need also to enact significant regulatory reform. The explosion of new regulation we have seen since 1988 has raised the cost of labor and capital, created barriers to the formation of new companies and jobs, and raised the cost of employing Americans.

The higher cost of employment, in turn, means that in a competitive economy the return to labor in the form of wages is greatly reduced. The regulatory burden needs to be rolled back, not only to allow wages to rise, but also to decrease the cost of hiring workers. And remember, again we are trying to address the concern that many have raised that will follow on with reforming the welfare structure.

We also need to have a modest increase in the long-term growth rate, which can have a dramatic impact on the standard of living here in the United States. A 1 percent increase in long-term economic growth would mean 6 million new jobs created over an 8-year-period, \$700 billion more in tax revenue, enough to balance the budget by the year 2002 without any spending cuts, and also Social Security would remain solvent for 30 more years if we were to have just a 1 percent increase in long-term economic growth.

Also, 200,000 new small businesses would be created over a 4-year period.

With that, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we could go a long way towards addressing the concerns that have been raised by Members on both

sides of the aisle that will following the wake of reforming the welfare system, but it must be done, it must be done as expeditiously as possible. Unleash this economy and let us do it now.

PENSIONS MUST BE PROTECTED

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss an issue important to every American: protecting pensions.

Pensions represent security and independence for all working Americans. As Americans have come to rely on Social Security, they also have every right to expect their pensions will be there when they retire.

This Congress has made great strides in enacting a balanced budget. Finally, Republicans and most Democrats agree that the budget must be balanced in the next 6 years. How we actually get to a balanced budget is still being debated, but at least there is bipartisan agreement to balance the budget.

The issue of pensions became a part of last year's budget battle. While I supported the balanced budget, I voted for the motion to instruct conferees that would have ensured workers' pensions throughout America. The reason we needed to instruct conferees was that the act proposed allowing some businesses to tap into so-called excess pension funds. While under this proposal, these funds would need to be used in other employee benefit accounts, cutting pension accounts for any reason could place workers' retirements at risk. The investment market is simply too volatile.

In many cases these were not "excess" pension funds at all, but were simply the value that inflation had added to the pension funds. If anything, these excess funds should only be used for cost-of-living adjustments for retirees. That is why I voted to instruct conferees to protect workers' pensions.

A study done by the Pension Guaranty Corporation reported that plans with excess funding could become underfunded with an economic downturn, such as a drop in interest rates or market shifts. While businesses must make up any shortfalls, this weakens their overall financial health. This just is not worth the risk.

It is critical that Congress protect these pensions for workers as it did when the Tax Reform Act of 1986 was passed. Congress recognized that employers have an obligation to ensure their employees' pensions. This obligation is critical in the 1990's.

When the budget was signed into law by President Clinton, it contained no changes that would allow any corporate raid on pensions. I will continue my work to protect workers' pensions.

These funds were earned by retirees and they must be there when they need them.

AMERICA IS IN NEED OF PRAYER

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to put in that section of the RECORD we call the Extension of Remarks a beautiful, thoughtful, short exposition by the Reverend Joseph Wright. He is not from my State. It was given to me by one of the outside institutions around this place, the lovely Rita Warren of Massachusetts, who goes through all the hoops around here to get permission to have a Passion Play on the East Steps of our beautiful U.S. Capitol every Easter week; and I noticed she is starting to worry about what is happening to our country, vis-a-vis what Reverend Billy Graham or the Holy Father in Rome has said.

So I notice that she has her Passion Play out on the steps with a figure of Jesus and all of his beautiful sayings as the Prince of Peace that can save our world. But she asked me, since she had given me this recitation by Reverend Wright if I could not read it on the floor of the House, as well as put it in.

So for Rita Warren, I will do that, Mr. Speaker. The following is excerpted from a prayer in the Kansas house. This was delivered on the floor of the Kansas legislature, courageous Bob Dole's home State, on January 23 by Joe Wright of Central Christian Church, Wichita.

We have ridiculed the absolute truth of God's word and called it pluralism.

We have worshiped false gods and called it multiculturalism.

We have endorsed perversion and called it alternative lifestyle or diversity.

We have exploited the poor and called it the lottery.

We have neglected the needy and called it self-preservation.

We have rewarded laziness and called it welfare.

We have killed the pre-born and called it choice.

We have neglected to discipline our children and have called it building self-esteem.

We have abused power and called it political savvy.

We have coveted our neighbor's possessions and called it ambition.

We have polluted the airwaves with profanity and pornography and called it freedom of expression.

We have ridiculed the time-honored values of our forefathers and called it enlightenment.

We have indoctrinated our children and called it education.

We have censored God from our public life and called it religious freedom.

We have prevented our citizens from defending themselves and called it gun control.

We have allowed violent criminals to be released to prey on society and called it compassion or rehabilitation.

We have imprisoned the innocent and let the guilty go free and called it justice.

Indeed America is in much need of prayer.

And in my concluding minute, let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that the RU-486 pill, about to emerge on the American market, has been called by Thomas Grenchik, director of the archdiocesan Pro-Life Office as a child-pesticide. He says Clinton has another anticipated victory in his campaign to kill the pre-born.

"At the President's direction," Mr. Grenchik says, "the Food and Drug Administration has strong-armed the use of RU-486 from its European owner and, as promised, will ramrod the approval of this child-pesticide at all costs."

It goes on to describe this panel of experts on July 19, way out of town in Gaithersburg with a 6-0 vote, two abstaining, on unleashing this child-pesticide.

RU-486, also known by its generic name mifepristone, is taken first and causes the uterine lining to break down and slough off. Then misoprostol, a prostaglandin that stimulates uterine contractions, is taken 2 days later, a complicated procedure requiring several medical visits, precise drug doses, and monitoring.

In an editorial in "L'Osservatore Romano," the Vatican newspaper, it was condemned as an abortion pill, "the pill of Cain, the monster that cynically kills one's brother"; and in this editorial, a moral theologian writes that the pill's anticipated approval in the United States is an important victory for what it termed, and this is in Rome, the "abortion party" led by the Population Council and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

So the battle goes on, Mr. Speaker, and let us hope that people go into this with their eyes open and that we do not have a delayed time bomb of the thalidomide problem here. Yes, as Reverend Joe Wright says, America is certainly a Nation in need of prayer.

As Billy Graham said in our beautiful Rotunda when he received, unanimously from both the Senate and the House, the Congressional Gold Medal, America is a Nation on the brink of self-destruction.

ACTIONS TO MARKET ABORTION PILL ARE DENOUNCED

The archdiocesan pro-life director denounced this week's government actions that would soon put the abortion-inducing pill RU-486 on the American market.

Thomas Grenchik, director of the archdiocesan Pro-Life Office, said that President Clinton "has another anticipated victory in his campaign to kill" the unborn. "At the president's direction, the Food and Drug Administration has strong-armed the use of RU-486 from its European owner and, as promised, will ramrod the approval of this child-pesticide at all costs."

A panel of scientific experts recommended July 19 that the FDA here in Washington

allow the controversial abortion-inducing pill to be marketed in the United States.

Following a public hearing in Gaithersburg, the FDA's Reproductive Health Drugs Advisory Committee voted 6-0 that the benefits of the RU-486/misoprostol regimen for terminating early pregnancies outweigh its risks. Two members of the panel abstained.

RU-486, also known by its generic name mifepristone, is taken first and causes the uterine lining to break down and slough off. Misoprostol, a prostaglandin that stimulates uterine contractions, is taken two days later. The procedure requires several medical visits, precise drug dosage and monitoring.

An editorial in the July 22 issue of L'Osservatore Romano, the Vatican newspaper, condemned the abortion pill as "the pill of Cain, the monster that cynically kills one's brother."

The editorial, signed by Father Gino Concetti, a moral theologian, said the pill's anticipated approval in the United States was an important victory for what it termed the "abortion party" led by the Population Council and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

At the hearing, the Population Council, a New-York based research organization that holds the U.S. patent rights to RU-486, presented clinical data from two French trials involving 2,480 women and preliminary safety data from U.S. trials involving 2,100 women.

More than 30 individuals also testified during the open portion of the meeting.

The French data showed the medical abortion procedure to be 95 percent effective. However, panelists also heard that women participating in the clinical trials experienced painful contractions of the uterus as well as nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, pelvic pain and spasm, and headache.

In some cases where the chemical combination failed to produce an abortion, women then had surgical abortions; others completed their pregnancies and delivered babies with deformities.

According to an FDA statement after the panel decision, "a very small percentage of patients in the clinical trials required hospitalizations, surgical treatment or transfusions."

Dr. Mark Louviere, a Waterloo, Iowa, emergency room physician who said he is a supporter of legalized abortion, told FDA panelists that he treated a participant in the Planned Parenthood of Iowa trial who lost more than half of her blood volume and nearly died.

"I am concerned that all of the true complications of RU-486 are not being reported to both the media and to the FDA," he said, adding that he also fears the use of RU-486 "by physicians without appropriate follow-up."

"The FDA approval process is moving at an unheard-of pace to approve this deadly drug combination, leaving many concerns about safety unresolved," said Wanda Franz, a developmental psychologist at West Virginia University and president of the National Right to Life Committee, in a statement from the group's Washington office.

"Respect for human life and women's health, not developing human 'pesticides,' should be at the center of the FDA's concern when advancing new drugs," said Judie Brown, president of the American Life League, in a statement from the organization's headquarters in Stafford, VA.

RU-486 was developed by the French company Roussel Uclaf, and has been taken by more than 200,000 European women since 1989. In 1994, Roussel Uclaf signed over U.S. rights to the Population Council, which filed the FDA application in March.

In deciding on drug applications, the federal agency usually has followed the recommendations of its advisory committees. If RU-486 is approved by the FDA, the drug would be sold by Advances in Health Technology, a company set up for that purpose last year, and could be available in the United States next year.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. GOSS (during the special order of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-735) on the resolution (H. Res. 500) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of a certain resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A DIFFERENT VISION OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk tonight about a different vision of America, a vision that we are not really seeing from the Washington bureaucracy, but one that this Congress is trying to form and trying to achieve and move our Nation towards.

We have asked ourselves some fundamental questions: What kind of America do we want? Do we want an America where illegal drug use is up? Do we want an America where taxes are up and wages are down? Do we want an America where welfare traps families and despairs generation after generation? And do we want an America where illegal immigration is up? And do we want one where a White House has more scandals than Hollywood has disaster films?

Look at that vision of America. That is somehow what many of the Washington bureaucrats see and administer today.

Think about another kind of America. Would we like one that has stronger and safer families through a real fight against crime and illegal drugs? Do we want an America where there are more opportunities through lower taxes, higher wages, better jobs and more free time? Do we want an American where illegal immigration is down and English is truly our common and unifying language? Do we want an America where welfare is replaced by work? And do we want an America where the White House is the moral leader of the country, not just the political issues.

These are the things that we are going to talk about tonight, and I have