Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, during the Fourth of July district work period, it was my distinct honor to join officials in Orange County, California, to highlight the transportation needs of the 46th Congressional District.

I joined the chairman of the Orange County Transportation Authority, Sara Catz, a longtime friend, and the regional administrator for the Federal Transit Administration, Mr. Leslie Rogers, to present a $5 million check in Federal transportation funding to undertake a feasibility study for the construction of an urban light rail system.

I believe that the final release of the Federal funding is an excellent example of the partnership between the Federal Government and regional transportation agencies in an effort to meet the transportation needs of local residents. I am pleased to work with the administration to make the funding available to begin the feasibility study of the transitway project.

The funding represents a significant step in relieving the crushing transportation demands of the residents of Orange County.

For example, the projected future economic growth will result in an estimated 43 percent increase in county traffic by the year 2020. In fact, if we take a look at the work that is being done today in the city of Anaheim, $5 billion worth of new construction, private construction, where we are building a second Disneyland theme park, Members will note that we have a lot of construction going on today.

While the residents of Orange County many years ago passed a proposition which would allow us to fund many of the transportation improvements we have been working on, the fact of the matter is that the economic good times that are occurring there with respect to construction and jobs require an even more fundamental solution.

For example, the interstate throughway through Orange County now has a place where it is 26 lanes wide in just one spot, so transit makes good sense if it can be affordable and if it can be applied correctly.

In fact, if we do not do something and we continue just to build freeways, it will add about another 20 minutes to commute time in Orange County, where some people already have commute times of 2 hours just one way to get to work in the morning.

The potential for the light rail system in our county is exciting. Transitway projects such as this represent a sound investment in infrastructure that enable our economy to thrive and to provide our communities with a safe and reliable transportation system. It becomes even more important as part of our population continues to age and as, for example, in the city of Santa Ana, which I represent, we have the youngest population across the United States.

Ultimately, by improving our transportation system, we stimulate economic growth, we create local jobs, and ultimately we improve the quality of life for our cities and our neighborhoods.

NORTON FILES BILL FOR FULL CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today I introduced the District of Columbia Voting Rights Act of 1998, my first bill following the July 4 recess. District citizens commemorated July 4 of this year by presenting a petition to Congress for redress of grievances granting the citizens of the District of Columbia representation in Congress.

July 4 was the date the Founders of the Nation and the Framers of the Constitution declared their right to full voting representation before submitting to any government. The residents of the District take them at their word and insist upon the same.

Because the petition is not self-executing but requires the introduction of a bill, I have an obligation to respond to the petition by introducing a bill to carry out its request to the Congress to grant the District full voting representation. I expect the same bill to be introduced in the Senate.

District citizens, with great patience, have pursued all the remedies available to them, the Voting Rights Act of 1978 and the New Columbia Admission Act of 1993. Following the example set at the founding of the Nation on July 4 of 1776, it has become impossible for the District to let the matter rest any longer. A combination of authoritative sources now make clear that Congress cannot continue constitutionally to deny District residents representation in the national legislature, but must and can take all steps necessary to afford them full representation.

The Congress has continually cited Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, for the proposition that it has plenary power to do whatever is constitutionally and legally necessary to or for the District. Using this power, the Congress has required District residents to meet the responsibilities of States and to accept the obligations of States, but has denied District citizens the rights that citizens of the States take for granted. Under the Constitution as interpreted by the courts today, it has become impossible to argue that the Constitution gives the Congress power at once to impose obligations and to deny rights.

Fortunately, the Framers of the Constitution have not left District citizens without a remedy, should Congress fail to act. That is what the courts are there for, and that is what the Constitution is there for.

Therefore, today I am introducing into the RECORD the Petition for Redress of Grievances, which lays out the broad outlines of the constitutional framework that requires that District citizens be treated like the full American citizens they are.

The courts have already decided that all Americans are entitled to equal representation in the national legislature. The Supreme Court has interpreted the due process clause, the equal protection clause, the privileges and immunities clause, and the guarantee of a republican form of government, to mean that no American citizen may be excluded from an equal vote in the Congress.

The right to be represented in the national legislature is a function of national citizenship. District residents cannot be held to be the only citizens excluded from the one man-one vote equal representation of Reynolds versus Sims.

The citizens of the District of Columbia are as much entitled to the right to full representation as citizens who leave our shores, perhaps for a lifetime, but still claim the right to representation in the House and Senate, under the Overseas Citizens Voting Rights Act of 1975 passed by the Congress.

Thomas Jefferson spoke for the people whom I represent when, in the Declaration of Independence, he wrote about ''. . . a long line of abuses and usurpations'' resulting from government without representation of the governed, and concluded that there was ''a duty to throw off such government and to provide new guards.''

Like the colonists, District citizens pay taxes as required by a body in which they have no representation. Unlike the colonists, District citizens have recourse to a peaceful path for the redress of grievances, the Congress of the United States, and failing that, Article 3 courts established by the Framers themselves.

Therefore, I call upon my colleagues in the House and Senate to use Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, and the other relevant constitutional provisions and cases forthwith to grant, in the words of the bill I introduced today, ''. . . the community of American citizens who are residents of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States . . . full voting representation in the Congress'' before the 105th Congress adjourns sine die.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the text of the Petition for the Redress of Grievances.

The material referred to is as follows:

PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES

We the people of the District of Columbia exercise our First Amendment right this July 4th ''to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.''[1] We file our Petition to ask the Congress and the President to redress the most fundamental of grievances: our lack of voting representation in the

[1] Footnotes at end of article.

United States House of Representatives and in the United States Senate.

We the people of the District of Columbia are citizens of the United States, endowed with all the attendant rights and duties of American citizenship. Like all other American citizens, we are governed by the laws Congress writes; thousands of us have fought and died in the wars Congress has declared; and we pay into the Treasury billions of dollars for the taxes Congress levies. Yet, unlike all other citizens, we have no vote in the decisions Congress makes. And we are denied that right solely because our home is the Nation's Capital, the city that is a symbol of Democracy to people throughout the world.

This denial is wrong, because it is contrary to the principles of democratic consent and representative government upon which our Nation was founded. It was wrong when the vote was denied to African-Americans; it was wrong when the vote was denied to women; it was wrong when the vote was denied through poll taxes, literacy tests, property requirements and other devices that excluded citizens from equal participation in our Government; and, it is wrong now to deny voting rights in Congress to the citizens of the District of Columbia. Congress and the President, in the noble American tradition of justice for all, have redressed these wrongs in the past. They should do the same for us now. We therefore petition the Congress and the President to right the wrong that continues to be done to the citizens in the Nation's Capital.

The principles upon which we base our petition were first set out in the Declaration of Independence, 222 years ago today. There, Thomas Jefferson and the other founders of our Republic declared that Governments justly derive their powers only ''from the consent of the governed'' and that Great Britain had violated that requirement by forcing our people to ''relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them . . .''[2]

In its first seven words, our Constitution carries forward these basic principles of our Declaration of Independence and articulates the sole source of our Government's legitimacy: ''We the people of the United States . . .''[3] On behalf of all the people of the United States, the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution in order to secure the Blessings of Liberty to the citizens of the original states and to their Posterity. We are part of that Posterity, and we therefore claim the rights the Constitution gives us.

The Constitution guarantees Due Process to all citizens. It guarantees Equal Protection of the Laws to all citizens. It guarantees the Privileges and Immunities of citizenship to all citizens. And it guarantees a Republican Form of Government to all citizens. As Abraham Lincoln said, ours is a government ''of the people, by the people, and for the people.''[4] We the citizens of the District of Columbia are entitled to the rights the Constitution guarantees, and we are certainly a part of the people of whom Lincoln so movingly spoke. To continue to deny us the vote is to deny us these constitutional rights and to exclude us from Lincoln's promise.

For how can ours be a Government of the people if part of the people have no voice in that Government solely because of their place of residence? How can we receive Due Process if we do not participate in the process that makes the laws we are asked to obey? How can we benefit from Equal Protection if the laws exclude us from voting representation? How can we exercise the Privileges of citizenship if we are denied citizenship's most precious privilege—the right to vote for those who govern us? And how can we enjoy a Republican form of Government if we have no voting representation in that Government? Indeed, how can our Government claim the consent of the governed when a half-million people in our Nation's Capital cannot consent because they have no vote?

The answer to all these questions is that without the right to vote, our Democratic rights are debased and the Blessings of Liberty are withheld. As Susan B. Anthony said in 1872: ''Our democratic-republican government is based on the idea of the natural right of every individual member thereof to a voice and a vote in making and executing the laws.''[5] As she also said: ''It was we, the people, not we, the white male citizens, but we, the whole people, who formed this Union.''[6] And as Martin Luther King, Jr., said on that historic day in 1963 when he and thousands of others gathered in our Nation's Capital: ''When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir.''[7] As he also said then, ''now is the time to make real the promises of democracy.''[8]

For most citizens, the Supreme Court made good that promise in 1964 in its landmark ''one-person one-vote'' decision (*Reynolds* v. *Sims*). In so doing our Supreme Court declared: ''No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live. Other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined.''[9]

To their great credit, our recent Presidents and Congresses have repeatedly acted to further this constitutional imperative of representation for all Americans. President Lyndon Johnson, placing the full weight of his presidency behind the historic Voting Rights Act in 1965, declared before a Joint Session of Congress that ''every American citizen must have an equal vote'' and that ''there is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty we have to ensure that right.''[10] Twenty-five years later, on the anniversary of that Act, President George Bush proclaimed a national day of celebration, declaring that ''the right to vote . . . is at the heart of freedom and self-government.''[11] He urged all Americans to ''reflect upon the importance of exercising our right to vote and our determination to uphold America's promise of equal opportunity for all.''[12]

For its part, Congress has repeatedly responded to such calls from our Presidents and from the Nation to protect the right to vote. For example, in the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, Congress expressly found that: (1) the right of citizens of the United States to vote is a fundamental right; and (2) it is the duty of the Federal, State, and local governments to promote the exercise of that right.[13]

Our grievance is that these resounding pronouncements ring hollow to us this July 4th. In November, when all other American citizens cast their ballots for their Representatives and Senators in our national Legislature, our votes will not be among them. On that day, the people of America will exercise their most precious right, but we the people of the Nation's Capital will be left out.

Twenty years ago, Congress recognized this grave injustice and proposed a constitutional amendment to address it. Two-thirds majorities of both Houses of Congress passed a joint resolution declaring that District citizens are entitled to full voting representation in both Houses. Senator Thurmond, who supported the amendment, defended its adoption as follows:

''I think it is a fair thing to do. We are advocating one-man, one vote. We are advocating democratic processes in this country. We have more than 700,000 people in the District of Columbia who do not have voting representation. I think it is nothing but right that we allow these people that representation. We are advocating democratic processes all over the world. We are holding ourselves up as the exemplary Nation that others may emulate in ideas of democracy. How can we do that when three-quarters of a million people are not allowed to have voting representation in the capital city of this Nation?''[14]

Senator Dole, who also championed the bill, explained that the 1976 Republican platform had endorsed voting representation for the District in both Houses, that as the Vice-Presidential nominee he had pointed ''with pride'' to that position as an ''excellent expression of Republican ideals and principles,'' and that he supported passage of the 1978 bill.[15] His reasons eloquently capture why such a bill was and is necessary:

''The absence of voting representation for the District in Congress is an anomaly which the Senate can no longer sanction. It is an unjustifiable gap in our scheme of representative government—a gap which we can fill this afternoon by passing this resolution.

* * * * *

''It seems clear that the framers of the Constitution did not intend to disenfranchise a significant number of Americans by establishing a Federal District. I believe that the framers would have found the current situation offensive to their notions of fairness and participatory government.

* * * * *

''The Republican Party [in 1976] supported D.C. voting representation because it was just, and in justice we could do nothing else. We supported full rights of citizenship because from the first—from Lincoln forward—we have supported the full rights of citizenship for all Americans.''[16]

These Senators' reasoning in support of full democratic representation for the District is as compelling today as it was 20 years ago. And yet, what these Senators rightly found intolerable 20 years ago still persists today. For although two-thirds of the Congress endorsed voting representation for the District in 1978, the vehicle chosen by Congress—a constitutional amendment—failed to attain ratification by the required three-fourths of the States. As a result, the equal rights for D.C. citizens that a large majority of the Members of Congress supported have still not been enacted into law.

However, a constitutional amendment is not required to give us those rights. Those rights are already guaranteed by the Constitution. All that Congress need do is pass a bill today recognizing that fact and giving us voting representation as it intended 20 years ago. Congress should do so now, not only because it is constitutionally and morally right, but also because it speaks to the common sense of the people. The most recent poll of public opinion shows that 80 per cent of the American people believe we should have equal representation in Congress.[17]

For these reasons, we formally petition the Congress to pass a bill granting us by legislation full voting representation as it approved for the District in 1978. We furthermore petition the Congress to pass such a bill before it adjourns this session. And we petition the President to support and promptly sign the bill. Our Government should not let us enter the 21st century as second-class citizens.

It is time to remedy this fundamental injustice. It is time to extend democracy to the loyal and taxpaying American citizens who reside in the Nation's Capital. It is time to give us the vote.

Respectfully submitted by John M. Ferren, District of Columbia Corporation Counsel, On Behalf of the Citizens of the Nation's Capital.

[To be signed, also, by a number of representative citizens of the District of Columbia]

FOOTNOTES

1. Constitution of the United States of America, Amendment I.
2. The Declaration of Independence (1776).
3. Constitution of the United States of America, Preamble.
4. Abraham Lincoln, The Gettysburg Address (November 19, 1863)
5. Susan B. Anthony, Women's Right to Vote Speech (June 1873)
6. Ibid.
7. Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., ''I Have a Dream'' Speech (August 28, 1963).
8. Ibid.
9. 377 U.S. 533, 560 (1964).
10. 111 Cong. Rec. H5059 (1965).
11. Proclamation No. 6165, 55 Fed. Reg. 32233 (1990).
12. Ibid.
13. 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg.
14. 124 Cong. Rec. 27253 (daily ed. August 22, 1978).
15. 124 Cong. Rec. 27254 (daily ed. August 22, 1978).
16. Ibid.
17. Washington Post, page J–1 (March 19, 1980).

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

May Your blessings, O God, that have touched our life since birth and continue with us day by day, abide in our hearts and minds this day. We recognize, gracious God, that the times abound with opportunities and challenges. As we seek to be responsible in our tasks, we need to know not only the details of issues, but we also need to surround ourselves with the great traditions from which we garner our values and ideals, our faith and our convictions. May our shared heritage remind us that in all things we should do justice, love mercy and ever walk humbly with You. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 26, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, June 26, 1998 at 1:00 p.m.:

That the Senate Agreed to House amendment S. 731.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 651.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 652.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 848.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 960.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 1184.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 1217.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 1635.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.J. Res. 113.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 29, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate on Monday, June 29, 1998 at 3:03 p.m.

That the Senate Agreed to House amendments to Senate amendments H.R. 3130.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, July 10, 1998 at 11:30 a.m.

That the Senate Agreed to conference report H.R. 2676.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule 1, the Speaker pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills on Tuesday June 30, 1998:

H.R. 651, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for the construction of a hydroelectric project located in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 652, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for the construction of a hydroelectric project located in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 848, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of the AuSable hydroelectric project in New York, and for other purposes;

H.R. 960, to validate certain conveyances in the city of Tulare, Tulare County, California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1184, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for the construction of the Bear Creek hydroelectric project in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1217, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for the construction of a hydroelectric project located in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2202, to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the Bone Marrow Donor Program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2864, to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a program under which employers may consult with State officials respecting compliance with occupational safety and health requirements;

H.R. 2877, to amend the Occupational Health Act of 1970;

H.R. 3130, to provide for an alternative penalty procedure for States that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentives payments for effective child support performance, to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements, and for other purposes; and

S. 731, to extend the legislative authority for construction of the National Peace Garden Memorial, and for other purposes;

And the Speaker pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution on Tuesday, July 7, 1998:

H.R. 1635, to establish within the United States National Park Service the National Underground Railroad