

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 24, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

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

In all our lives and in the decisions that come before us, O God, may we sense Your presence and power. When we are weak, give us strength; when we are ill, give us health; when the doubts of everyday life surround us, give us faith; when we despair and miss the heavenly vision, give us hope; and when we are alone may Your spirit accompany us and be our companion along life's way. This is our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. BOEHNER 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 98. Joint Resolution to express appreciation for the benefit brought to the Nation by Amtrak during its 20 years of existence.

THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION REFORM PLAN

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week the President offered a comprehensive reform program to improve education in our country.

Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the current problems of our educational system, which include declin-

ing parental involvement and sinking test scores, and the President's new strategy confronts these problems directly. Some say the plan is controversial. However, Mr. Speaker, I say, "Maybe controversy is exactly what we need to shake up the educational system."

The President's plan focused on making all of our communities places where learning will happen, and that means parents must play a greater role. And what about these sinking test scores? The President's plan introduces a much needed dimension to our schools: accountability.

Mr. Speaker, from establishing standards in five core subjects, to providing and promoting school choice, this strategy will make schools and teachers accountable.

There has been too much theoretical jabbering and not enough effective action in education. The President has given us a plan that can work. Let us work together to implement it.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 132) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on the District of Columbia: Sander M. Levin, Michigan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COVETED ATF CONTRACT AWARDED TO LOCKHEED AERONAUTICAL SYSTEMS IN MARIETTA, GA

(Mr. DARDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the multibillion dollar, 5-year battle is over. The YF-22, "Lightning 2" has won.

In a suspenseful announcement yesterday by the Secretary of the Air Force, the prime contractor of the YF-22—Lockheed Aeronautical Systems based in Marietta, GA—was awarded the largest aircraft development con-

tract ever—the plan to build the advanced tactical fighter aircraft—the next generation fighter.

Lockheed has a long history of technological excellence in aeronautical engineering—the most recent example being the stealthy and sophisticated F-117 fighter, which performed so well in Operation Desert Storm. The production of the YF-22 is a logical extension of this success.

The combined technological skill of the Lockheed, Boeing, General Dynamics team have resulted in one of the most sophisticated and capable fighter planes ever designed. The agility, capability, and overall performance of the YF-22 is expected to surpass that of any fighter plane built to date.

Thousands of additional workers will be needed for the full-scale production of the ATF. Not only will the construction of the ATF ensure the U.S. Air Force of total air superiority well into the next century, but also it will bring impressive gains to the local economy.

Mr. Speaker, I must also point out that this year marks 40 years of aeronautical excellence on behalf of Lockheed. I can think of no better anniversary gift than this—the coveted ATF contract.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR RICHARD BOLLING

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when a Member of this body dies, and this last Sunday one of the most distinguished Members of this body passed away. Our former colleague, Richard Bolling, who served in this House of Representatives from 1948 until 1982, passed away this past Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, I want to notify my colleagues that there will be two memorial services on his behalf. The first will be held this afternoon at 4 o'clock p.m. in Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States. The second memorial service will be held in his home district this Friday afternoon, 1 o'clock, at the Unitarian Church in Kansas City. Members of Congress, friends, family, and, of course, the general public are all invited to attend.

A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT JAMES BUCHANAN, OUR 15TH PRESIDENT

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today in the presence of students from his hometown, Mercersburg, PA, we celebrate the 200th anniversary of the birthday of James Buchanan, our 15th President and the only United States President from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, James Buchanan was appointed ambassador to Russia and minister to Great Britain. He served in the Congress, the Senate and as Secretary of State under James Polk. He was elected President of the United States in 1856, and he served in the White House from 1857 until March 1861.

Mr. Speaker, Buchanan's tenure was marked by a political struggle over the Kansas Constitution, John Brown's raid on Harpers Ferry, debate over Fort Sumter and the secession of seven Southern States. He tried diligently to hold the Union together, however the Civil War started a few weeks after he left office.

Mr. Speaker, James Buchanan retired to Wheatland in Lancaster, PA, where he died in 1868 at the age of 77.

Today we pay tribute to Pennsylvania's outstanding native son, James Buchanan, and his lifetime of distinguished service, and I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, to announce to the students that on Saturday we will be unveiling on Interstate 81 in Pennsylvania a sign indicating: James Buchanan's birthplace, Mercersburg, exit 3.

BUSH TORPEDOES CIVIL RIGHTS NEGOTIATIONS

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the "kinder, gentler" rhetoric of the Bush administration would have us believe that they are in favor of civil rights for all Americans in the workplace. But as the President vetoed the Civil Rights Act of 1990, which was designed to guarantee those rights, he raised the specter of quotas.

This was the beginning of a self-serving, deceitful, and contemptible effort to, once again, use racial differences and fears in our country for political ends.

Yet, the administration purported to plead for reasonableness and compromise in its alleged support for civil rights for workers. And so, civil rights groups and the leaders of business sat down around a table to forge a reasonable compromise, an idea allegedly supported by the President.

But last week, as this group neared success, the White House Chief of Staff—during one of his apparently short stays in Washington—bludgeoned business from the table.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, when deciding between pursuit of a political issue, one intended to divide the country further on the basis of race, or legislation which would ensure fairness in the workplace, justice in the workplace, and equal opportunity for all Americans in the workplace, this administration chooses partisan political factors and the specter of race every time.

□ 1410

GAS PRICES

(Mr. SUNDQUIST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I am a free-market conservative, who has taken the floor on more than one occasion to defend the oil industry from what I felt was an unfair attack.

But today, I find myself keeping company with many of my constituents, who are beginning to wonder whether the oil industry is not taking unfair advantage of the public.

NBC Nightly News this week reported that oil refineries in this country are operating at only 83 percent of capacity—a drop of nearly 10 percent since the end of the Gulf war. And it appears that the only reason for the drop in refinery production, is the desire on the part of oil companies to inflate the price of gasoline at the pump.

The oil industry profited handsomely from the higher prices resulting from the gulf crisis. They boosted instantaneously and brought them down only gradually.

Now, when the crisis has passed, when supply is plentiful and demand is steady, we see the price of gas being pushed upward by the maneuvering of oil companies.

If they've got a sound reason for doing this, I suggest it is time they share it with the American people. Because to me, it smacks of profiteering.

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. FAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the business leaders of the Nation who came to the table with the civil rights community, despite pressure from the White House. They had all but shaken on a deal when the President's men decided to break the grip of progress. The White House had decided that they do not want a civil rights bill. They, in fact, have sabotaged that effort. They want a divisive issue for the election of 1992.

The quota argument is a smoke-screen, and George Bush and John Sununu know it. It is diversity that

has made our country such a remarkable place, and it is time that the White House accepted all the colors, cultures, and genders that have made our Nation great. It is time to produce a civil rights bill that will give every American a chance to prove themselves.

In my State of California, 46 percent of the people are people of color, people of racial and ethnic minority groups. Women today are the new majority of entrants in the workplace, more and more of their sex and gender.

America works when we work together, but this President will not work for unity and progress. He prefers to divide and conquer.

CHIEF OF STAFF TRAVEL REASONABLE

(Mr. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, as we all well know, claims have been made by the media and some of my Democratic colleagues that the President's Chief of Staff has overstepped his right to use Pentagon C-20's for travel by doing so for personal reasons. This is a tempest in a teapot. This travel by military plane is perfectly reasonable and to do otherwise would be irresponsible.

The policy set forth first by President Reagan and continued by President Bush requires the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser to use military planes for all travel purposes, including personal travel. The reasons are simple. These men hold two of the most important positions in the administration and it only makes sense that they should be as immediately accessible to the President as possible with the appropriate technology to guarantee secure lines of communication and safeguard highly classified documents. They are on duty working 24 hours a day, every day, even when they are going about personal matters. Commercial airlines have neither secure communications nor security personnel or top secret safes.

Moreover, if the President's Chief of Staff flies commercial then security personnel would have to fly commercial airlines as well, because they have to be protected. Even then the degree of security would be nowhere near what it is on a military plane. Additionally, does the presence of top government officials on commercial airlines increase the vulnerability of civilian air travelers to terrorist attacks? Perhaps, perhaps not, but if it does it will be very unfortunate should a terrorist attack against the President's Chief of Staff occur when he is surrounded by civilians.

The use of military aircraft by all government officials should be pru-

dent, but let's not be penny-wise and pound-foolish. We should recognize that this issue is being profiled not on the merits, but primarily because of the Democratic Presidential politics of 1992.

CIVIL RIGHTS NEGOTIATIONS

(Mr. SYNAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, the reports that negotiations between business and civil rights groups were halted last week because of pressure from White House officials disturbed me and other Members greatly.

It is difficult to believe that a President who has publicly stated that he is against discrimination and supports civil rights would condone such actions of administration officials.

We all would like to believe no one really discriminates, but, as painful as it is to acknowledge, discrimination is present in our society. Even the administration is not immune as recent judgments against the FBI for discriminatory job practices indicate.

The Business Roundtable is to be commended for its efforts to negotiate with civil rights supporters to reach an acceptable compromise on necessary legislation. Fighting discrimination is the right fight. It is also good business to eliminate discrimination in the workplace.

Mr. President, be a leader, get these groups back together to work on a solution.

H.R. 5 AS AMENDED IS STILL DANGEROUS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, committees last week amended the striker replacement bill by adding the Boehlert-Williams amendment. Proponents say this solves the nonunion issue. Let me tell you, it does not, the main danger of H.R. 5 is still intact.

That is, an employer would be handcuffed while workers are on strike because he would have to hire temporary replacements who often are unskilled and who would be working under the prospects of being fired any day. Also, businesses in remote rural areas would have to find temporaries to stay open.

The Boehlert-Williams amendment is suppose to restrict hiring permanent replacements to union shop economic strikes only. Nonunion shops are allegedly exempt.

However, the language of the amendment leaves a wide interpretation for what kind of strikes could be covered. It states that in disputes where workers have exercised the right to join, to

assist in organizing, or to bargain collectively through labor organizations they cannot be permanently replaced. In other words, striking nonunion employees can get around this exemption if they pledge their allegiance to a union.

The amendment clarifies the intent of the bill—to organize unions. Join me in voting against H.R. 5.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SCHEDULING OF INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify all Members of the House that the classified schedule of authorizations and the classified annex to the report accompanying H.R. 1455, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991, are now available for review by Members in the Offices of the Intelligence Committee, room H-405 in the Capitol. Access to these documents, which is restricted to Members only, will be provided from Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m.

The committee hopes that the intelligence bill will come before the House next week. The schedule and annex contain the committee's recommendations on the fiscal year 1991 intelligence and intelligence-related budget, and issues pertaining thereto, which cannot be discussed publicly. Accordingly, I urge Members to avail themselves of the opportunity to thoroughly review these documents so that they may be fully informed about the committee's decisions.

WORKING FOR A CONSENSUS CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

(Mr. MCCURDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that Americans can and will find ways to make real progress in every aspect of national life. Honest debate and committed leadership are crucial in helping us attain equal opportunity for all citizens.

I have spoken with representatives of American business who have been involved with civil rights leaders in attempting to work out a consensus civil rights bill. I want American business to know that there are political leaders in this country who want progress, not polarization, and who applaud this conscientious effort at real compromise.

It is disheartening, then, that representatives of the President, by derauling the talks, have made it abundantly clear that they are more interested in having a divisive, poisonous, negative campaign issue than they are in encouraging efforts to find a solution to a complex legal problem.

Mr. Speaker, we have enough strife in our land; we need to be about the business of making things better, not worse. Those of us who grew up learning about our melting pot society know that that idea was perhaps as much romanticism as reality. But it has lodged in our hearts anyway, and the goal of a just society with room for the diversity that marks the best of human experience is before us still. And we will pursue it.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO BENEFIT HEARING-IMPAIRED CHILDREN

(Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues for their support in a matter which will safeguard American children, which will bring great comfort to many families, and which will save taxpayers money.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1758, to mandate hearing testing for all newborn children. My bill would require all hospitals to follow uniform requirements established by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The costs are to be paid by insurance plans or Medicaid if no private insurance is available. Early diagnosis can have a tremendously positive effect on learning and development—as well as save millions of dollars in special education costs and medical visits.

Despite our great technological advancements in medicine, hundreds of babies each year risk brain damage or developmental disability because their auditory brain stem has not been stimulated due to hearing loss. With a proper diagnosis, done early enough, a baby as young as 3 months can be fitted with a hearing aid.

I want to thank two constituents, Mr. Bruce Bryan, an attorney in Syracuse, and Susanna Giuliano, who works with hearing impaired children, for bringing this preventive procedure to my attention.

Please support mandatory hearing testing. It makes sense.

□ 1420

CIVIL RIGHTS AND WOMEN'S EQUITY IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1991

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the Civil Rights and Women's in Employment Act of 1991.

This is not a radical measure. It simply embodies fundamental principles of fairness and equity.

And, in large part, it simply restores the law as it existed for 20 years in employment discrimination cases prior to an ill conceived 1989 Supreme Court decision. No one opposing this measure has offered any evidence that the law prior to 1989 disserved the business community or resulted in the arbitrary imposition of quotas in the workplace.

Any such claims are just smoke and mirrors. They are intended to stop a measure that moves America forward and recognizes the rich diversity of our workers.

The administration is guilty of this backward thinking. Its blatant actions to end talks between civil rights groups and the business community on a compromise civil rights measure are a slap in the face to millions of Americans.

"You just don't rate," says the administration to the millions of women in the work force. "You don't deserve fair treatment," women are told. Even if your employers intentionally discriminate against you. That is the administration's loud and clear message to hard working women.

The civil rights bill recognizes that the strength of our work force lies in its ever increasing diversity, and acknowledges that all workers deserve equal and just treatment. A vote against H.R. 1 is a vote to turn the clocks back.

IMMIGRANTS WITH AIDS SHOULD BE PROHIBITED

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 30 original cosponsors, I am introducing legislation to reinstate the prohibition against people with AIDS from freely immigrating into this Nation. They formerly were prohibited from doing so by rule of the Department of Health and Human Services. However, the Department recently changed this rule, despite the fact that of more than 40,000 public comments received, the comments ran more than 9 to 1 against this change.

Not only the public comments submitted, but public opinion polls show the American people are overwhelmingly against allowing HIV positive immigrants into this country.

I certainly feel sorry for those who have AIDS. I have no objection to them receiving medical treatment. However, the experts tell us our medical system is already near collapse. We have a big enough problem with AIDS now in this Nation already. We do not need to add to this problem or increase this great burden by taking AIDS patients from all over the world, and thus increasing the burden on American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, this could ultimately lead to other Americans being short-

changed and not receiving adequate treatment for other illnesses. I urge Members to join with me in supporting this legislation which the people want, and to prohibit people with AIDS from immigrating freely into this Nation.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOLLY: MESSING UP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, this body will debate the Civil Rights Act of 1991. I find it difficult to believe that White House officials undermined discussions between the business community and the civil rights community. In fact, White House officials, including America's most renowned frequent flyer, John Sununu, attacked the Business Roundtable for meeting with civil rights officials.

The White House has acted irresponsibly in this matter. It appears to me that White House officials are not interested in civil rights legislation. Instead of creating a climate of cooperation, the administration has created a climate of noncooperation.

President Bush owes the American people an explanation of the strange behavior of his administration. I'd like to know why President Bush can send more than 500,000 of this Nation's men and women to liberate Kuwait in the name of freedom and democracy. Yet, he won't help to ensure freedom and democracy at home by supporting the Civil Rights Act. He won't even allow others to meet and discuss—in a democratic fashion—ways to ensure freedom at home.

I'd also like to know why the President can send Secretary of State James Baker all over the world seeking peace in the Middle East, but he cannot seek a compromise on the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The guests in the gallery are reminded we are very happy to have them here, but they are not to respond positively or negatively to any statements made by Members on the floor.

SALUTE TO ASSOCIATION OF CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL SECRETARIES

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in honor of National Secretaries Week, I would

like to salute a group of very special people: members of the Association of Certified Professional Secretaries [ACPS].

This international organization was formed, I am proud to say, in Scottsdale, AZ, which I represent, almost 5 years ago. To belong, one must be a certified professional secretary, a distinction which is earned after satisfying education and work-experience requirements and passing an arduous 2-day, six-part examination. Those who accept this worthy challenge justify the confidence placed in them to get the job done.

ACPS is dedicated to making the value of this earning rating known to management in all fields of endeavor.

Good work, ACPS.

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that once again, thanks to President Bush and John Sununu, the cause of civil rights is back to square one. The business community has walked away from the negotiations. Pressured by the President, they left the civil rights coalition. Instead of nurturing compromise, the White House sabotaged the process.

There is no question about it. Discrimination is wrong, whether it is drawn on racial lines or ethnic grounds. Whether to hire based on gender or to fire based on color, it is completely, absolutely wrong. Last year, Congress had the opportunity to make discrimination in the American workplace a thing of the past. And with his veto, the President said no.

Today we should be celebrating not strategizing how to overcome the President's opposition. I am convinced that the business community understands the need to overcome discrimination in the workplace. Clearly, many of the members of the Business Roundtable were willing to continue working towards a solution. The President, through his spokesman John Sununu, has indicated that he cares little about a solution and is content to allow discrimination to persist.

This administration doesn't have an interest in working out a real civil rights bill. John Sununu knows that a continued controversy makes for good campaign fodder. So while the White House looks for sound bites and polling points, the Democrats, as always, are fighting discrimination and working for equal justice.

CONTINUED EXPLORATION OF ETHANOL AS AN ALTERNATIVE FUEL

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, annually, the U.S. transportation's demand for energy increases exponentially. Fuel demand by passenger vehicles will grow by 45 percent. Energy consumption by heavy trucks will rise by 80 percent by the year 2030. We now use 100 billion gallons of gasoline a year. This amounts to 43 percent of the world's supply. Yet, we can only supply a fraction of this amount. Before our resources become precariously thin and our foreign dependence grows, we must look to alternative fuels such as ethanol.

This corn derivative has been popular since the beginning of the gasoline powered transportation industry. Alexander Graham Bell considered alcohol a very clean and efficient fuel. Henry Ford, an alcohol fuel proponent, built the early model A's engine to accept ethanol. Today, Brazil has proven that a transportation system can run on ethanol.

Congress should take additional steps to exploit corn's resources, and begin making even bigger strides toward the implementation of ethanol into our system.

Ethanol will allow America to become less dependent upon foreign oil and help us become the leaders of a new energy standard.

CIVIL RIGHTS SHOULD NOT BE POLITICIZED

(Mr. HOAGLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was as pained as anyone to read over the weekend reports in the Washington Post and New York Times and other publications of the breakdown in negotiations over the Civil Rights Act between the Business Round Table representatives and proponents of the Civil Rights Act, H.R. 1, which I am co-sponsoring.

□ 1430

Reports make it clear that the breakdown in negotiations is political and not substantive, due to pressure from John Sununu to break off the negotiation so that he and the President might use the issue to political advantage in the coming election. Reports also indicate that they were close to an agreement, the parties were actually close to an agreement before Mr. Sununu intervened strictly for political reasons.

This will do absolutely nothing to protect minorities and women dis-

criminated against in the job market or corporations which desire clear and reasonable statutes and policies to deal with. Needless to say, all of us would encourage the participants to get back to work, get back together again and find a compromise that will address the most urgent needs of both sides of this controversy. I am confident it can be done.

Let us work together, not practice politics as usual. Let us legislate effectively.

RTC FUNDING BASED UPON PERFORMANCE

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution that calls for Congress to put the Resolution Trust Corporation on a performance based asset sale program.

Several weeks ago the House was embroiled in a debate regarding further funding for the RTC. Most members had a hard time voting for additional funding when there seems to be no end to the amount of money the RTC requires. Even the RTC itself said that it will have to come back this year with another request for more taxpayer dollars. There was very little enthusiasm that the bill we passed would finally enable the RTC to close out and sell off the assets of failed thrifts.

Therefore, I am introducing a resolution expressing the will of Congress that what the RTC needs is a performance based asset sale program linked to its further funding needs. Basically the program would require that the RTC depend on its sale of assets to guarantee any further funding by Congress. So as the RTC sold off its inventory, the Congress would step forward with additional funds based on the rate and quantity of sales made by the RTC. At the very least this would encourage the RTC to step up its efforts to liquidate its holdings, knowing that its funding was linked to the success of its sales.

I am not, in this resolution, attempting to set up the performance asset sale program. However, I am suggesting that such a thing is not only possible, but would link the agency's funding with the job its doing. I realize the entire RTC could not be funded in this manner, but at least a portion of its funds could be tied to the job it does.

Further funding of the RTC based on its sale of assets is an idea that might encourage the RTC to step up and keep the pace of its sales. Such a program would give Congress a guideline by which to measure the kind of job the RTC is doing. The end of the savings and loan debacle is not only to make sure this mess never happens again but also to close and sell the inventory the

Government has quickly and this resolution points out a way to do that.

LOST OPPORTUNITY IN BREAKDOWN OF CIVIL RIGHTS TALKS

(Mr. REED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my regrets for a loss—the loss of an opportunity.

This week we saw the breakdown of historic negotiations between business groups and the civil rights community over the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Just a few weeks ago Robert Allen, the chairman of the Board of AT&T and an active member of the Business Roundtable, said "I firmly believe we need civil rights legislation. We need law, not lip service."

This week Mr. Allen told the Wall Street Journal "We don't see much value in taking our discussion further." Mr. Allen said he didn't need the grief he was being subjected to because of his participation in these talks.

These talks didn't break down because the business groups weren't willing to compromise. The talks didn't fall apart because civil rights groups doubted the intentions of business groups.

The talks stopped because the White House let Mr. Allen and other members of the Business Roundtable know that their participation wasn't helpful.

Looking toward 1992, Republican operatives must have decided that civil rights legislation on which business and civil rights groups agree—legislation introduced and supported by Democrats—would not further their election strategy.

The talks may not have been helpful for the White House reelection strategy, but they were helpful for the business groups and the civil rights groups involved.

And most important, those talks were more than helpful for the millions of people who need the protection this legislation would provide. For people across the country following the progress of these talks, they represented a new spirit in our country.

What a shame and what a lost opportunity.

I join many of my colleagues today in urging the Business Roundtable to resume these talks. You may lose friends at the top, but I guarantee you will make friends in other places.

DEMOCRAT CRITICISM OF MR. SUNUNU

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have had some strong words from the other side directed at the Chief of Staff of

the White House, Mr. Sununu, for his use of military airplanes. It reminded me of a debate we had back in 1989 when the Democrats were determined to give the Speaker an airplane for his use, and some of us raised questions as to whether or not that was a good idea. I want to quote the reasons for that given by the Democratic leadership on the floor that day.

The Air Force has been very forthcoming, and has indicated an airplane could be designated. We certainly feel very strongly about it because of the Speaker's high responsibility and the fact that increased terrorist activity is present and so forth, we feel it is very important to insure security for the Speaker and everybody agrees to that.

The question is: If the Democrats are willing to give the Speaker an airplane, it seems to me that they speak out of both sides of their mouth when they criticize Mr. Sununu.

SHORTCHANGED TOO LONG

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Missouri is a very benevolent State. But charity begins at home. After 20 years of sending our share of highway funds to other States, Missouri has been shortchanged too long.

When Horace Greeley said for young men to go west, he didn't tell them to take Missouri's highway funds with them. The Crossroads of the Nation and gateway to the West will become the gateway roadblock unless Missouri begins receiving its fair share of highway funds. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that will allow Missouri and other midwest and sunbelt States to once again receive their fair share. No longer can these States put up with deteriorating roads, lost industry because of inadequate infrastructure and no longer will Missouri and many States put their drivers' safety in jeopardy.

My bill will give all States more flexibility on spending their highway funds. It restructures the formula used in determining the States' rightful amount. It lifts the restrictions on mass transit and gives the States more flexibility. It calls on the administration to use the highway trust funds for their intended purposes and it provides more flexibility for States to construct toll roads, bridges or tunnels. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation which will preserve our national highway system as the greatest one in the world.

IT IS TIME FOR MR. SUNUNU TO COME DOWN TO EARTH

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, since we are talking about military jets, it has been widely reported that White House Chief of Staff, Mr. Sununu, never met a military jet that he did not fly in.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 2½ years he has taken over 70 flights. But wait until you hear this. He said, "That's unfair. What about my rights?" And he said, "Only four of those trips were personal."

Let me tell Members about one. One he said was so critical it cost the American taxpayers \$14,000 to fly him to New Hampshire. Let me tell you why. Mr. Speaker, he had a toothache. That is right, a toothache.

Think about it. While certain big shots in the District of Columbia are flying around getting dental work, the American taxpayer just keeps getting kicked right in the teeth.

Mr. Sununu, I think it is time for you to come down to earth. All you are doing is ripping us off every time, the taxpayer in this country.

□ 1440

NO MORE FAST TRACK FREE-TRADE AGREEMENTS

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President wants to steamroll a Mexican free-trade agreement through this House under the cover of fast-track authority. Fast track: A process by which Congress cedes all authority and oversight except for one take-it-or-leave-it vote.

Think about it. An open borders trade agreement with a country of 80 million people with virtually no environmental laws; occupational, health, and safety laws; child-labor laws, with a prevailing industrial wage of 87 cents an hour, and we are being told, "Do not worry," and you will get a take-it-or-leave-it vote, no modifications, no amendment.

Look at the fast track Canada Free-Trade Agreement, recent history. They are still flooding our market with subsidized lumber and wood products while prohibiting the sale of our inferior plywood in Canada. The only thing inferior about our plywood is that it is made in the United States.

The fisheries, agriculture, and now even Blitz Weinhard beer from Oregon have fallen under the heavy hand of Canadian protectionism.

Free trade? Yes, free trade: But it is one-way free trade, our jobs for their products and an \$8 billion trade deficit.

Let us learn from our mistakes. No more fast track free-trade agreements.

JEFFERSON COUNTY'S BARBARA DURRETT WINS NATIONAL TEACHING AWARD

(Mr. ERDREICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, President Bush recently focused the eyes of the Nation on education with a comprehensive plan to improve our schools. In Alabama, education reform is at the top of the agenda, as my State searches for ways to make sure our children get the best education possible.

We all share this goal, and realize that a key part of our success depends, of course, on the daily, dedicated efforts of our classroom teachers. I'm proud to have, in my county, an example of innovative excellence in education, Barbara Durrett, chosen as one of seven national recipients of the Business Week/Challenger Fellowship for Innovative Education Technology.

Mrs. Durrett's creativity and commitment captured the hearts and minds of her fourth grade class at Cahaba Heights Elementary School, where I visited last week, and caught the attention of education experts across the country. Mrs. Durrett taught her students to explore steps they could take to save the rain forest, combining computers, videodisc players, camcorders, sound, digitized images, and interactive video into a multidisciplinary unit.

We congratulate Mrs. Durrett and thank her for her contributing to the education of our Nation.

SWEET DEALS OF AMERICA'S HIGH AND MIGHTY

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the cherry blossoms are out—and so are the sweet deals of America's high and mighty. First it was David Maxwell, who pocketed a cool \$27 million for 10 years of work at a company backed by the U.S. Government. For 10 years of work, most Americans would be lucky to get a handshake and a beer on the boss.

Now we learn that the President's Chief of Staff, John Sununu, has taken more than 70 trips over the last couple of years, all funded mostly by the American taxpayer. He could not fly commercial flights and carry along his portable White House phone, like other Chiefs of Staff used to do. No, he had to fly a sleek Air Force jet, to the tune of about 4 grand an hour. A skiing trip here, a Republican campaign speech there, and the next thing you know, he is billing taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars for his official trips.

You would think he would know better. After all, millions of Americans

are out of work these days. But then again, the State he governed for three terms taxes working families three times more heavily than the wealthy. So we should not be surprised that the Sununu brand of Republicanism is nothing more than socialism for the rich and free enterprise for everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, Let us enact legislation to buy Mr. Sununu round trip, first class commercial tickets for all his trips. That way he would save millions of taxpayers dollars and still be able to ride in style. Maybe we can call it the John Su-no-no Supersaver Act of 1991.

A MARSHALL PLAN FOR AMERICA

(Mr. THORNTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, many people, including many of my colleagues, have become interested in the concept I have been referring to as a Marshall plan for America.

There is a general agreement on our need for improvement of our educational base for revitalization of our competitive edge and for rebuilding our home front as a vital part of our national security. We should now provide the vision and leadership to develop a coordinated plan to address these needs and to reorder our priorities through an overall comprehensive and dynamic approach.

Later today I will be presenting an outline for a Marshall plan for America, and I will be asking for input and suggestions from my colleagues and for their leadership and vision as we seize the historic opportunity to harness our can-do spirit to accomplish our national goals.

INDIANA'S BUDDY SYSTEM: PRECURSOR TO NEW KIND OF EDUCATION

(Ms. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, in his "America 2000" strategy, President Bush has expressed his commitment to technology education. In fact, he has stated that he wants to become proficient at the use of computers himself. Computer literacy is now poised to become a national priority, yet most young students around the country have access to a computer for only a few minutes each week. In Indiana, however, students who participate in the buddy system, as it is called, are afforded access to personal computers not only in the classroom but also in the home.

The buddy system, which operates in 12 schools in Indiana, is a partnership between State government and the pri-

vate sector. Corporate sponsors supply hardware and technical assistance to offset some of the costs to the State.

The buddy system is an ideal example of the kind of education initiative that President Bush and the Congress should pursue. The buddy system is, I believe, a precursor to a new kind of education in America, where technology is recognized as a vital component of the American society and where the private sector is encouraged to invest more of its resources into education.

SUPPORT FUNDING FOR DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to voice my support for a program that should be brought to the forefront of this year's budget debate. The Displaced Homemakers Self-Sufficiency Program became law last November but was left without funding. This year, the Displaced Homemakers Program needs approximately \$25 million in funding to assure its continuation as an operable and successful program.

In my district, the Bay State Centers for Displaced Homemakers serves hundreds of women each year who are desperately seeking help with their lives. The Displaced Homemakers Program works with women in transition who have often suddenly lost the financial support of a spouse due to death, divorce, or disablement. Many of these women have dependent children. Many are older and struggle against ageism in society. Many are ethnic minorities and struggle against racism. Most feel as if they have been allowed to "slip through the cracks" of child support, pay equity, and other assistance programs.

The success of the Bay State Centers for Displaced Homemakers Program in Massachusetts can best be evaluated by examining the numbers of women who the program has placed into jobs, education, and training. During fiscal year 1990, almost 3,000 women in my state were enrolled in displaced homemakers. Almost half of these women were receiving public assistance upon entering the program. Of these 3,000 participants, 582 were placed into jobs that paid \$8 an hour or more, and 1,045 were placed into training or education to prepare for jobs. The placement rate into jobs, education, or training in fiscal year 1990 was 84 percent.

I urge my colleagues to support the appropriation of a least \$25 million to fund the Displaced Homemakers Self-Sufficiency Act, which I believe will help save money as women and their families leave and avoid public assistance.

TIME TO DEMOCRATIZE BANKING SYSTEM

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the savings and loan fiasco is the largest single act of thievery in the history of our country—an act which will eventually cost our taxpayers some \$500 billion. It is now well known that a great many of the S&L bank failures were not simply caused by bad management and poor judgment but by outright dishonesty and illegal behavior on the part of S&L management and boards of directors.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House Banking Committee received a report from the General Accounting Office regarding the accounting and auditing practices of the 39 largest commercial banks that failed in 1988 through 1989, and the news is not good. Among other findings, the GAO stated:

Breakdowns in corporate governance by bank management and boards of directors combined with flexible accounting rules have led to both bank failures and a seriously flawed early warning system to identify troubled banks.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that the time is now to begin the process of rethinking the manner in which boards of directors of banks are selected. The time is now to suggest that perhaps the boards of directors of our banks should not simply be wealthy business people who are often motivated by greed and self-interest.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to democratize the banking system and open up the corporate board rooms of the banks so that community representatives, local government officials, and representatives from all sectors of the community, not just the wealthy, have an opportunity to serve.

I intend to offer legislation to this effect and look forward to the support of many of our Members.

□ 1450

CONDITION MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS WITH CHINA

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon be considering the renewal of most-favored-nation [MFN] status to China. Accordingly, I will introduce legislation to condition that renewal on an improvement of human rights in China. There are several reasons why we should consider conditioning our trade status to the People's Republic of China.

One, since the debate last October, when this House overwhelmingly supported a strong bill for conditioning

MFN, the Chinese Government has continued to persecute those students and workers who spoke out for democracy. Students have been sentenced to long prison terms, and families of exiled students have been denied permission to leave the country.

Two, as far as our trade is concerned, the United States trade deficit with China is climbing rapidly, and is expected to reach \$15 billion this year. American workers should not be forced to compete with slave labor or prison labor. The Chinese Government should not be allowed to benefit from trade barriers against United States imports.

In addition, China is undermining international peace and stability by assisting Algeria in building a nuclear plant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in sending a clear message to the Government of China by cosponsoring my bill to condition most-favored-nation status to China.

KUWAIT SHOWS NO LOYALTY

(Mr. APPELEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, where all else, all others feared to tread, the United States did not. The United States invaded Kuwait, and they threw out a ruthless tyrant and a killer.

Oh, yes, we brought the United Nations in with the United States, but mostly it was the U.S. casualties and U.S. lives, and billions of taxpayers' dollars that did it.

Kuwait now needs repairs. However, Kuwait, do they seem to have any obligations to the United States? No, no, no. Instead of loyalty, it shows up greed again. The first contracts for 12,000 tons of steel to Japan, and 15,000 metric tons of steel to Venezuela. Kuwait owes the United States.

I have introduced a sense of Congress resolution which expresses the awarding of all contracts for the rebuilding of Kuwait, that such contracts shall reflect the extent of military and economic support offered by the United States in the liberation of Kuwait. I ask every Member of this House to join me in this resolution. It is House Concurrent Resolution 130.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1344

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1344.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT SUPPORTS WRONG SIDE IN LEGAL BATTLE

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, if there is any one nation in the Middle East—maybe the world—which owes the United States and our citizens and soldiers and taxpayers a heavy debt it is Saudi Arabia. The Gulf war was fought to protect Saudi Arabia.

But, instead of doing the right thing towards our people, the kingdom is resisting a legal suit brought by an American citizen, Mr. Scott Nelson, of North Carolina, for damages he allegedly suffered from being tortured while in a Saudi prison in 1984.

I am sad to report that the State Department is aiding and abetting Saudi Arabia in this deplorable action.

In February a three-judge Federal panel in Atlanta agreed unanimously that Mr. Nelson had standing under the 1976 law to go forward with proof of his allegations of torture.

But, as reported in today's New York Times, at the urging of the Saudi Ambassador to the United States—Prince Bindar Bin Sultan—the State Department has filed a brief in the Federal court siding with the Saudis asking that Mr. Nelson be prevented from going forward with his case.

It is bad enough that Saudi Arabia is stonewalling Mr. Nelson.

It is even worse that Mr. Nelson's own government is ready to throw him to the wolves.

I hope the State Department reconsiders its unfortunate position respecting this law suit.

HONORING THE KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY DEBATE TEAM

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Kansas State University debate team, winners of this year's national debate championship.

All Kansans can take pride in this achievement—all but one of the team members are Kansas residents who have attended Kansas high schools.

This championship is one in a long line of recent accomplishments for the students at Kansas State University.

Kansas State ranks in the top 1 percent of all U.S. universities, public or private, in the number of students to receive Rhodes scholarships.

It is the only public university to have two Rhodes scholars in 1990 and two Marshall scholars in 1991.

Kansas State is also first in the Big Eight in the number of Marshall scholars over the past 10 years and tied for

first with the University of Michigan for the highest number of Truman scholars.

Kansas State students have been honored recently for their achievements in architecture, journalism, accounting, teaching, engineering, veterinary medicine, and the list goes on and on.

At a time when private educational costs are rising so dramatically, State universities like Kansas State are playing an increasingly important role in training our Nation's future leaders at a reasonable cost.

Kansas, and the Nation, will continue to benefit from the continued commitment to excellence at Kansas State University.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

(Mr. HAYES of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week the Business Roundtable pulled out of talks with the civil rights groups on the civil rights bill. This occurred after much criticism and intimidation from the White House. Only 2 weeks ago the Roundtable had unanimously rejected John Sununu's political pressure. I had hoped that the negotiations would end in a compromise that would provide this country with a strong civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, now it is time that we take a bold step and make this bill a reality. In the past weeks we have been welcoming our men and women home from the Persian Gulf with much fanfare and yet the President continues to neglect the minorities and women who served by not supporting the civil rights bill. The best way to welcome home the large numbers of women and minorities who served in the Persian Gulf, is to pass a strong civil rights bill. I hope that we can cut through the rhetoric and political games and get down to business.

Today, women and minorities are now being represented in greater numbers in the U.S. work force, and with a strong civil rights bill they will have the opportunity to tap into their full potential without hindrance of discrimination. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the White House and its cronies can get beyond the quota rhetoric and punitive damage talk and work with the business community, the civil rights community, and the Congress in reaching a compromise. Let's not abandon the millions of men and women who have helped to build this country.

OPPOSE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES ARMS PACKAGE REQUEST

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with disturbing news. The starting gun for the latest round in the Middle East arms race has just been fired.

The United Arab Emirates has requested a multibillion dollar arms package from the Bush administration. The deal includes over 500 tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles, 18 Apache attack helicopters, and more than 800 multi-purpose tactical vehicles.

At a time when people throughout the world are praying for peace in the Middle East, this major escalation of arms sales to the region could not be more inappropriate.

No arsenal, regardless of size, will give the small gulf states real security, or protect them from the aggression of their more populous neighbors. The only real effect of this sale will be to send a signal to the region that the United States has given up on peace, that tension and war are inevitable.

I learned this morning that the administration has informed the United Arab Emirates that it supports the deal, and will soon come before Congress to seek approval for this large arms transfer.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this irresponsible sale. Peace in the region is possible, but only if we give up the failed strategies of the past and work to limit arms, not sell them.

□ 1500

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

DISCLAIMING FEDERAL LAND INTERESTS IN WASHINGTON STATE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 427) to disclaim any interests of the United States in certain lands on San Juan Island, WA, and for other purposes, as amended.

H.R. 427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(1) The term "1921 Act" means the Act of August 3, 1921 (42 Stat. 173), whereby the

United States granted to the State of Washington, for the use of the University of Washington for purposes of a biological station and general university research purposes, certain lands comprising a military reservation at San Juan Island, in San Juan County, Washington.

(2) The term "encroached lands" means those portions of the lands granted to the State of Washington by the 1921 Act that are designated as "Encroached Lands" on a survey plat to be prepared by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 2 of this Act.

(3) The term "university" means the University of Washington.

(4) The term "the Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) The term "occupants" means the parties, who on January 3, 1991, were listed on the tax records of San Juan County, Washington, as the owners of the encroached lands, and their heirs and assigns.

SEC. 2. SURVEY PLAT.

Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall complete a survey of the lands granted to the State by the 1921 Act, and shall prepare a map detailing those portions of the land granted to the State that have been encroached upon: *Provided*, That not more than 50 per centum of the cost of such survey shall be paid by the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. EXEMPTION, DISCLAIMER, AND CONDITIONS.

(a) Subject to the limitation in subsection (c), the provisions of the 1921 Act relating to the right of the United States to assume control of, hold, use, and occupy the lands granted to the State by the 1921 Act, the provisions of such Act providing for reversion of such lands to the United States, and section 2 of such Act as amended by this Act shall not apply to the encroached lands.

(b) Subject to the limitations of subsection (c), the United States hereby disclaims all right, title and interest in the encroached lands and, effective one year after the survey plat is prepared pursuant to section 2, all right, title, and interest of the United States in such lands shall vest in the University.

(c)(1) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not take effect unless, within six months after the date of enactment of this Act the University and the State have entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary whereby the State and the University agree—

(A) to accept the map referred to in section 2 as accurate and conclusive and that the University and the State will not attempt to convey or otherwise transfer any portion of the encroached lands to any party or parties other than the occupants; and

(B) To reimburse the Secretary for the administrative costs of implementing this Act plus half the costs of the survey required by section 2, and also to pay the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, an amount equal to the total amounts that the State and the University receive as consideration for conveyance of some of all of the encroached lands to any of the occupants in excess of reasonable costs (including the survey and other costs required by this Act) incurred by the University and the State incident to such conveyance.

(2) All amounts received by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection shall be retained by the Secretary and, subject to appropriations, shall be used for the management of public lands managed by the Bureau of Land

Management and shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. AVAILABILITY OF SURVEY OF PLAT.

The survey plat referred to in section 2 shall be available for public inspection in the offices of the Secretary and the State Director of the Bureau of Land Management for the State of Washington, and the Secretary shall transmit copies thereof to the University and to the appropriate officials of the State and of San Juan County, Washington.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENT.

The 1921 Act is hereby amended by the addition at the end thereof of the following new section:

"SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if any land, or portion thereof, granted or otherwise conveyed to the State of Washington is or shall become contaminated with hazardous substances (as defined in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601)), or if such land, or portion thereof, has been used for purposes that the Secretary of the Interior finds may result in the disposal, placement or release of any hazardous substance, such land shall not, under any circumstance, revert to the United States.

"(b) If lands granted or conveyed to the State by this Act shall be used for purposes that the Secretary of the Interior finds: (1) inconsistent with the purposes of this Act, and (2) which may result in the disposal, placement or release of any hazardous substance, the State shall be liable to pay to the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, the fair market value of the land, including the value of any improvement, thereon, as of the date of conversion of the land to the nonconforming purpose. All amounts received by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to this subsection shall be retained by the Secretary of the Interior and used, subject to appropriations, for the management of public lands and shall remain available until expended."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO.]

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 427, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 427. This is a bill to assist in clearing the titles of several residential properties on San Juan Island, in the State of Washington, that encroach on land granted to the State in 1921 for use by the University of Washington. This bill is similar to one approved by the Interior Committee and passed by the

House in the last Congress upon which action was not completed.

The problem addressed by the bill arose because when lands next to the lands covered by the 1921 grant were subdivided, the developers relied on a survey by a local surveyor that did not coincide with the official Government survey on which the grant to the State had been based.

As a result, about 14 residential properties actually overlapped onto the lands covered by the 1921 grant. In all, these overlaps, or encroachments, amount to about 13 acres.

The 1921 grant was a conditional one. Under it, the land must be used for the university's marine sciences research station, or title will revert to the United States.

Thus, the title cloud cannot be removed from the residential properties without legislation—because if the State or university attempted to convey the encroachments to the occupants, the reversionary clause would be triggered.

This bill would resolve this situation by providing for relinquishment by the national Government of its interests in the lands where the overlap occurred. The State and university would then be able to transfer these encroachment lands to their occupants.

To protect the national interest, the bill provides that the State and university can convey the overlap lands only to the occupants, and that any profits over and above the costs involved in making such conveyances must be turned over to the national Government.

The bill would also amend the 1921 act that made the original grant, to include protection against any Federal liability for possible contamination of the rest of the research station land resulting from disposal of hazardous or toxic materials.

These provisions are merely precautionary, Mr. Speaker, to protect the national interest. We have no reason to believe that the State or the university would try to make a profit from resolving these title problems or that any of the research station's lands have been or will be contaminated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should note that H.R. 427, unlike the House-passed bill of the last Congress, would require that there be a new survey of the affected lands, on which further actions would be based, and that the State and university would be required to bear half the cost of this survey, plus all the administrative costs of the Bureau of Land Management, which will act on behalf of the United States. These changes respond to some points raised by the administration after the House action during the last Congress, and we believe that they are fair to all parties involved.

Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively minor matter, but one that is impor-

tant to the individuals involved and to the State of Washington and its university system. I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], the sponsor of the measure.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding this time.

First of all, I want to thank the committee for taking up this bill, which is a bill of small import to Congress and of big import to a number of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 427 was introduced to correct faulty survey lines, resulting in the U.S. Government owning parts of my constituents' back yards—in all a total of 13 acres.

The surveys were taken in 1874 by the Department of the Army, in 1919 by the county, and in 1965 by the University of Washington. Each of these surveys resulted in different boundary lines.

In 1957, the county platted the lands using the 1919 survey. Houses were built and taxes were paid on these lands. When the university surveyed the line, the discrepancy was found.

Currently these properties have a clouded title and cannot be sold. There is one property that is ready to be sold and is awaiting passage of the legislation.

The university has been working with the county, the property owners, the Bureau of Land Management, and our offices to resolve this problem. The result is this legislation.

H.R. 427 requires a fourth survey to be conducted by the Bureau of Land Management. Further, the legislation requires the State of Washington and/or the university to pay for all administrative costs and half of the survey costs. The State and/or university can pass these costs on to the property owners who are affected by this legislation.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 427, introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT]. This legislation will correct a property encroachment affecting 13 acres in Washington State caused by a faulty property survey done 70 years ago.

H.R. 427 would vest title of these 13 acres with clouded title from the Federal Government to the State of Washington. The State would then have the complete responsibility to see that these lands are resurveyed and transferred to the current occupants. This legislation requires that any profits from the sale of this land be returned to the Federal Treasury. As a result, it prevents any windfall to the State of Washington at the expense of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am most impressed that this legislation gives the State, and not the Federal Government, the opportunity to solve this problem. I hope we use this legislation as a model to allow States and local governments who are closest to the people to solve problems of this kind.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 427 which takes a commonsense approach to solve a complicated problem.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 427, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BETHUNE COUNCIL HOUSE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 690, to authorize the National Park Service to acquire and manage the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 690

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

- (1) preserve and interpret the life and work of Mary McLeod Bethune;
- (2) preserve and interpret the history, lives, and contributions of African American women; and
- (3) preserve and interpret the struggle for civil rights in the United States of America.

SEC. 2. ACQUISITION.

The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") may acquire, with the consent of the owner thereof, by donation or by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, the property designated under the Act of October 15, 1982 (Public Law 97-329; 96 Stat. 1615), as the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site, located at 1318 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., together with such structures and improvements thereon and such personal property associated with the site as he deems appropriate for interpretation of the site.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon acquisition of the property described in section 2, the cooperative agreement referred to in section 3 of the Act of October 15, 1982 (Public Law 97-329; 96 Stat. 1615) shall cease to have any force and effect, and upon acquisition of such property, the Secretary shall administer the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site (hereinafter in this Act re-

ferred to as the "historic site") in accordance with this Act and in accordance with the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the national park system, including the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4) and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467).

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—(1) The Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into a cooperative agreement with nonprofit organizations dedicated to preserving and interpreting the life and work of Mary McLeod Bethune and the history and contributions of African American women—

(A) to provide to the public such programs, seminars, and lectures as are appropriate to interpret the life and work of Mary McLeod Bethune and the history and contributions of African American women, and

(B) to administer the archives currently located at the historic site, including providing reasonable access to the archives by scholars and other interested parties.

(2) The Secretary is authorized to provide space and administrative support for such nonprofit organization.

(2) MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT.—The historic site shall be operated and managed in accordance with a General Management Plan. The Advisory Commission appointed under section 4 shall fully participate in an advisory capacity with the Secretary in the development of the General Management Plan for the historic site. The Secretary and the Advisory Commission shall meet and consult on matters relating to the management and development of the historic site as often as necessary, but at least semiannually.

SEC. 4. ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall carry out the functions specified in section 3(c) of this Act.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be composed of 15 members appointed by the Secretary for 4-year terms as follows:

(1) 3 members appointed from recommendations submitted by the National Council of Negro Women, Inc.

(2) 2 members appointed from recommendations submitted by other national organizations in which Mary McLeod Bethune played a leadership role.

(3) 2 members appointed from recommendations submitted by the Bethune Museum and Archives, Inc.

(4) 2 members who shall have professional expertise in the history of African American women.

(5) 2 members who shall have professional expertise in archival management.

(6) 3 members who shall represent the general public.

(7) 1 member who shall have professional expertise in historic preservation.

Any member of the Commission appointed for a definite term may serve after the expiration of his or her term until his or her successor is appointed. A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation except that the Secretary is authorized to pay such expenses as are reasonably incurred by the members in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(d) OFFICERS.—The Chair and other officers of the Commission shall be elected by a majority of the members of the Commission to serve for terms established by the Commission.

(e) BYLAWS, RULES, AND REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall make such bylaws, rules, and regulations as it considers necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. The provisions of section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix) are hereby waived with respect to this Commission.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 690, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Mary McLeod Bethune stands as one of this century's most distinguished African-Americans. She was an educator, political and civil rights activist and humanitarian. In 1935 she founded the National Council of Negro Women [NCNW] which united the major African-American women's organizations into one national organization. Bethune was the NCNW's president until 1949 and represented that organization at the founding of the United Nations. Her house, located at 1318 Vermont Avenue, Washington, DC, served as both her home and the NCNW's headquarters from 1943 until her death in 1955.

H.R. 690, introduced by my friend and colleague on the interior committee, Representative JOHN LEWIS, makes Mary McLeod Bethune's house a full-fledged unit of the National Park System. There is no question that this is an appropriate addition to the National Park System. It has long been an affiliated park site but deserves greater recognition, especially as it fully meets the National Park Service's criteria for significance and physical integrity. Legislation similar to H.R. 690 passed the House in the 101st Congress but was not considered by the Senate.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs amended the bill to clarify the role of the advisory commission

and to make several minor technical changes.

I want to note that the historic site's preservation and interpretation must include the struggle for civil rights in this country as a way of placing Mrs. Bethune in her larger historical context. It is not, however, our intention that the archives should be expanded to cover that entire history. Furthermore, the Committee, in recognition of the assistance the National Park Service has given the site over the years, strongly prefers that the archives be donated. Recognition should also be given for the previous Federal contribution to the site.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing the Mary McLeod Bethune council house National Historic Site a full-fledged unit of the National Park System. I endorse this legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 690, a bill to provide for establishment of the Mary McCleod Bethune Council House National Historic Site. This bill would bring full designation of this nationally significant resource as a unit of the National Park System; and provide a logical conclusion to previous congressional recognition of this site some 9 years ago.

The measure before us today has the general support of the administration since most of the issues raised in their testimony have now been addressed. The difficult issues associated with the role of the nonprofit associations in the management of the area have also been largely resolved.

I am especially pleased that the report language recognizes the \$1.5 million in Federal funding which has been provided to this site over the last 8 years will be considered in determining the appropriate acquisition cost. The report also recognizes that donation of the Bethune Archives to the Federal Government has the broad support of the subcommittee members.

I note for the RECORD that there is some concern on behalf of subcommittee members regarding the relatively high costs for development and operation of this site, especially in consideration of the relatively low visitation projected. I believe this is an important issue which deserves the continuing scrutiny of the subcommittee.

As a cosponsor of the measure, I am pleased to commend this bill to my colleagues and I would like to recognize Mr. LEWIS for his flexibility in working with us on our concerns and the chairman Mr. VENTO for his long interest in this issue; starting with his ultimately successful efforts to secure from the National Park Service a thorough study upon which to base this legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the committee and the author of the bill. The gentleman from Georgia has done an excellent job on this bill, and I commend him.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman VENTO, and Congressman LAGOMARSINO for their commitment in helping to bring the Bethune legislation, H.R. 690, before the full House. The prospect of bringing the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site into the National Park System fills me with tremendous pride.

Mary McLeod Bethune was a remarkable woman. Born in Maysville, SC, on July 10, 1875, she was one of 17 children born to former slaves.

In 1904, Mrs. Bethune founded what is now known as Bethune-Cookman College. She started the school with almost no money. She made and sold sweet potato pies and ice cream to raise money to build the school. The students used crates for desks, charcoal for pencils, and mashed elderberries for ink.

Mrs. Bethune served as an advisor to Presidents Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt. In 1935, she was appointed to the National Youth Administration [NYA]. The next year, she became director of the Negro Division of the NYA.

Mrs. Bethune convened what was called the Black Cabinet. Members of the Black Cabinet advised President Roosevelt during the New Deal.

Mrs. Bethune also founded the National Council of Negro Women and served at the helm of that powerful, national, civil rights organization for 14 years.

Mrs. Bethune's work laid the foundation for the success of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. She was pioneer and an activist. She was an early, important and key player in the effort to gain civil rights for blacks in America.

Unfortunately, the inventory of historic sites administered by the National Park Service does not yet provide a full picture of American history. The contributions of blacks are not adequately represented. Of the more than 350 national historic sites, which are units of the National Park System, only seven commemorate African-Americans.

This bill, H.R. 690, has given us the opportunity to do better. It gives the National Park Service an opportunity to tell a more complete story of America's history.

I hope the House lends its full support to H.R. 690.

□ 1510

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a worthy bill that honors and perpetuates the memory of one of America's truly great educators and leaders, Mary McLeod Bethune.

Given her inspirational role as a college founder and president, as a government official and civil rights advocate, and as a friend and confidante of five Presidents, it is only fitting that Dr. Bethune's accomplishments and legacy be more fully recognized.

Enactment of the bill, which authorizes the Department of the Interior to acquire and the National Park Service to operate Dr. Bethune's home and headquarters here in Washington, DC, would be a major step in that direction.

In particular, this measure will help make it possible for present and future generations to learn more about Dr. Bethune's Government service and her vast contributions to the civil rights movement. It tasks the National Park Service, and the nonprofit groups with which it will work, with responsibility for preserving and interpreting the life and work of Dr. Bethune, the history, lives and contributions of others like her, and the struggle for civil rights in general. And appropriately so, for Mary McLeod Bethune has left us a legacy from which all of us can learn and in which all of us can take pride.

I say that as one who has more than a passing familiarity with the work and accomplishments of Mary McLeod Bethune. The college she founded, Bethune Cookman College of Daytona Beach, FL, is in the congressional district I am privileged to represent. And her work as president of that college for a period of 36 years is remembered and honored in Florida and elsewhere to this day.

In 1986, in fact, Congress authorized \$6.2 million for construction of a fine arts center at Bethune Cookman College, to be named after Mary McLeod Bethune in recognition of her tremendous contributions to the college and to America. I'm happy to report that the first phase of that construction is virtually complete.

I am hopeful that Congress will see fit to authorize and appropriate another \$9.5 million so that the rest of the Mary McLeod Bethune Fine Arts Center can be finished as soon as possible. Such action would round out the recognition being accorded Dr. Bethune and would be a fine complement to the measure being considered here today. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 690.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to rise in support of legislation introduction by my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, to authorize the National Park Service to acquire the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site.

First of all, I want to commend Mr. LEWIS for sponsoring this legislation. It is so important that this Nation better recognize the achieve-

ments of African-Americans and their invaluable contributions to this country. Mr. LEWIS understands that great Americans like Mary McLeod Bethune deserve to be honored and remembered in ways that will also instruct and inspire us. The Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site does just that. Far too few historic sites administered by the National Park Service commemorate the accomplishments of black Americans. Mr. LEWIS deserves great credit for helping to rectify this situation.

Mary McLeod Bethune was a remarkable person. She founded what is now known as Bethune-Cookman College. She served as advisor to three Presidents. She was director of the Negro division of the National Youth Administration. She founded the National Council of Negro Women. She was a leader in the elimination of segregation in government and the Armed Forces.

Her influence even extended to my home, the U.S. Virgin Islands, 20 years after her death. Operation Sisters United, a project sponsored and implemented by the National Council of Negro Women, worked with the people of St. Thomas for 7 years, from 1975 to 1981.

It provided an alternative to detention for girls aged 11 to 18 referred by Virgin Islands courts. More than 200 girls benefited from the one-on-one support this program provided. Girls were given academic assistance and learned about nutrition and homemaking. They were given workshops to further understand and appreciate their culture to enhance their sense of self-esteem and self-worth. Operation Sisters United developed family counseling, foster care placements, crisis intervention, and child care training.

More than 150 volunteers from the community assisted Sisters United in St. Thomas. During those years it was the only service of its kind for female youth on the island, and its success was well established. Many Sisters United graduates returned to school and completed high school. Some went to college. Most had no further conflicts with the law.

The spirit of Mary McLeod Bethune lives today, in the college she founded, in the organizations she developed, in the influence she provided for my home, the Virgin Islands, as well as an entire Nation. It is certainly fitting that the council house become a National Park Service site.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and again I salute the gentleman from Georgia for sponsoring this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to recognize the accomplishments of this great American woman, Mary McLeod Bethune.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to support H.R. 690, which authorizes the National Park Service to acquire the Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site, located at 1318 Vermont Avenue, NW., in my district. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, not only for this bill but for similar legislation he has sponsored for the District of Columbia before I came to Congress and at a time when there was no representative from the District on the appropriate committee. In doing so he has earned the gratitude first of the Nation and then of the

residents of the District, especially the 70 percent who, as African-Americans, take pride in the recognition of great black leaders.

Mary McLeod Bethune was indeed a great American leader. Her exceptional energy and ability was clear from the earliest age. By the time she was 9 years old, in 1884, the child who was to become Mary McLeod Bethune could pick 250 pounds of cotton a day in the hot South Carolina sunshine. But young Mary and her 16 older siblings could not read or write, because it still wasn't possible at that time—almost two decades after the Civil War ended—for southern children of color to get an education.

When the first free school was started in Mary McLeod's neighborhood in that same year, 1884, by a northern Presbyterian missionary, young Mary walked 5 miles to and from school each day in order to take advantage of what she saw as a precious opportunity; she then came home at night and taught everything she had learned that day to her family. After 6 years, 15-year-old Mary had taken every course offered by the small school and hungered for more. But times were hard, and her parents' 5-acre farm barely supplied the day-to-day essentials for the large McLeod family. There was no money for education.

At about that time, in faraway Denver, CO, a white woman named Mary Crissman, a dressmaker, heard about the Mayesville, SC, school and offered to pay for the education of a worthy graduate. Mary McLeod was selected by her teacher, and soon was enrolled in the Scotia Seminary in Concord, NC. After graduation from Scotia and later from the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago, Miss McLeod's earlier ambition to become a missionary to Africa was superseded by a new and all-consuming desire to devote herself to the education of her own people in the United States. During her early teaching career, she married a fellow teacher, Albert L. Bethune.

Five years later, in 1904, Mary McLeod Bethune opened her first small school for young women in Daytona Beach, FL, with a total capital of \$1.50. "We burned logs and used the charred splinters as pencils, and smashed elderberries for ink," she later wrote. "I begged strangers for a broom, a lamp, a bit of cretonne to put around the packing case which served as my desk. I haunted the city dump and the trash piles behind hotels, retrieving discarded linen and kitchenware, cracked dishes, broken chairs, pieces of old lumber. Everything was scoured and mended. This was a part of the training—to salvage, to reconstruct, to make bricks without straw."

Nineteen years later, when her school was consolidated with a men's college to form the Bethune-Cookman College, the result of the merger was a progressive coeducational institution with 600 students, a staff of 32, 14 modern buildings on a 32-acre campus, and a total college property worth \$800,000, completely unencumbered by mortgages or other obligations.

Herbert Hoover was the first U.S. President to make use of the exceptional abilities of Mary McLeod Bethune when, in 1930, he invited her to a White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. Franklin D. Roosevelt later named her to serve on the Advisory Committee of the National Youth Admin-

istration [NYA]. A year later, her work for the NYA had so impressed President Roosevelt that he persuaded her to set up an Office of Minority Affairs, and to serve as its Administrator. This established a precedent, for it was the first post of its kind ever to be held by an American black woman.

When Mrs. Bethune died in 1955 at the age of 80, this Nation lost a true leader who had worked her way up from the cotton fields of South Carolina to worldwide recognition and acclaim.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 690, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OCMULGEE NATIONAL MONUMENT LAND ADDITION

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 749) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of land for addition to the Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 749

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ACCEPTANCE AND ADMINISTRATION OF LAND.

(a) ACCEPTANCE OF LAND.—The Secretary of the Interior may accept the donation of all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in section 2 from the owners of that land.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF LAND.—The land acquired by the United States under this section shall be added to, and administered as part of, the Ocmulgee National Monument.

SEC. 2. DESCRIPTION OF LAND.

The land referred to in section 1 is the approximately 18.6 acre parcel of land known as Drake Field and located adjacent to the Ocmulgee National Monument in the City of Macon, Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R.

749, the legislation presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 749 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of an 18-acre property for inclusion at Ocmulgee National Monument in Georgia. The bill was introduced by our colleague from Georgia, Representative ROY ROWLAND.

The legislation before us today would authorize the addition of a parcel known as Drake Field to the monument. Drake Field was once part of a village of early Mississippians, a farming people who lived at Ocmulgee between 900 and 1100 A.D. The parcel is located directly adjacent to the funeral mound, where evidence of over 100 burials has been found. Drake Field is one of the few remaining parcels of land in the monument's vicinity which has not been intensely developed. Incorporation of this property into the monument would prevent the loss of cultural artifacts and restore tranquility to the area adjacent to the funeral mound. The parcel is owned by the city of Macon, GA, which wants to donate it to the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is supported by the city of Macon, the State of Georgia, and the National Park Service. I commend the gentleman from Georgia, Representative ROWLAND for introducing this legislation and urge its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 749, a bill to authorize the expansion of Ocmulgee National Monument.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straight forward measure which permits the National Park Service to accept a donation of approximately 19 acres immediately adjacent to the existing Ocmulgee National Monument. The lands to be added were apparently considered for inclusion in the monument at the time of its original establishment.

Ultimately these lands were acquired partially with land and water conservation funds for local recreation purposes. About 7 years ago, the lands became surplus to the city of Macon and in recognition of their archeological values the city proposed their addition to the park. This proposal has the support of the local people and the administration. Further, it appears that the cost for the long-term management of these lands will be minimal. Given the constraints associated with conversion of LWCF properties, it appears that ad-

dition of these lands to the park is the best option.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the efforts of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND] for bringing forward this measure which reflects a reasonable recommendation based on thorough evaluation of all the options.

I commend this bill to my colleagues and I urge their support of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND], the sponsor of this measure.

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, I introduced H.R. 749 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of land for addition to the Ocmulgee National Monument. This donation of a parcel of land called Drake's Field will be made by the city of Macon, which is in my district. Because the boundaries of the monument are established by law, legislation must be passed in order to allow the acceptance of the city's generous offer.

For several years, officials of the Ocmulgee National Monument have been interested in adding Drake's Field to the park to enhance its historic setting and visual impact. There is undoubtedly archaeological significance to the field. Archaeologists say that there was continuous occupation on the field beginning about 10,000 B.C. and ending around A.D. 1715. Sporadic occupation by the Creek Indians continued at the site until 1819. If this land is added to the Ocmulgee National Monument, potentially valuable archaeological materials could be recovered for study.

This bill is supported by the local community as well as the National Park Service, and it will not affect pay-as-you-go scoring.

I want to thank the chairman of the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee, BRUCE VENTO, for his prompt consideration of this bill and for the hard work the committee has done to bring it to the floor today.

□ 1520

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 749.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) designating the second week in May 1991 as "National Tourism Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON], the chief sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that as chairman of the congressional travel and tourism caucus, it is my pleasure to speak to you and my other colleagues about the eighth consecutive celebration of National Tourism Week.

This resolution is an important way to recognize the commendable efforts of an industry that is vitally important, not only to my own State of South Carolina's economic, social, and cultural well-being, but to that of the Nation.

This year, National Tourism Week takes on an even larger focus as this industry struggles to recover from the economic damage caused by the gulf war and the recession.

Recent weeks have seen an unprecedented cooperative campaign called GO*USA among more than 40 industry organizations that have banded together to encourage leisure visitors and business travelers to take to the roads and skies again.

To pay tribute to tourism for its educational, economic, and recreational benefits, I urge today, the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 102 commemorating National Tourism Week.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON].

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, who I believe wants to relate to our colleagues the schedule for next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Let me say that after today and for the rest of the day, our business is finished. There will be no more votes.

On Monday, April 29, the House will meet at noon. There will not be legislative business.

On Tuesday, April 30, the House will meet at noon. We will have two suspension bills; recorded votes on suspensions will be postponed until after debate on all suspensions. First there will

be a bill to authorize emergency humanitarian assistance for fiscal year 1991 for Iraqi refugees and other persons who are displaced as a result of the Persian Gulf conflict.

The second bill will be S. 258, to correct an error in the Solar, Wind, Waste, and Geothermal Power Production Incentives Act of 1990; again votes will be held until after all bills have been debated.

On Wednesday, May 1, the House will meet at 2 p.m. to consider H.R. 1455, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991.

And on Thursday, May 2, the House will meet at 11 a.m. to take up the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Multiyear Authorization Act of 1991, subject to a rule.

On Friday, May 3, the House will not be in session.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if we could just go to the next week, for the clarification for the Members, does the majority leader have any idea of what that schedule might be, perhaps with the Brady bill or the civil rights bill? Is there any schedule?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the one bill that I feel sure will be up in that week is the Brady bill. I am less certain at this point of exactly when the civil rights bill will be scheduled. It is out of the committee, but we are not sure at this point of its scheduling, and there are obviously other matters that are coming out of committee.

The only thing I can say today with certainty that we will try to have on schedule for that week is the Brady bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader as well.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection and referring to House Joint Resolution 103, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 103, designating the second week in May 1991 as "National Tourism Week." And I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON] for introducing this important measure.

The tourism industry in the United States represents the second largest industry that we have. Furthermore, the industry has consistently brought foreign visitors and their capital into the United States to ease our trade deficit.

Now, with the end of the war in the Persian Gulf, and the easing of ten-

sions worldwide, it is time to encourage both Americans and foreigners to travel again in the United States.

In my own 22d Congressional District of New York, we have a thriving tourism industry in the Catskill Mountain and Hudson Valley region. The beautiful Catskills and our mid-Hudson Valley are less than 2 to 3 hours from New York City and draw millions each year to the scenic views found along the Hudson River and in the mountains, good food in the hotels and restaurants, and challenging golf courses and recreational facilities.

Mr. SPEAKER, I am pleased to support this measure and I urge my colleagues to lend their support as well.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 102

Whereas travel and tourism is the third largest retail industry and the second largest private employer in the United States, generating nearly six million jobs and indirectly employing another two million six hundred and forty thousand Americans;

Whereas total travel expenditures in the United States amount to more than \$350,000,000,000 annually, or about 6.5 percent of the gross national product;

Whereas tourism is an essential American export, as thirty-eight million seven hundred thousand foreign travelers spend approximately \$44,000,000,000 annually in the United States;

Whereas development and promotion of tourism have brought new industries, jobs and economic revitalization to cities and regions across the United States;

Whereas tourism contributes substantially to personal growth, education, appreciation of intercultural differences, and the enhancement of international understanding and good will; and

Whereas the abundant natural and man-made attractions of the United States and the hospitality of the American people establish the United States as the preeminent destination for both foreign and domestic travelers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning the first Sunday in May 1991 is designated as "National Tourism Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. HALLEN, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following titles,

in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate from Thursday, April 25, 1991, or Friday, April 26, 1991, until Monday, May 6, 1991, or Tuesday, May 7, 1991.

ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 173) to designate May 1991 and May 1992 as "Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not object, but I take the time to yield to the two sponsors of this resolution.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be the primary sponsor of House Joint Resolution 173 which calls upon the Congress and the President to set aside the month of May 1991 and May 1992 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month.

I want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, Representative TOM SAWYER and also the ranking member of the subcommittee, Representative TOM RIDGE, for their assistance in bringing this measure to the floor in an expedited fashion.

On June 30, 1977, I had the unique honor and pleasure of introducing House Joint Resolution 540 and later House Joint Resolution 1007 which for the first time in this Nation's history, asked the Congress and the people of the United States to set aside a period in May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week.

I am joined in this motion by my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. NORMAN MINETA, who was also the original sponsor with me in 1977. Joining with us in support of this measure are Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. HUNTER of California, Mr. FALEOMAVEGA of American Samoa, Ms. MOLINARI of New York, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BLAZ of Guam, and Mr. DE LUGO of the Virgin Islands.

More than 13 years ago a woman came to my office and told my administrative assistant, Ruby Moy, and me a very compelling and persuasive story.

Today, I share the origin of this landmark legislation.

The celebration of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month has a very deep and personal place for Jeanie Jew and her family. Their story began sometime in the 1800's when a young man, M.Y. Lee left Tolshan, Canton, China to find a better life in America. Mr. Lee was one of the first Chinese pioneers to help build the Transcontinental Railroad. He later became a prominent California businessman. When the Chinese were having difficulties in Oregon, Mr. Lee traveled to Oregon and was killed during that period of unrest. It was a time of anti-Chinese and Anti-Asian sentiment. The revelations about Mr. Lee and the story of Asian Americans led this one woman to believe that not only should Asians understand their own heritage, but that all Americans must know about the contributions and histories of the Asian/Pacific American experience in the United States. Jeanie Jew, the creator of the idea for a heritage month is the granddaughter of M.Y. Lee, the early pioneer.

The original resolution designated the week beginning May 4 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week because that week included two significant occasions in the proud history of Asian Americans. May 10, 1809, or "Golden Spike Day" was the day on which the Transcontinental Railroad was completed, largely by Chinese American pioneers. May 7, 1843, marks the date of the first arrival of the Japanese in the United States. Both dates will fittingly be included in Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month.

I want to commend the two women who made this event possible. Mrs. Jew turned a personal tragedy in her family history into a positive force.

Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month will now be observed by all Americans. I also want to thank Ruby Moy, my administrative assistant, for her efforts to pass this legislation. She held the highest professional position to a Member of Congress, and is a second generation Asian-American.

In 1977, Mrs. Jew and Ms. Moy cofounded the Congressional Asian/Pacific Staff Caucus, an organization which collectively worked for the establishment of the first heritage proclamation and supports yearly efforts to perpetuate its recognition. The caucus, a group of professional staff members of Asian descent, periodically discusses and reviews legislation and issues of concern to Asian/Pacific Americans.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution and in recognizing the history and contributions of Asian/Pacific Americans, particularly during Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month.

□ 1530

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 173, legislation which designates May 1991 and May 1992 as Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

I wish to thank our fine colleagues, Mr. SAWYER of Ohio and Mr. RIDGE of Pennsylvania for their leadership in bringing this matter to the floor as expeditiously as they have.

Since 1979, when Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week was first established, there has been increased visibility of the accomplishments of Asian and Pacific Island communities in the United States.

In 1990, for the first time, the entire month of May was designated in recognition of the Asian/Pacific American experience, and the importance of that experience to the development of our Nation.

For that great effort, I would like to offer special tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], who first authored Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week in the House a dozen years ago, and who had championed this cause ever since.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the last 150 years, since the first immigrants from China arrived in the United States, Americans of Asian and Pacific island ancestry have made many contributions to the diverse cultural tapestry of this Nation.

Asian/Pacific Americans have used their influence and great energies to fight for civil rights, improved education for our children, and increased business opportunities among others that are important to all Americans.

A dozen years ago, before the establishment of heritage week, all too many of the outstanding achievements of Asian/Pacific Americans were unknown even within these diverse communities.

Since then, Asian and Pacific Island Americans have gathered strength through sharing their unique insights and experiences. And now, with an expanded designation of heritage month, even more of this great legacy and pride may be shared with the entire Nation. For this the Asian Pacific island community across the Nation is grateful and thankful to the wonderful efforts by Mr. HORTON for his continued recognition of the history and contributions of Asian Pacific Americans to this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House

Joint Resolution 173, designating May 1991 and May 1992 as "Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month." And I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], for introducing this significant commemoration.

The contributions of Asian/Pacific Americans to our great Nation have been too numerous to count. Suffice it to say that Asian/Pacific Americans, many of whom are highly educated and skilled professionals, have contributed to the strength of America in our research laboratories, on our assembly lines, in battle, in our Congress, our universities, and in our Nation's Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this measure and I urge my colleagues to lend their support.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] for his sponsorship of this piece of legislation. As a matter of fact, the gentleman has been doing this for the past several years now, and I do commend him for his sincere interest and firm commitment to assist with the needs of our Asian-Pacific communities throughout this great Nation of ours. Thanks also to our colleagues Mr. RIDGE from Pennsylvania and Mr. SAWYER from Ohio for their support of House Joint Resolution 173.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will make it an official declaration of the Congress, with the approval of our President, to officially declare the month of May as Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month, and that the President will call upon all our Federal and State executives, as well as communities throughout our country to conduct appropriate activities to commemorate the many contributions that Asian-Pacific Americans have made to the needs of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 7 million Asian-Pacific Americans in the United States, and no doubt with the same social and economic needs, and aspirations like all other Americans.

Mr. Speaker, probably no other country in the world can actually lay claim to the fact that these—United States and territories—are representations of almost every nationality from throughout the world. The greatness of this Nation rests in the fact that no one person is above the law—that that historical and most solemn document, the Constitution is truly color blind; that despite its many shortcomings, our Nation's ideals and standards are still the most noble and highest tributes attributed to mankind. The late

Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., could not have said it better on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial—that America to him is a place where a man will be judged not in accordance with the color of his skin, but by the contents of his character. That's America, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, time will not allow me to elaborate on the various occasions or areas whereby Asian-Pacific Americans contributed substantially to our country's needs. However, I want to draw the attention of my distinguished colleagues to one of the most significant contributions made by Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this year, on December 7, will mark the 50th anniversary of the surprise bombing of Pearl Harbor by Japanese military forces. It was a dark period of our history, and in this very Chamber, President Roosevelt with the support of the Congress officially declared war on Japan.

Along with this declaration of war was our announced policy of literally herding of thousands of Americans—and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, Americans born and raised in these United States—but who just happen to be of Japanese ancestry—were herded like cattle and supposedly placed in retention camps—but in my own mind behind barbed wire, they were concentration camps. Their homes and properties were confiscated—they were literally stripped of their dignity and self-esteem as citizens of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we must exercise discretion and appropriate demeanor on this so-called remembrance day of December 7, because our Nation must never again make judgments on the basis of ethnicity, but upon sound principles above race, creed, or religion.

To prove the patriotism of Japanese-Americans, many volunteered to join the armed services to fight in World War II. Hence, two combat units were organized composed entirely of Japanese-Americans, namely the 100th Battalion, and the 442d Regimental Combat Team.

Mr. Speaker, these two units were assigned to the European theater, and as a result—let me share with my colleagues the accomplishments of these units. They suffered 314 percent casualties; earned 18,143 individual decorations; participated in 6 campaigns; earned 7 distinguished unit citations—the units became the most decorated military units of their size in the history of the Army.

How ironic, Mr. Speaker, that two of the original members of the 100th Battalion 442d Infantry were members of this body—the late Senator Spark Matsunaga and Senator DANIEL K. INOUE, who currently serves as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Defense. How

ironic that the distinguished gentlemen from California, Mr. MATSUI and Mr. MINETA, were both—in their youths—occupants of these relocation camps the Government built to house Japanese-Americans during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted also that President Truman was so moved by the courage and sacrifices made by these Japanese-Americans that it contributed significantly to Truman's eventual decision to desegregate our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, the United States currently conducts approximately a \$300 billion annual trade relationship with the Asia-Pacific region of the world. Over two-thirds of the world's population is in Asia-Pacific. Let us not kid ourselves. It is in our vital interest that our Nation get more involved to understand and appreciate the Asia-Pacific region. And I believe the 7 million Americans of Asian-Pacific ancestry will only enrich this great Nation of ours, and again, I thank the gentleman from New York for bringing this legislation to the floor and to give it favorable consideration.

□ 1540

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure I join my colleagues in support of House Joint Resolution 173, which designates May as Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month. As an Asian-American I am proud of the rich and unique heritage that has served to enhance the strength of this Nation.

Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month will be a time to recognize the achievements of Asians and Pacific Islanders and to reflect upon the culture, traditions, and values that have been the foundation of our success. Americans of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry have gained national and international prominence in the fields of science, business, and the arts, leaving a distinctive mark in virtually every aspect of American life.

Let us recognize these successes of Asians and Pacific Islanders in the past and look forward to even greater achievements from these Americans as they contribute to the improvement of our world community.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues in the House to support House Joint Resolution 173, Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month, and honor the remarkable and inspiring efforts that have made the Asian-Pacific Island legacy a proud one.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H. J. RES. 173

Whereas, on May 7, 1843, the 1st Japanese immigrants came to the United States and, on May 10, 1869, Golden Spike Day, the 1st transcontinental railroad in the United

States was completed with significant contributions from Chinese pioneers;

Whereas, in 1979, the President proclaimed the week beginning on May 4, 1979, as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week, providing an opportunity for the people of the United States to recognize the history, concerns, contributions, and achievements of Asian and Pacific Americans;

Whereas more than 6.9 million people in the United States can trace their roots to Asia and the islands of the Pacific; and

Whereas Asian and Pacific Americans have contributed significantly to the development of the arts, sciences, government, military, and education in the United States: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) May 1991 and May 1992 are each designated as "Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month";

(2) The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation for each such month calling on the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

(3) The chief executive officer of each State and locality is requested to issue a proclamation for each such month calling on the people of the State or locality to observe such month with appropriate programs, ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 154) designating the month of May 1991, as "National Foster Care Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to acknowledge the work of the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], who is the chief sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from California for introducing House Joint Resolution 154, which designates May 1991 as National Foster Care Month. The families who open

their hearts and their homes to children in need of a safe haven certainly deserve our recognition and admiration.

How we as a nation take care of our most vulnerable children; the ones who, for various reasons, must be sent to live apart from their families, is vitally important to all of us. There is an emerging consensus across the political spectrum that we must find new initiatives to make sure that all American kids get the kind of emotional and physical nurturing that the best of families, whether natural or foster, give to help their children grow into contributing adults.

This leads us to one of those intersections of demographics and public policy that my colleague from Pennsylvania and I find to be among the most challenging and rewarding aspects of our committee jurisdiction.

I have introduced legislation which calls upon the Bureau of the Census to collect data about children who are sent to live away from home. That data will create a demographic profile of these children and will help all of us, from those of us making public policy and administrative decisions to the foster care families that are so important to kids who must live apart from their families, make the best choices for all of America's children.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the 224 Members who have joined me in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 154, designating May 1991 as National Foster Care Month. By passing this resolution my colleagues and I ask Americans across the Nation to recognize thousands of foster families who open their homes to the less fortunate children in our society.

In the past decade the deterioration of the traditional family structure has made the role of the foster family even more critical to thousands of children. Today there are over 250,000 licensed foster families who not only provide high quality home care, but also lend guidance and emotional support to many of the young among us. It is our duty to offer children who do not have the benefit of growing up with the support of parents and siblings the most nurturing environment possible so they can reach their highest potential. After all, we must remember that today's youth are the cornerstone of tomorrow's society. Because the foster family system offers a safe living environment to those who should not have to fend for themselves, it is critical that we stand behind those families who strive to enhance and preserve the well-being of our children.

In recent years there has been an explosion in the number of children entering the foster care system. As a result, the Nation's foster care system is under tremendous stress. There are not enough foster family homes to meet the demands imposed by the current system. In California alone, the number of foster families increased by 11 percent between 1986 and 1988, while the number of foster children increased by 28 percent. In this

sense, the designation of May as National Foster Care Month will not only pay tribute to foster families, it will also provide an opportunity to bring extra attention to hundreds of thousands of children who need the guidance and love that only a family environment can provide. We must not allow the foster care system to be weakened by overloading it. By nationally recognizing foster families we can encourage others to donate their time and energy to support foster youth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SAWYER of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, the cosponsoring Members and the organizations that have supported House Joint Resolution 154. It is their unwavering dedication to children and to the services that the foster care system provides that has made the designating of May 1991 as National Foster Care Month possible.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 154

Whereas today there are more than 250,000 licensed foster families in the United States who temporarily provide guidance, emotional support, food, shelter, and nurture to children who cannot remain in their own home;

Whereas foster parents devotedly and unselfishly open their homes and family lives to foster children in need;

Whereas foster parents are a vital part in permanency planning to protect the best interests of a foster child;

Whereas foster parents work cooperatively with human service agencies and biological parents to strengthen family life;

Whereas foster parents must have the commitment of the national, State and local communities in terms of funding, support, and training; and

Whereas the National Foster Parent Association holds its annual training conference during the month of May 1991: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of May 1991, is designated as "National Foster Care Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the several joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO AMTRAK FOR BENEFITS BROUGHT TO NATION DURING ITS 20 YEARS OF EXISTENCE

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 98) to express appreciation for the benefit brought to the Nation by Amtrak during its 20 years of existence, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, while I will not object, I take this reservation for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Washington, Mr. [SWIFT] to explain the contents of this Senate joint resolution.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, this year Amtrak celebrates 20 years of carrying passengers by rail throughout the United States. When you consider the peaks and valleys through which it has traveled since 1970, this is indeed a remarkable accomplishment.

Amtrak started 20 years ago as a rag-tag booking service set up to preserve a dying tradition, passenger rail service. It was equipped with old, second-hand rolling stock, and it operated virtually by the seat of its pants.

I'm pleased to report that since then Amtrak has grown into a vibrant element of our Nation's transportation system. It carries over 40 million passengers a year over a record 6.1 billion passenger miles per year.

It is currently covering nearly 80 percent of its operating expenses, and is on track to eliminate its Federal operating support by the year 2000. This is an achievement no other carrier can claim; Amtrak is the most efficient passenger railroad in the world.

In these times of environmental sensitivity and uncertain energy supplies, Amtrak offers a safe, efficient, environmentally benign alternative. I have met with the president of Amtrak, Mr. Graham Claytor, and am pleased at the direction Amtrak is moving. In addition the Committee on Energy and Commerce will continue to encourage Amtrak to have an active role in our economy.

The nonbinding resolution before us commemorates these achievements. It affirms the role of Amtrak in our national transportation system, and encourages both State and Federal Governments to continue to factor passenger rail service into their transportation plans. It is my belief that rail passenger service is something whose time has come again.

I congratulate our colleagues in the Senate, including the 43 sponsors of this legislation, on their good work in expressing the thanks of a grateful nation for a job well done by Amtrak.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 98, a resolution expressing appreciation to Amtrak for its 20 years of service.

Mr. Speaker, for most of us Amtrak has become such a regular feature of our transportation system that it is hard to visualize or even remember the rail crisis of the late 1960's and early 1970's when it looked as though the Nation would lose all of its intercity rail passenger trains.

Fortunately, that did not happen because with the passage of the Rail Passenger Service Act, the Federal Government helped to support the continuation of passenger service through the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, better known to most of us as Amtrak. The first Amtrak operated passenger trains rolled out of the station on May 1, 1971, and it is the 20th birthday of Amtrak's service that we mark today.

Over the intervening 20 years, Amtrak has had a sometimes tempestuous career. At times it looked as if Amtrak would be denied Federal support, but that did not happen. Congress and the American people decided that it was important to retain intercity rail passenger transportation.

□ 1550

So instead of demise, Amtrak was subjected to increasingly stringent financial discipline under the leadership of its president, Graham Claytor, who took over in 1982. Under his management, Amtrak has dramatically increased the proportion of its costs covered by its revenues from 46 percent in 1976 to 80 percent in 1990.

It is difficult to think of any other federally funded activity where the level of service has steadily increased while the level of Federal support has actually declined in real terms. Amtrak's role in our national transportation strategy is all the more vital in this age of heightened environmental and energy consciousness. Rail travel provides the highest level of energy efficiency and lowest level of emissions of virtually any modern means of transportation. For that reason alone, the Nation's need for speedy, reliable rail service is sure to grow in the decades ahead.

In addition, as our highways and airways become ever more congested, intercity rail service will perform an increasingly vital function. People in congested areas are fed up with the cramped parking-lot character of the interstate highways and the highways at rush hour. Trains can relieve pressure on highways, and they can relieve

pressure on airport and air traffic control infrastructures.

Trains, planes, and automobiles all are essential to solving America's transportation problems. Farther down the line, once we decide on comprehensive transportation strategy, Amtrak should be one of the early users of the high-speed rail transportation already used in Europe and Japan, and potentially the magnetic-levitation technology is now coming into use in Germany and Japan.

It is quite amazing how far, how far behind America has fallen in passenger rail transportation service. With upgraded technology, there is great potential for fast, clean, and uncongested transportation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to commend Amtrak, its management, and employees, past and present, for a fine job of delivering a vital service to the American public at an increasingly low cost to the taxpayer.

We have got a ways to go, Amtrak, and so do we as a nation, but, Amtrak, you have come a long way.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE].

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and add my congratulations also to Amtrak for its anniversary and for the fine job that it is doing.

My wife and I have used Amtrak several times in recent years for our own personal vacations, and we have found it to be a very satisfactory and enjoyable experience.

It seems to me that if we could only bring ourselves to have a transportation policy in this country, we would put increasing emphasis on mass transportation within cities and on Amtrak between cities.

I saw a newspaper story about a year ago which said that if traffic continues to increase in the corridor between Los Angeles and San Diego in the coming years, within two decades, they will need an additional highway 40 lanes wide to handle the traffic. That is ridiculous. We ought to move to train travel instead. We could get, as the gentleman suggested, any one of the high-speed rail technologies, move a lot of people a lot faster with a lot less pollution and at a better cost to the public and to the people in the private sector as well.

So I hope we will continue the emphasis, and I think all of us need to remember how important Amtrak is and how far along it has come and how well managed it is as we look at appropriations measures for Amtrak this year and in the years to come.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to

thank the gentleman from Ohio for his comments and just add that we have all been through the love affair with the automobile and the love affair with the airplane. We realize that none of the above is the only solution to America's transportation problems. Congestion continues to increase on the highways and in the airways.

We need everything we can get to get us between our population centers, and so rail transportation, this gentleman believes, is in a new era, and there is a new dawn, and hopefully Amtrak can help America deal with that situation.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 of this year, Amtrak—America's passenger railroad—will mark 20 years of continuous service to the American public. Many Americans may not know, or may have forgotten, how close we came to the total extinction of intercity rail passenger service in 1970. With virtually all the freight railroads unable to sustain passenger service, and many of them in or near bankruptcy on their freight operations as well, it appeared that passenger trains would die a quick death.

Fortunately, enough far-sighted Americans insisted on preserving rail service through the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, better known as Amtrak. When Congress approved the Rail Passenger Service Act in 1970, it established a basic charter for a continuing, constructive Federal role in supporting intercity rail service as part of a balanced national transportation network. The wisdom of that judgment has been demonstrated over the intervening years.

Coming from the New York area, I can appreciate how vital Amtrak's operations are to the high-density transportation needs of the east coast of the United States. Without Amtrak, our already overcrowded airports and airways simply couldn't handle the load, and that means not only inconvenience, but loss of productivity for our economy. And as our population becomes increasingly urbanized, new transportation corridors in areas like the west coast, the Midwest, and the Southwest will undoubtedly require the high-capacity, reliable, all-weather service that only a rail passenger system can provide.

I also want to note that, during its existence, Amtrak has made great progress in becoming more efficient, and in earning revenues to offset more and more of its operating costs. In 1976, for example, Amtrak was covering only 42 percent of its operating costs with earned revenue. But under the outstanding leadership of a veteran railroader, Mr. Graham Claytor, who took the helm of Amtrak in 1982, the percentage of costs covered by earned revenues has marched higher and higher: 65 percent by 1987 and 80 percent by 1990, with a declared goal of self-sufficiency by the turn of the century.

This is a remarkable achievement, especially when you consider that Amtrak has been serving an ever-growing number of passengers. Last year, a record 22 million Americans rode Amtrak's intercity trains, and almost an equal number used commuter-rail trains operated by Amtrak under contract with State and local authorities. In short, some 40 million Americans relied upon Amtrak last year for

vital transportation service. This could not have been done so efficiently and at such a low cost to the taxpayer without the managerial talent displayed by Graham Claytor and his executives.

We all wish Amtrak the best as it enters its third decade of service to the American public, and we look forward to an exciting future for Amtrak in the years to come. I know that we can count on Amtrak to provide America with a safe, energy-efficient, and environmentally sound key element in our national transportation infrastructure.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 98

Whereas May 1, 1991, will mark the twentieth anniversary of the commencement of intercity rail passenger service by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, better known as Amtrak;

Whereas Amtrak has dramatically improved both the quality and the economics of rail passenger service in the past twenty years and provides a marketable and highly desired national transportation service, with over two hundred and twenty trains each day operating over twenty-four thousand track miles through forty-four States;

Whereas Amtrak carries passengers more miles and longer distances than carried by all the passenger railroads in 1970 prior to the establishment of Amtrak, provides transportation to nearly twenty-two million intercity and eighteen million commuter passengers each year, and serves as a vital national transportation link to rural America, which increasingly is losing other modes of public transportation;

Whereas Amtrak employs nearly twenty-four thousand railroad employees, who cumulatively earn over \$1,000,000,000 in annual taxable income, and procures over \$350,000,000 in goods and services from domestic companies across the country;

Whereas the country is witnessing a remarkable resurgence in support for a national rail passenger system, reflected by trains that frequently are sold out far in advance of departure and by increasing demands across the country for additional Amtrak service;

Whereas Amtrak is now covering over 80 percent of its operating costs without Federal support compared to just 50 percent in 1981, and is committed to covering 100 percent of its operating costs by the year 2000;

Whereas rail passenger service increasingly is recognized as a critical element of a balanced national transportation system and as an energy efficient, environmentally benign alternative to growing highway and airport congestion;

Whereas Congress has repeatedly been required to preserve funding for a national rail passenger system in the face of proposals to eliminate Federal assistance for Amtrak, and is proud of the success Amtrak has achieved in providing increasingly better service at less cost to the Federal taxpayer; and

Whereas Amtrak has a critical role to play in the future of the Nation's surface transportation system, as the operator of both

conventional and high-speed rail systems, new systems based on magnetic levitation, and contract commuter rail systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the creation of Amtrak had the important effect of preserving a national rail passenger system and of providing Americans with an energy efficient, environmentally preferable transportation alternative, and that the need for a balanced national transportation system in this country dictates that Federal and State transportation planners consider the many advantages of improved rail passenger service as they look to addressing national and regional transportation concerns.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 98, the Senate joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE FROM APRIL 25, 1991, OR APRIL 26, 1991, TO MAY 6, 1991, OR MAY 7, 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House a privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) providing for recess or adjournment of the Senate from April 25, 1991, or April 26, 1991, until May 6, 1991, or May 7, 1991.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, April 25, 1991, or Friday, April 26, 1991, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, or until such time as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to adjourn or recess, on Monday, May 6, 1991, or Tuesday, May 7, 1991, or until 12 o'clock noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate, after consultation with the Republican Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble whenever, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled joint resolution on Tuesday, April 23, 1991:

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 21, 1991, and the week beginning April 19, 1992, each as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week."

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1991, TO MONDAY, APRIL 29, 1991

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 25, 1991, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

□ 1600

FIRST BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES PANEL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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 Science, Space, and Technology.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, April 24, 1991.)

INTRODUCTION OF AIRLINE COMPETITION AND PASSENGER PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

(Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Airline Competition and Passenger Protection Act. This comprehensive bill is designed to address two major problems facing our air transportation system

today. The first is poor customer service. And the second is a diminishing level of competition.

With respect to passenger service, the situation may have improved somewhat recently. Complaints to the Department of Transportation [DOT] are down. However, other evidence indicates that serious problems still remain. The 1990 Zagat airline survey, reflecting the opinions of frequent business travelers, found that in general they were pretty unhappy with airline service. More recently, Airport Interviewing and Research, Inc., concluded that there is "increasing customer dissatisfaction with air travel." Also, in February, the Wall Street Journal reported that flight cancellations are a rising problem for travelers. The existence of these problems is reinforced by the experiences that are related to us by individual air travelers.

In the past, we might have relied on competition to prod airlines into improving passenger service, but, unfortunately, the industry is becoming more concentrated. The mergers of the eighties reduced the number of carriers. And recent economic problems may reduce the number even further. Eastern is already out of business. Pan Am, Continental, and Midway are bankrupt. And TWA seems to be on the brink. Therefore, the level of competition may soon no longer be sufficient to ensure adequate passenger service. Some Government-mandated protections appear to be called for.

The bill I am introducing attempts to address these problems in two ways. First, it proposes measures that would help maintain and even enhance competition. Second, it would impose requirements that would help protect passengers and lead to improved passenger service. These requirements would be in addition to those already mandated by DOT's airline service quality rule at 14 CFR part 234. They are carefully designed to impose the minimum burden on airlines that is possible in light of the goals of improved service that we are trying to accomplish.

The bill would cover primarily the major airlines and, in some cases, their code-sharing commuter partners. It is intended to be consistent with the coverage of DOT's rule.

I am entering into the RECORD the specific provisions of the bill in more detail.

Hubs.—The bill would require an airline to report, and DOT to publish, the percentage of each airline's passengers that missed their connection at that airline's hub airports. For this purpose, a hub would be defined as an airport at which an airline has 75 or more departures (counting both its own operations and those of its code sharing partners). Only the airline[s] with the 75 or more departures would be subject to this requirement and only at the airport[s] where they have that level of operations. This is the same as section 1701(b)(6) of H.R. 3051 which passed the

House during the 100th Congress. It would complement current requirements in DOT rules that airlines report on-time performance. This additional reporting requirement would help us determine which hubs were working and which were not and may give airlines an incentive to increase their connecting times or hold flights for connecting passengers.

Within 18 months after it first receives the data required above, DOT would have to report to Congress and provide an assessment of the quality of service being provided to passengers at hubs and on whether and what kind of changes are needed to improve that service.

The bill would require that agreements between an airline and its hub airport be submitted to the Justice Department at least 30 days before that agreement is to take effect. Justice is authorized to act to void an agreement within the 30-day period if it finds that the agreement would be anti-competitive. This is designed to block majority in interest clauses and exclusive use provisions in airline-airport contracts that inhibit competition at hubs.

Delays.—For each flight that is delayed more than 15 minutes beyond its scheduled arrival time, the bill would require airlines to report the reasons for the delay. DOT would be required to issue a rule within 180 days establishing categories (such as weather or air traffic control holds) that airlines would use in reporting the reasons for delays to ensure some consistency in reporting. In order to fix the delay problem, we have to know the reasons for it. This would help to provide the needed data.

If an airline knows before the passengers board the plane that the departure will be delayed by more than one hour, it would be required to notify the passengers of the approximate length of the delay, the reasons for the delay, and give each passenger the opportunity to cancel with a full refund regardless of the type of ticket the passenger holds. This is based on section 1704(b) of H.R. 3051.

Notwithstanding any other law or any contract between an airport and an air carrier, the bill would permit, on a 3-year trial basis, airports to charge higher landing fees at peak hours in order to spread out traffic and reduce delays during congested time periods. Higher peak-hour fees, if adopted, would have to be non-discriminatory and could not single out any particular class of user.

Baggage.—The bill would direct DOT to revise its baggage reporting system within 180 days to require airlines to report to DOT the total number of bags that they handle, the number of bags that are lost permanently, the number of bags that are lost temporarily, the number of passengers who filed mishandled baggage reports with the airline, and the average elapsed time between the arrival of its aircraft (at an airport where it has more than 75 flights per day) and baggage delivery to passengers. Currently, airlines are required to report only the number of passengers who filed mishandled baggage reports.

Notwithstanding 14 CFR Part 254, the bill would prohibit an airline from limiting its liability for lost, damaged or delayed passenger baggage to less than \$2,500. The current limit is \$1,250.

The bill would also direct airlines to act on a passenger's claim for lost luggage within 60 days.

In a flight connection involving code-sharing partners, the bill would make the large airline responsible for reimbursing the pas-

sengers for lost, damaged, or delayed baggage. The large airline would be free to seek reimbursement from the smaller carrier on its own. Frequently, in these situations, it is not clear which airline caused the baggage problem. Small commuter airlines are currently not subject to DOT's baggage rules. Passengers who seek help from the major airline are often told that the commuter is a completely separate entity even though it has the same name, colors, and computer code as the major airline. This problem was dealt with generally in section 202 of the Airport and Airway Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-223, 101 Stat. 1516) which added a new section 419(1) to the Federal Aviation Act. However, it is apparent that a more specific provision is necessary.

The bill would make it a crime for any person to file a false report regarding lost, damaged, or delayed baggage with the intent of defrauding an airline. Airlines often argue that additional baggage rules are not needed because many baggage claims are fraudulent. To the extent that this is so, this provision would help discourage such fraudulent claims.

Cancellations.—Economic cancellations would be prohibited by the bill and an airline that cancels a flight for economic reasons would be subject to a \$100,000 civil penalty. This provision applies to all airlines, including commuters, and is designed to prevent a carrier from canceling a flight at the last minute because there are not enough passengers. Flights that have no passengers could be cancelled without penalty as could those where the passenger has more than 72 hours notice.

Each passenger whose flight is cancelled for economic reasons could be considered a separate violation against the airline for the purpose of aggregating the civil penalty. Passengers would also be entitled to compensation for the cancellation. Safety related adjustments in schedules would not be affected by this prohibition.

The reasons for any cancellation would have to be reported by the airline as recommended by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in June 1990. Airlines would have to report both their own cancellations and the cancellations of their code-sharing partners. DOT would have to submit an annual report providing a breakdown of the reasons flights were cancelled during the previous year together with any recommendations for improving the situation.

Complaints.—Within 180 days, DOT would be required to issue rules to enable passengers to more easily file complaints with DOT. These rules would have to include either a requirement that DOT establish a toll-free number printed on airline tickets or a requirement that a postcard addressed to DOT's consumer office be included with each airline ticket sold.

DOT would be directed to establish offices at a minimum of four airports. DOT officials in these offices would be responsible for receiving complaints, monitoring airline performance, ensuring that airlines are properly reporting, and providing some assistance to passengers.

Comparative Airline Service.—Within 1 year, DOT must develop a system to rank airlines on the basis of the quality of service that each provides. This ranking would be derived by using data reported on on-time performance, cancelled flights, missed connections, mishandled luggage, denied boarding, and passenger complaints. DOT would have to periodically publish the ranking of airlines in accordance with this system. An

airline service performance ranking system developed by the Prism Group, travel management consultants, was published last year. More recently, a similar system was developed by researchers at Wichita State University. DOT could use one of these systems or develop its own.

Bankruptcy.—The tickets of an airline that has declared bankruptcy would have to be honored by other airlines (who fly the same route) on a space available basis with no additional collection.

Advertising.—An airline's fare between two cities, which is not available on all flights of that airline between those two points, could not be advertised by that airline unless the ad stated that the fare was not available on all of its flights. An airline could not advertise a restrictive fare unless the ad included those restrictions. This is the same as section 1706 of H.R. 3051.

Frequent Flyer Programs.—The bill would direct DOT to initiate a rulemaking within 180 days to (1) consider ways to ensure that airlines make enough seats available for people redeeming frequent flyer awards to meet anticipated demand and (2) to consider mandating that frequent flyer mileage be transferable from one plan to another or from one passenger to another as a way to help reduce the anti-competitive effects of these programs. The second directive is a GAO suggestion from an August 1990 study on airline competition.

Non-Refundable Tickets.—The bill would require airlines to permit their non-refundable domestic tickets (and tickets with a cancellation penalty) to be transferred from one passenger to another.

Computer Reservation Systems.—The bill would direct DOT to undertake a rulemaking to address the major competitive problems that people have identified with computer reservation systems (CRS). These include liquidated damages, roll-over provisions, contract length, minimum use clauses, booking fees, and the allegation that some CRS vendors do not promptly turn over to participating carriers the payment from passengers made through the vendor's system.

Advisory Committee.—DOT would be directed to establish an advisory committee, whose membership would consist of representatives from airline passenger groups, commercial airlines (both major and regional), airports, travel agencies, and other airline related groups. This committee would meet periodically and advise the Secretary on issues related to airline practices, passenger rights, and complaints. This advice could include recommended rules or legislation involving reporting, reservations, ticketing, denied boarding, flight delays and cancellations, baggage handling, and frequent flyer programs. DOT would have to give substantial weight to the views of the advisory committee in the exercise of its duties regarding passenger protection issues.

Route Sales.—The bill would establish a public interest test for DOT to use in evaluating proposed international route sales. This would include an evaluation of the impact of the route sale on the viability of the carriers involved and on domestic competition generally. The bill would also direct DOT to consider competing applications for the routes. In choosing among competing applications for a route, some of the factors that DOT would be required to consider would be the quality of passenger service provided by each of the competing carriers, enhancing competition among carriers, and the financial viability of the buying and selling carrier. The bill would also require, in

appropriate cases, the submission to DOT of a financial plan by the selling carrier to insure that the proceeds of a route transfer are used to maintain the carrier's financial viability. DOT may require the selling carrier to agree to implement the plan.

WHO BENEFITS FROM NEW SUPER IRA'S?

(Mr. PEASE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEASE, Mr. Speaker, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has recently released a report on exactly who would benefit from the new Super IRA proposal. I will submit the entire report for the RECORD, but I would like to highlight a few of their findings.

Only one-fifth of all taxpayers have income which exceeds \$50,000. Yet, 95 percent of all of the benefits of reinstating a deductible IRA go to this group. That means only 5 percent of the benefits of this proposal would go to the remaining 80 percent of all families, those with incomes less than \$50,000. This is just as bad as the distribution of the benefits from a capital gains tax cut.

Fully deductible IRA's are available to 86 million families with earned income in 1990. Another 8 million can take a partial deduction. This represents 87 percent of the eligible families? The Super IRA proposal is directed at providing a tax deduction for the remaining 13 percent. These are largely well-off families who need no encouragement to save.

THE NEW IRA PROPOSALS: WHO WOULD GAIN FROM THEM?

(By Robert Greenstein)

A proposal to expand Individual Retirement Accounts substantially is now before Congress. Senators Lloyd Bentsen and William Roth have introduced the Senate version along with 77 co-sponsors. On the House side, Reps. J.J. Pickle and William Thomas are the lead sponsors of an identical bill that had 94 cosponsors as of April 17.

Who would benefit from these large expansions? How much would the proposals cost? Who would pay these costs? How solid is the evidence they would promote savings and help the economy? These issues are explored below.

CURRENT LAW ON IRAS

Under current law, two types of taxpayers may deposit up to \$2,000 a year into an Individual Retirement Account and deduct the contribution from their taxable income. First, taxpayers at all income levels who are not covered by an employer-sponsored pension plan may take advantage of this provision. Second, taxpayers who are covered by an employer-sponsored pension plan also may make tax-deductible deposits into an IRA if they have adjusted gross income below \$35,000 for a single tax filer or \$50,000 for a married couple. The current law on IRAs was established by the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

Funds deposited in IRA accounts then accumulate interest that is tax free until the funds are withdrawn after retirement. With-

drawals are taxed as ordinary income at that point.

Prior to the Tax Reform Act of 1986, taxpayers at higher income levels who were covered by an employer-sponsored pension plan also could get a \$2,000-a-year deduction for deposits into IRA accounts. This was one of the tax advantages the Tax Reform Act ended for these people in return for sharply lowering their income tax rates.

The Tax Reform Act did not end all tax advantages from IRAs for those who are at higher income levels and are covered by employer-sponsored pensions. While such individuals may not deduct contributions to an IRA account, the interest on any deposits they make into such an account still accumulates tax-free until it is withdrawn after retirement.

THE NEW PROPOSAL

The new proposal has several aspects. First, and most important, it would undo the limitations on IRAs imposed by the Tax Reform Act of 1986. Taxpayers at higher income levels who participate in a tax-favored pension plan would regain eligibility for full IRA deductibility.

In addition, the proposal would create a second type of IRA. Under the new type of IRA, a taxpayer at any income level could deposit up to \$2,000 a year. The taxpayer would not receive an up-front tax deduction, but all interest earned by the account would be permanently tax-free (i.e., both the interest and the principal could later be withdrawn free of any tax) so long as the funds were not withdrawn from the account for five years. A taxpayer could use either the conventional IRA, the new type of IRA, or both. If both types of IRAs were used, deposits would be limited to an overall total of \$2,000 per year.

Finally, the legislation would allow people with IRA accounts to make early IRA withdrawals without the normal penalty if the funds were used for one of three designated purposes: a first-time home purchase for the depositor, his or her children, or his or her grandchildren; education expenses for the depositor, his or her children, or his or her grandchildren; or medical costs exceeding 7.5 percent of income. There would be no limit on the amount that could be withdrawn or on the value of the home to which the withdrawal could be applied.

WHO STANDS TO GAIN?

The Joint Committee on Taxation has examined the question of which taxpayers would gain if IRA deductibility were restored for taxpayers who lost this deductibility in the 1986 Tax Reform Act. The Congressional Budget Office has looked at which taxpayers would benefit most from a Bush Administration proposal that is similar to the new type of IRA contained in the recently introduced legislation. Both analyses reveal the benefits would accrue overwhelmingly to those in the upper part of the income scale.

The Joint Committee on Taxation studied several proposals introduced in the 101st Congress to restore IRA deductibility for individuals who have other pension plans and are above the income cut-off established by the Tax Reform Act. The Committee's findings indicate that:

Only one-fifth of all taxpayers have incomes exceeding \$50,000, but they would receive 95 percent of the tax benefits (from restoring IRA deductibility for taxpayers who lost it in the Tax Reform Act). This is as high as the percentage of the tax benefits that would go to the top fifth under a capital gains tax cut.

The richest 4.5 percent of taxpayers—those with incomes of at least \$100,000—would collect nearly one-third of the tax benefits. This one-third share is not as great as the share that taxpayers over \$100,000 would receive from a capital gains tax cut, but it still represents a highly disproportionate share of the tax benefits.

The bottom four-fifths of all taxpayers would receive the remaining five percent of the tax benefits.

IRA supporters often attempt to cast a different light on the distribution of benefits by noting that 51 percent of the benefits from restoring full IRA deductibility would go to taxpayers with incomes below \$75,000. This is simply a reflection, however, of the fact that taxpayers with incomes below \$75,000 are so numerous. Some 92 percent of all taxpayers are in this category. Furthermore, nearly all the benefits for the under-\$75,000 income group would go to those with incomes in the \$50,000 to \$75,000 range. Joint Tax Committee data show that about four-fifths of all taxpayers have incomes below \$50,000, but they would receive only about five percent of the tax benefits. (See table on next page.)

Indeed, most taxpayers with incomes below \$50,000 would not gain at all from the proposal. Only one-tenth of one percent of taxpayers with incomes below \$30,000 would receive any tax benefit, according to the Joint Tax Committee estimate. Just four percent of those in the \$30,000 to \$50,000 bracket would receive a tax reduction.

By contrast, the 21 percent of all taxpayers with incomes over \$50,000 would, as noted, receive 95 percent of the tax benefits. Nearly one of every three taxpayers at this income level would receive a new tax break.

Furthermore, a Congressional Budget Office analysis of a proposal quite similar to the new type of IRA shows that it, too, would direct most of its benefits to the upper parts of the income scale. CBO examined an Administration proposal to establish Family Savings Accounts, under which a taxpayer could deposit up to \$2,500 a year in an account (up to \$5,000 for married couples) and have all interest on the account be tax-free forever so long as no withdrawal was made for seven years. CBO concluded that taxpayers with incomes above \$50,000 would be the principal beneficiaries of the proposal.

The Joint Tax Committee and CBO estimates are consistent with past experience with IRAs. IRA participation has been concentrated within upper income groups, not middle- or lower-income groups. IRS tax return data show that in 1986, the last year in which IRA tax deductions were available to all taxpayers, 66 percent of the tax units in the top four percent of the income scale made IRA contributions. But only 13 percent of taxpayers in the middle third of the income scale made such contributions. Only four percent of those with adjusted gross incomes below \$15,000 participated. These data provide further evidence that IRAs are of much greater use to upper income taxpayers than to those in the middle or bottom of the income scale.

Moreover, the new proposal relaxes IRA restrictions that affect only higher income taxpayers. This is because the vast majority of those in the middle and lower parts of the income spectrum are already eligible for IRAs under current law. The Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that 87 percent of all tax filers with earned income are eligible to make deductible IRA contributions under current law. Some 80 percent are eligible to deduct a full \$2,000.

IRA proponents may contend some middle income households who are currently eligi-

ble for IRA deductibility might be more likely to use IRAs if the law were modified to allow penalty-free withdrawals from IRAs in certain circumstances. Yet such a provision need not depend upon restoration of IRA deductibility for those in higher income brackets—or upon creation of a new type of IRA in which interest earnings are permanently sheltered from taxation. If Congress so elected, it could allow penalty-free IRA withdrawals for certain designated purposes while otherwise retaining the current IRA structure. For example, the Administration has proposed allowing penalty-free IRA withdrawals for first-time home purchases without restoring IRA deductibility for those who lost it in the 1986 Tax Reform Act. Moreover, the Administration proposal would limit such withdrawals to \$10,000 and would not permit their use for homes whose value was well above the average for the local community. By contrast, the legislation now before Congress places no limit on the amount that could be withdrawn penalty-free and would allow such withdrawals to be used for homes of any value.

DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS OF RESTORING IRA DEDUCTIBILITY

(In percent)

Income group, 1990 income levels	Proportion of tax returns that fall in each income group	Percentage of tax benefits that would go to each income group
Under \$20,000	25.7	(1)
\$20,000 to \$30,000	23.5	0.1
\$30,000 to \$40,000	18.8	1.7
\$40,000 to \$50,000	10.6	3.4
\$50,000 to \$75,000	13.3	45.7
\$75,000 to \$100,000	3.6	17.9
Over \$100,000	4.5	31.2

¹ Less than .05 percent.

Source: Joint Committee on Taxation. Data based on Joint Committee estimates of number of tax returns in each income class (based on 1990 income levels and 1990 tax laws) and Joint Committee estimates of distributional impacts of a proposal to make IRAs 50 percent deductible for those taxpayers who lost deductibility under the Tax Reform Act of 1986. When the Joint Committee produces estimates for the new IRA proposal, based on 1991 income levels and tax laws, the figures shown in this table may change modestly, but the overall distributional pattern should be largely unaffected.

One other point about IRAs should be underscored. In 1986, upper income taxpayers lost tax deductibility for IRA contributions, along with certain other tax breaks, but received sharply lower income tax rates in return. Under the new IRA proposals, these taxpayers would regain IRA deductibility while keeping the lower tax rates.

HOW MUCH WOULD THE PROPOSAL COST?

Cost estimates of the new proposal have not yet been made available. Estimates from earlier proposals are available, however. They show the cost to be very substantial. Joint Tax Committee estimates indicate that earlier proposals to restore full IRA deductibility for those in higher income brackets would result in a loss of more than \$30 billion in revenue over the next five years.

While the new proposal is expected to be less costly than this over the five-year period, that is due to a budget gimmick embedded in the proposal. Over the long-term, the new proposal is likely to be at least as costly as the earlier proposals.

To understand the budget gimmick in the new proposal, further discussion of the new types of IRA is needed. Under these new IRAs, deposits into IRA accounts would not be deductible, but interest on the deposits would be permanently tax-free. The initial revenue loss from the new type of IRA thus would be small because of the lack of an up-front deduction, but the loss would grow in-

creasingly large with each passing year. As additional funds were moved into these IRA accounts each year, a steadily increasing amount of interest earnings would be sheltered from taxation.

This is clearly seen in both the Joint Tax Committee and the Bush Administration estimates of the revenue loss from the proposal to create Family Savings Accounts, a proposal similar to the new type of IRA. The Joint Tax Committee estimates the Family Savings Account proposal would lose \$355 million in revenue in the first year, but \$1.8 billion by the fifth year. The Administration has estimated the proposal would lose \$300 million in the first year and \$2.3 billion by the fifth year. CBO has noted these losses would continue to escalate after the fifth year and could ultimately reach a level as large as \$8 billion a year. The losses from the new type of IRA can be expected to grow over time in a similar manner.

Thus, the long-term effect of combining restoration of full IRA deductibility with the proposal to establish the new type of IRA would be to generate at least as great a revenue loss as would result from restoring full deductibility alone. The short-term effect of combining the two proposals, however, is to make the price tag smaller. It is likely the price tag over the next five years will be somewhere in the \$15 billion to \$25 billion range.

(The short-term cost of the new proposal is smaller than the short-term cost of restoring full deductibility alone because some taxpayers who would use regular IRAs if full deductibility were restored would use the new type of IRA instead if both types of IRAs are allowed. Since the new type of IRA has no up-front tax deduction, the immediate revenue loss is smaller.)

According to some Congressional insiders, a principal reason the new type of IRA was added to the proposal to restore full IRA deductibility was precisely because such an action would reduce the revenue loss for the next five years.

Of course, under the budget legislation enacted last fall, any revenue loss from a change in the tax laws must be offset for the next five years, either through an increase in taxes or a reduction in an entitlement program. But there is no requirement the revenue loss be offset for years after the five-year period ends. Thus, if the pending IRA legislation is "paid for" by another revenue change that offsets the costs of the proposal for the next five years, the likely effect will be a substantial increase in the deficit after the five-year period is over. This would make it harder to reach whatever deficit targets may be set for such years. It would probably also necessitate further budget reductions or tax increases in other areas after 1996.

Because the new type of IRA postpones the large revenue losses until after the five-year budget "window" ends, some tax experts have urged great caution in considering this proposal. Henry Aaron, director of economic studies at the Brookings Institution, has described proposals such as the Family Savings Account and the new type of IRA as proposals whose "revenue-losing effects [are] concealed." Aaron has suggested that Congress decline to debate such proposals until the Joint Tax Committee or CBO supplies estimates of the long term revenue losses they would generate.

WHO WOULD PAY FOR THESE COSTS?

As noted, proposals that result in revenue losses must be paid for through offsetting tax increases or cuts in entitlement benefits. No such offsets are contained in the IRA pro-

posal now before Congress. The offsets would have to be identified at a later date by the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee.

Unless the offsets consisted primarily of upper income tax increases such as an increase in the top income tax rate—an approach that may prove unacceptable to the White House and would probably face difficulty in the Senate—the net result would likely be to redistribute income from low and middle income households to those higher on the income scale. Such an outcome is a distinct possibility.

Some of the principal sponsors of the new legislation have indicated they will look for upper income tax increases to offset the costs of the IRA proposals. Even if such offsets can be identified and passed, however, serious questions remain about the wisdom of this approach.

First, as noted earlier, the five-year offsets that ultimately are identified are unlikely to pay for the long-term costs of the IRA proposal. After the five-year budget window ends, the net effect is likely to be a substantial increase in the deficit, which in turn will likely generate pressures for additional deficit reduction in other areas. Such additional deficit reduction measures are unlikely to extract most of their savings from those in the top fifth of the income spectrum.

Second, even if new tax revenues can be raised from those in the upper parts of the income spectrum—both now and after the five year period ends—is restoration of IRA deductibility really the best use of these tax dollars? On the tax side of the ledger alone, there are a number of proposals that represent sounder tax policy and would be of substantially greater benefit to low and middle income households. These include proposals to convert the personal exemption for children into a refundable tax credit or to increase the personal exemption, along with proposals to raise the standard deduction and to make the dependent care tax credit into a refundable tax credit of greater value to low and moderate income working families.

Using tax dollars instead to restore IRA deductibility primarily for those in the top fifth of the income scale would represent an ill-advised policy choice. This is particularly so since restoration of IRA deductibility would follow a period in which average after-tax incomes declined for families in the middle and bottom of the income spectrum while rising sharply for those in upper brackets. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that from 1977 to 1990, average after-tax income fell 2.5 percent (after adjustment for inflation) for those in the middle fifth of the income distribution while falling 10 percent for those in the bottom fifth. By contrast, for those in the top, fifth, average after-tax income rose 35 percent; and for the richest one percent of Americans, after-tax income climbed more than 100 percent during this 13-year period.

Overall, the CBO figures indicate that by 1990, the top fifth of U.S. households—the group that would secure the bulk of the benefits from the new IRA proposals—had as much after-tax income as the other four-fifths of the population combined.

WOULD THE PROPOSAL INCREASE SAVINGS AND HELP THE ECONOMY?

Those who lobby for proposals to expand IRAs claim these proposals would increase savings and thereby help the economy. This claim is dubious.

IRA proposals result in a loss of federal revenues; there is no disagreement on that

score. Since the savings available to finance growth-producing investments are the savings that are left over after private savings are soaked up to finance government deficits, IRA proposals can not increase the pool of savings available for investment unless they stimulate an increase in personal saving that exceeds the government's revenue loss.

The IRA proposal now before Congress is likely to lead to long-term revenue losses even if the losses for the next five years are offset. As a result, the net effect of the proposal would be to reduce the total pool of savings available for investment, unless the proposal stimulated a large growth in savings. The evidence to support the belief that a very substantial increase in savings would occur is weak, however.

Henry Aaron, director of economic studies at the Brookings Institution and a leading tax expert, has noted:

"... despite the alleged stimulation of savings from IRAs, personal saving plummeted in the 1980s after IRAs were liberalized and rose following the Tax Reform Act of 1986 which curtailed IRAs. Many other factors influenced savings in addition to these particular tax changes. But those who claim that IRAs boost saving have relied on evidence that is subject, in my view, to devastating criticism. It seems foolhardy to enact a measure that promises to lose large amounts of revenue, thereby boosting the federal deficit and reducing national savings, in the name of unsubstantiated claims that it will boost private savings."

Aaron points out that IRAs are particularly attractive to people of some means who can afford simply to transfer \$2,000 each year from one account to another—moving their funds from an account where interest is taxable to an IRA account where deposits are deductible and interest is sheltered from taxation until the taxpayer retires (or under the new type of IRA, where interest is permanently tax-free). Such shifting of funds from one account to another reduces national savings, Aaron observes, because it leaves the overall amount of private savings unchanged while reducing federal tax revenues and "thereby boosting the deficit and lowering national saving." Aaron concludes the result "should be seen as primarily a give-away to people with enough assets to shift them into sheltered accounts."

The Congressional Budget Office has also expressed skepticism about claims that liberalizing IRAs would boost savings significantly. CBO notes that "studies of saving behavior generally have not found that people save significantly more in response to higher after-tax returns."

A recent House Budget Committee staff report makes the same point. The report notes while a higher rate of return makes it more rewarding to save, it also means an individual needs to save less to reach a specific savings target. The Budget Committee report comes to the same conclusion as CBO, namely that the evidence shows personal saving is not highly responsive to increases in the rate of return.

"For example," the Budget Committee report states, "the U.S. private saving rate did not rise in the early and mid-1980s, a period of increased tax incentives, lower marginal income tax rates, historically high rates of return of saving, and financial deregulation that extended the availability of high rates of return; instead, it fell."

IRA proponents point out that IRA deposits declined substantially after enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1986. But that does

not mean overall saving declined—to the contrary, it rose—or that significantly less was saved than would have been saved if IRA deductibility had been maintained for taxpayers at all income levels. When CBO and the House Budget Committee observe that people do not save significantly more in response to higher rates of after-tax return, they are essentially indicating that liberalizing IRAs would result in the loss of billions of dollars of federal revenue to reward people of some means for saving funds that they would largely save anyway.

INTRODUCTION OF THE YOUNG AMERICAN WORKERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, there it was, my colleagues, on the front page of the Washington Post just 10 days ago. The headline on the story read: "Illegal Child Labor Resurging in U.S."

In this day and age, recent statistics from the U.S. General Accounting Office and other reputable sources on child labor in America are truly shocking. Child labor violations in America have increased 150 percent since 1983—a disturbing leap from 10,000 to over 25,000 reported violations in 1989. There were more than 128,000 work-related injuries to children reported just in 1987 and 1988.

A Labor Department sting operation last year uncovered, 15,000 child labor violations in just 3 days. The average fine levied by the Labor Department for the death of a minor in the workplace is \$740.

In 59 case studies where teenagers had been killed on the job, the Labor Department did not even cite 22 employers for any serious violations of child labor or safety laws.

There are fewer than 1,000 Labor Department compliance officers to enforce all provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, including wage and hour violations for adult workers. Only 4 percent of their enforcement activities are devoted to child labor, according to the GAO. That's the equivalent of fewer than 40 Federal investigators policing child labor violators nationwide. Incredibly, the Bush administration asserts no additional inspectors or other resources are needed for now.

The child labor provisions of Federal labor law have not been thoughtfully updated since 1938. Yet detailed recommendations from a blue ribbon panel of experts, the Child Labor Advisory Committee, have been sitting on the desk of the Secretary of Labor since 1988. The continued existence of the panel itself remains in doubt.

Not surprisingly, the landscape of child labor in 1991 has changed significantly from what it was in 1938. A handful of undercover stings followed by highly publicized media blitzes by

the U.S. Labor Department are no substitute for practical laws and sustained enforcement over time. That is why Congressmen CHARLES SCHUMER and TOM LANTOS are joining me in the introduction of new legislation to update our child labor laws to address the newer and different violations that compound recurring old problems. We call our bill the young American workers bill of rights.

Following are highlights of our bill:

First, the penalties for child labor violators must be tougher. Our bill establishes criminal sanctions for willful violations of child labor laws that result in the death of a minor—maximum 10 years in prison—or that cause serious bodily injury to a minor—maximum 5 years in prison. Willful and repeat offenders would be ineligible for Federal grants, loans, or contracts for 5 years. They would also be unable to pay the subminimum youth training wage. Furthermore, a private right of action would be authorized, in cases of serious bodily injury or death, for aggrieved minors or their families against child labor scofflaws that would be coupled with discretionary powers for the states to prevent double dipping for damages vis-a-vis State workers' compensation systems. Such private right of action already exists statutorily to enforce certain minimum wage and honor violations.

Second, the law, implementing regulations, and enforcement efforts should make clear that getting a good education is the top job for all young Americans. This is an aspect of contemporary family life in America where President Bush can pitch in with us and demonstrably improve the quality of public school education in America without having to spend an additional dime.

Under our bill, work certificates would be required for anybody under age 18 unless he/she is a high school graduate. For the first time, limits of 5 hours per day and 25 hours per week would be established for 16- and 17-year-old minors to work during the school year to parallel the existing limits of 3 hours per day and 15 hours per week for 14- and 15-year-old minors. Forty-hour workweeks are not permissible for juniors and seniors in high school and are not uncommon.

Third, the law should emphasize that work experience, under the proper circumstances can benefit young Americans. Our legislative focus centers on prohibiting the exploitation of children in the workplace and not preventing minors from working for pay at all.

A key in this regard is strengthening the work certificate system. Parents, teachers, principals, and health professionals must take more seriously their roles. They are the first line of defense in protecting children from being exploited in the workplace.

Also, the basic conditions under which work certificates can be approved should be revised. For example, before a work certificate is issued to a minor, there should be clear determinations that the proposed work is safe.

Fourth, priority must go to informing young Americans about their rights and how to protect themselves on the job. By extension, parents of children applying for work certificates must be included in this educational effort.

Currently, minors are routinely instructed in schools on what is expected of responsible employees in the work world. At the time when minors apply for work certificates, why not require that they be informed and instructed, in straightforward terms, about their basic rights on the job? Too often neither working minors nor their parents know their rights. Routinely providing that information would go a long way toward empowering working children to protect themselves.

Similarly, employers of minors should be required to post notices prominently, on their jobsites, informing their young employees of their basic rights and protections under the law.

Finally, monitoring and reporting on employment patterns of minors must be improved. Nobody, including the Labor Department, has wholly reliable and comprehensive statistics on the scope of child labor. Recently disclosed statistics on child labor violators, while shocking by themselves, represent the tip of the iceberg.

Across the country, children are being exploited in every sector of the work force. Now is the time for the 102d Congress to enact badly needed safeguards to protect young Americans on the job.

REJECT FAST-TRACK PROPOSAL

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the economic debate of our country is turning in these coming weeks to the fast-track proposal for the so-called liberalization of international trade involving our country.

I had the opportunity, in the last several weeks, to listen to many proponents and many opponents of the fast-track system. The fast-track system, I believe, is procedurally flawed, and ultimately the agreement that the proponents support is substantively flawed and should be rejected by this body.

It is procedurally flawed because it takes the position that key economic decisions should stop at the borders; that the same democratic process which brought each Member here, Mr.

Speaker, to speak on behalf of his or her constituent, somehow does not apply when we get to economic issues beyond our borders.

In a world that is growing and changing and becoming even more international in scope, I say it applies more than ever. More importantly, though, and substantively, the reason that fast track is the wrong track is that it fails to address three very important questions.

Now, some of the opponents of fast track and trade liberalization tell Members that they do not want to see fast track and trade liberalization because they want American companies and American workers to be sheltered from the rigors of competition. I would respectfully disagree with their position. We will only be emboldened and only be stronger when we benefit from participation in that competition.

However, I would disagree with the proponents of fast tracking, because I believe that they are sending our economy into a competition where the rules are uneven, where the playing field is uneven, and where we are being asked to swim with lead weights around our ankles.

They fail to answer three questions about whether we will be ready to compete. First of all, where is the manufacturing capital going to come from to produce all these products that we are purportedly going to be exporting to our neighbors under fast track?

□ 1610

Our economic policies have led to a net private savings rate in this country of less than 5 percent, far below that of our economic competitors. You cannot compete without good manufacturing. You cannot have good manufacturing without capital reinvestment, and we are not going to have capital reinvestment as long as we have an economic policy that subsidizes wasteful consumption, that penalizes investment and fails to reward the productive reinvestment in the American economy.

The second question they do not answer is, when are we going to stop subsidizing our economic competitors?

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of this country are shelling out between \$70 billion and \$80 billion a year to pay for the defense of our economic competition. The taxpayers of Europe and the taxpayers of Japan are getting a free ride on our backs because we are underwriting their defense.

We should not be entering into a competition with uneven ground rules at the same time we are subsidizing those against whom we are supposedly competing. They have not answered that question.

Finally, they have not answered the question that says, when are our economic competitors going to treat us with reciprocal fairness? When are they going to stop keeping our products out

of their markets by unfair tariffs, unfair trade restrictions and unfair practices? When are they going to give, as well as they receive?

I am not, Mr. Speaker, one of those who wants to shelter this economy or our companies or our workers from the rigors of international competition, but I want the international competition to be on accepted fair ground rules. I want the competition to take place after we have recapitalized the American economy, after we have stopped subsidizing the national defense of our competitors and after we have insisted that they play by the same fair ground rules that we do.

Until that time, Mr. Speaker, fast track is the wrong track and this body should reject it.

MEDICAID HOME CARE WAIVER REQUIREMENTS

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to correct an opprobrious, costly, and indeed discriminatory element of our Nation's Medicaid system.

The problem is illustrated by the case of Chippo Ramirez, an 18-year-old boy who lives in my district. Afflicted with muscular dystrophy and glaucoma, he has been cared for in his home under private insurance coverage. At least until now. His care has recently exceeded the limits of private insurance coverage, and he will now need Medicaid assistance. I am currently working with Chippo's family to obtain a home care waiver under Medicaid. However, even if this waiver is obtained, under current California regulations, Chippo will be forced to enter an institution for an unspecified period of time. With a family at home willing to care for him and the comforts of his home being the only that he has enjoyed in this life, it is an unreasonable and costly prerequisite that he be forced to leave his home and family and enter an institution simply to qualify for home care benefits.

Currently, there are no explicit Federal provisions for home health care under Medicaid. States are, however, permitted to waive the home care exclusion and provide home health services to groups of patients whom they choose to define, subject to the condition that the home care program must be cost-neutral as compared to institutional Medicaid care. The injustice and inefficiency of these waivers is that several State-defined waiver programs require a patient to be institutionalized before the patient is eligible for the home care services. Obviously, this is not a problem for those patients seeking home care who are institutionalized at the time they become eligible for Medicaid. However, for those patients being cared for at home at the time they enter the Medicaid Program, it becomes a severe and even traumatic obstacle for them to enter an institution in order to become eligible for home care services under Medicaid. Furthermore, this requirement wastes Medicaid funds to institutionalize patients who can be cared for at

home at a lower cost. My legislation would prevent States from discriminating against those patients who are not institutionalized at the time they seek home care under Medicaid and would also prevent the waste of Federal and State Medicaid funds.

Home health care has proven to be an effective means of providing vital health care to medically needy patients who do not require institutionalization. Such an alternative allows the patient to retain a sense of dignity and independence while continuing to enjoy the familiar and comforting surroundings of his or her own home. Moreover, by expanding the availability of this health care option, we can save valuable dollars currently spent by unnecessarily placing such patients in nursing homes, hospitals, or other institutions.

For all of the benefits of home care, there still exists a maze of procedural obstacles preventing its usage in Federal health care programs. By definition, a patient entering Medicaid who is eligible for home care is eligible for institutionalization because the home care must be of an equal or lesser cost. Thus, it is unnecessary, redundant, and inefficient to force these patients to enter an institution in order to receive the home care services for which they are otherwise qualified. State Medicaid case workers should certainly be able to make the determination as to whether a Medicaid patient is eligible for home care regardless of whether the individual is currently in an institution or at home.

My legislation would prevent States from imposing arbitrary institutionalization requirements upon Medicaid patients who are eligible for home health care. Until we can create a better health care system which will provide for humane, comprehensive, and cost-effective long-term care for those such as Chipp Ramirez, we should make their care under current Federal assistance programs such as Medicaid as comfortable, accessible, and efficient as possible. Prohibiting State institutionalization requirements for Medicaid home care services is a step toward this goal. I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this important legislation.

For the convenience of my colleagues, the text of the bill is included here:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION IN MEDICAID HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED WAIVERS BASED ON INSTITUTIONAL STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1915(c)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396n(c)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Secretary may not approve a waiver (or a renewal of a waiver) under this subsection which makes available home and community-based services to individuals who would require the level of care provided in a hospital or nursing facility if under the waiver an individual is denied such services solely because the individual is not (or has not been) an inpatient of a hospital or a resident of a nursing facility."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to waivers, or renewals of waivers, occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT AS WELL AS JOBS

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this week's Earth Day commemorations will remind each Member of this House that there are a number of proposals before this Congress that can help safeguard our environment for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to touch on several of these bills, which I have cosponsored, because I believe they can help us to protect our land, air, and water resources without threatening the jobs of American workers.

I'd first like to discuss H.R. 300, a bill that would mandate the recycling of consumer products to head off the threat posed by a rapidly dwindling number of open landfills across this country.

The Environmental Protection Agency reports that Americans produce 180 million tons of municipal garbage each year. Nearly 70 percent of that waste is dumped in landfills. Another 15 percent is burned and 15 percent is recycled. The volume of waste has nearly doubled since 1960, and it is expected to increase by another 20 percent by the year 2000. Meanwhile, the number of landfills accepting solid waste has dropped over the last decade from 20,000 to 6,000. Many more landfills are expected to close in the coming decade because of higher costs and tougher environmental regulations.

The adoption of a nationwide recycling program can delay the closing of landfills, and buy time to allow for the development of new technologies to deal with solid waste.

If enacted, the Recyclable Materials Technology and Markets Development Act would set down guidelines for manufacturers to begin recycling consumer items made from materials such as glass, paper, metal, and plastic. The bill sets recycling goals of 25 percent for many nondurable products over the next 3 years. By 1998, it would call for the recycling of 75 percent of such materials. These requirements are tough, but the limited space in our landfills leaves us no choice but to act. No longer can we afford to dump reusable materials into junkyards as we have done in the past.

The recycling bill won't cost jobs because all manufacturers will operate under the same rules. Also, the bill will stimulate new business activity by fostering the establishment of markets for recycled goods.

Government studies will aid in this process, and a Federal grant program will be established to help fund in recycling technologies. The bill also calls for the establishment of a public outreach program to educate Americans about the need to deal with our solid waste dilemma.

The goal of recycling consumer goods goes hand in hand with the idea of preserving undeveloped lands that are increasingly at risk in our industrial society. Take, for example, the 19-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in northeastern Alaska. President Bush would like to open up the 1.5-million-acre coastal plain of that refuge for oil and natural gas drilling. While all of us are concerned about find-

ing new, secure sources of energy, setting up oil rigs in the Alaskan wilderness isn't worth the tradeoff.

According to the Department of the Interior, oil reserves estimated at 3.57 billion barrels are now underneath the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. If that oil were tapped, it would cut our estimated daily consumption of 7.2 million barrels of imported oil by about 10 percent over the next 15 years. We currently import over 40 percent of our oil from abroad.

Clearly then, the new Alaskan oil fields won't significantly reduce our dependence on foreign oil. In any event, new oil discoveries in Alaska would only allow us to put off the day when we are forced to develop products that use alternative fuels such as electric cars. The innovative technologies nurtured by the need to use alternative fuels are likely to produce the jobs of tomorrow. Therefore, I see no reason to risk Alaska's pristine wilderness in order to obtain a quick fix for our energy problems.

For these reasons, I've endorsed H.R. 39, which calls for a permanent ban on developments in Alaska's Arctic Refuge, including oil drilling. The bill was introduced earlier this year by Congressman MO UDALL who recently announced his retirement. I can think of no better way to honor Mr. UDALL's 30-year legacy than by passing H.R. 39, a bill that symbolizes his decades of work to protect the environment.

I also favor the addition of another safeguard to protect the natural diversity of animal life in all our wilderness areas. The added protection is called for in a bill that would ban hunting in federally protected wilderness areas. The bill, H.R. 330, would allow exceptions to the hunting ban under special circumstances to be determined by U.S. officials.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider these new efforts to preserve and protect our environment, I would urge my colleagues to keep in mind the economic impact that such changes can have on American businesses and workers.

To ease the impact of new environmental rules on businesses and consumers, I'm currently supporting two changes in bills that were recently enacted by the Congress. I believe we must keep an open mind to consider modifying any rule that has a negative impact on jobs.

First, in connection with last year's amendments to the Clean Air Act, I favor the restoration of tax breaks and financial incentives to help coal-burning utility companies meet the high costs of upgrading equipment to meet tougher emission-control standards. These rule changes will help utility companies reduce their costs and avoid passing on rate hikes to consumers. It also will encourage utility companies to continue burning low-cost coal, which is our most abundant energy resource.

Second, I favor adding language to last year's reauthorization of the Superfund law that will bar judges from demanding that financial institutions pay for toxic waste cleanups on properties that they didn't pollute. This was the original intent of the 1980 Superfund law, but recent court decisions have undermined the exemption designed to protect financial institutions with interests in contaminated properties. The beefed up protection from liability is called for in H.R. 1450, a bill that is vital to

many small business owners. Without it, farmers, homebuilders, manufacturers, and other business owners will continue to find it difficult to get credit because bankers are afraid of getting stuck with a multimillion dollar tab for hazardous waste cleanups.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that whenever possible, all new laws designed to improve our environment should strive to minimize economic dislocations that can produce layoffs and weaken our international competitiveness. The environmental problems we face emerged over more than 100 years—we can't expect to solve them overnight. Instead, we must make a long-term commitment to changing our environmentally damaging habits as fast as possible, while minimizing the effect on our economy.

RETIREMENT OF CHIEF M. SGT. BOBBY JOE DAVIS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, one of the Mississippi Air National Guard's most senior and most valued members is retiring this summer after 34 years of loyal and committed service. His name is Chief M. Sgt. Bobby Joe Davis of Pearl, MS.

He joined the newly formed Air National Guard unit in Jackson, MS, in 1956. He helped shape this into one of the very best Air National Guard units in the country. Over the years, Chief Davis' leadership abilities and his experience have been so important to the success of the 172d Military Airlift Group.

In addition to his service in the Air National Guard, Bobby Joe has been very active in community affairs. I know he will continue to be a participant in those community activities in retirement as well.

Bobby Joe Davis is a great American who has served his State and his country well. I want to salute him for a job well done and wish him the best in retirement.

I also want to share with my colleagues Chief M. Sgt. Bobby Joe Davis' biography.

BIOGRAPHY ON BOBBY JOE DAVIS

Chief Master Sergeant Davis was born in Hinds County, Mississippi, on 21 June 1931. He was educated in the Hinds County school system and attended Hinds Junior College. For the past 17 years, he and his family have resided in Pearl, Mississippi.

Entering the military service in March of 1948, he enlisted in the United States Army. He served in Korea and then was discharged in August 1951. He came back home and joined the Mississippi Army National Guard. He transferred to the newly formed Air National Guard unit in Jackson in September 1956, where he soon was hired as a full time employee. Thirty-four years later, he is a leader of that same organization.

Chief Davis headed up one of the first NDI regional labs in the Air National Guard, and has worked as a shop chief in every Field Maintenance area. He served as Squadron First Sergeant for 21 years. He has completed the NCO Leadership school, the First Sergeant's course, and was an Honor Graduate of the NCO Academy.

Active in his community, he is a Trustee and active member of the Pearson Road Bap-

tist Church, a member of the American Legion, VFW, Disabled American Veterans, Jackson Consistory-Scottish Rite Bodies, and the Pearl Booster Club. He has served as Co-Chairman of the United Way/Combined Federal Campaign for the past 10 years, and served as Vice Chairman of the 35th Anniversary Open House for the 172d MAG. He was a charter member and Chairman of the Handicap Committee for Pearl, charter member of the Pearl Jaycees, charter President of the Pearl Shrine Club, charter Past Master of the John P. Byrd Lodge in 1966 and was elected again in 1973. He is a devoted member of the Masons and Shrine, having organized and built the Byrd Lodge. He also organized the local order of Rainbow Girls and was honored by their naming their group the "Davis Assembly". He served with the Rainbow Girls as General Grand Chairman, State of Mississippi, International Order of Rainbow for Girls, and State Dad for Rainbow in 1977.

EXEMPTING CERTAIN STATE LEGISLATORS' REQUIREMENTS

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

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to propose two minor alterations in the Internal Revenue Code that will greatly benefit a group of exceptional public servants. Our State legislators are dedicated men and women who make major sacrifices in service to this country. They leave their families and friends behind for extended periods of time. They also leave their jobs, often with only the hope that their employers, or partners, or customers will understand why they cannot tend to business for several months of every year. Our State legislators make these sacrifices because of their deep loyalty to this Nation, and we, at least, should give them every incentive to continue their tradition of service.

Regrettably, the current tax laws do not encourage service in the State assemblies. Accordingly, I am introducing legislation which would amend the tax law to assist our State legislators. First, I would correct an obviously unintended result of a recent change in section 62 of the Tax Code. This section of the code, and the regulations issued pursuant to it, prevent State legislators from deducting their per diem allowance unless they substantiate every expense they incur. While substantiation of expenses is desirable in most business situations, it is not necessary for State legislators, because of the federally determined cap on the total deductible per diem amount. Consequently, it would be impossible for a State legislator to abuse business expense deductibility by padding his or her expense account.

The second change that I propose is one that will remedy an arbitrary distinction made between State legislators living on one side or the other of a 50-mile radius of the State capital. While both of these groups of legislators make major sacrifices to perform their public duties, only those living more than 50 miles from the capital are able to deduct their per diem allowance. As members of this body are quite aware, this distinction is illogical, as a legislator's presence is often required in the

capital at all hours of the day and night. Even those legislators who reside close to the capital often do not spend their evenings and weekends at home. They too should be entitled to deduct their per diem allowance as living expenses associated with their business as a legislator.

I encourage you to join me in thanking those men and women chosen to represent us as our State legislators by supporting these minor, yet important, changes in the Tax Code.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION DISCLOSURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce important legislation, the Higher Education Disclosure Act, which is designed to ensure a public accounting of large gifts from foreign sources to our institutions of higher education.

In response to growing concern about the influence of foreign entities over our colleges and universities, Congress enacted certain public disclosure requirements during the 1986 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. These provisions required institutions of higher education to disclose foreign grants, contracts or gifts that exceed \$250,000 in value, to identify the sources of these gifts, and to disclose any conditions which may have been placed upon these gifts.

These provisions did not in any way restrict institutions of higher learning from entering into arrangements with foreign entities. Rather, the provisions only required that large gifts be disclosed fully to the public.

The disclosure requirements operated successfully from 1987 through 1989, and the Secretary of Education issued regular reports on foreign gifts during that period. There were no complaints from the universities or the Department of Education about the disclosure requirements. Unfortunately, the law contained a sunset provision, and it was inadvertently allowed to expire on August 1, 1989, without being extended.

Most universities are completely unaware of the 1989 repeal of these reporting requirements, and have continued to file disclosure reports with the Secretary of Education. Further, the Department has continued to issue regular disclosure reports. In fact, the Department issued a foreign gifts disclosure report on November 2, 1990, well after the expiration of the disclosure requirements.

In my view, there has been no lessening of the need for this type of disclosure. It is important to our Nation's academic freedom that large gifts from foreign sources—and any conditions attached to those gifts—be subject to public scrutiny.

In some cases, foreign entities have sought to place severe restrictions on the operation of our universities—including attempts to dictate what can be taught, who can be taught, and who can teach it. Clearly, such practices distort the operation of the free marketplace of ideas at our universities. Public disclosure is likely to reduce these practices and ensure

more academic freedom for American students.

In addition, some of the conditions which foreign entities have sought to impose on American universities threaten our Nation's future competitiveness. For instance, some foreign companies have sought to invest in research at American universities under the condition that the companies will gain full use of the results of that research.

This could result in a situation in which American taxpayers partially subsidize research which offers our competitors a direct advantage in developing and improving technology. The consequences of these types of arrangements could be extremely detrimental to our economy, contribute to an increased trade deficit with foreign nations and a reduced ability to create jobs and spur growth in America. Particularly at this time of recession, we must do everything possible to prevent this from occurring.

The academic freedom of American students and educators is one of the most prized possessions of this Nation. We cannot restrict the ability of colleges and universities to receive gifts or enter into contracts with foreign sources, since this could also threaten the full academic freedom of these institutions. However, public disclosure of these arrangements is absolutely essential to ensuring that our institutions of higher education are as independent as possible, and that their research efforts benefit our economy and our competitiveness in the world marketplace.

Given the enormous benefits of disclosure, and the proven ability of institutions of higher education and the Department of Education to implement disclosure requirements without shouldering an undue burden, Congress should act this year to reinstate the disclosure requirements as a matter of law. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to join me as co-sponsors of the Higher Education Disclosure Act, which will accomplish this important objective.

This year, the Committee on Education and Labor will once again act on legislation to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. It is my intent to make the Higher Education Disclosure Act a part of this extremely important reauthorization legislation. I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in this important effort.

A MARSHALL PLAN FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been losing its competitive edge in several areas of productivity and high technology. We have witnessed an erosion of support for improvements in education, agriculture, and our environment—a neglect of our infrastructure of roads and bridges as well as our manufacturing base.

I think everyone who is looking at America recognizes and identifies the needs which must be addressed, but we have not developed an overall, comprehensive, and dynamic plan to address these needs. Planning is important, but so is vision and leadership.

We need a process similar in concept to the approach developed through the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan to stimulate economic success in Europe and Asia following World War II. For some time now, I have been working with some of the best minds in our country and with many of my colleagues in the Congress to develop an outline for such an approach to achieve America's goals.

The process must be extensive, coordinated, and aimed at stimulating efforts by the States, by the private sector, and by cooperative groups of individuals and institutions. Piecemeal repairs to existing institutions will be expensive and will not accomplish the goals attainable from a carefully developed and coordinated process.

As an example of the importance of planning, the United States spent almost as many dollars for relief and humanitarian aid to Europe during the first 2½ years following World War II before the Marshall plan, as was spent during the next 3½ years during the implementation of the Marshall plan.

The billions of dollars spent for the earlier piecemeal and relief-oriented assistance had little impact on European recovery. The Marshall plan with its different, coherent approach to increase industrial and agricultural production, to stimulate trade, to restore sound budgets and currencies was based upon the idea that each technical and financial component contributed to the attainment of these long-term objectives. The money spent to implement the comprehensive, coordinated plan had enormous and continuing impact long after the plan itself was completed.

Recent events in the Persian Gulf have once again demonstrated how much can be accomplished when we have a coherent set of objectives and strategies. It's time to harness our newly recovered "can-do" spirit to developing and implementing a plan for accomplishing America's goals.

I ask for input and suggestions from my colleagues in refining this outline, and for their leadership and vision in moving toward a strategy to seize the historic opportunity we now have to reorder our priorities and address our needs here at home.

It is my hope that the following outline will be a useful point from which to begin that quest:

A MARSHALL PLAN FOR AMERICA—NEW STRATEGIES FOR A CHANGING WORLD I. INTRODUCTION

At the end of World War II, the United States recognized that its own national interest required that Europe and Asia, devastated by the war, be restored to economic health and vitality, not only for altruistic reasons but in order to offer an alternative to the spread of world communism. The Truman Doctrine led to strategies of encouraging and stimulating recovery efforts in Europe and Asia. The European component of the strategies, as implemented by Secretary of State General George C. Marshall, devoted nearly 2% of our gross national product to that effort.

Objectives included the restoration and repair of roads, bridges, and the manufacturing infrastructure; opportunities for educating and training employees; the development of new manufacturing technologies, tools, equipment, and capital investment mechanisms; and other strategies aimed at provid-

ing housing, transportation, and an acceptable standard of living.

History has shown that the Marshall Plan and its counterpart for Asia succeeded in stimulating economic recovery and productivity throughout Western Europe and the Pacific Rim, including our former adversaries.

The continuing successes of the competitive free market economies in Europe and Asia placed great pressures upon the state-planned economies of the Eastern Block nations. These pressures were enhanced by containment policies, backed by military commitment, which denied the alternative of military conquest. The success of these policies was demonstrated by the crumbling of the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and the movement toward democratization of Eastern Europe.

II. TIME FOR A NEW BEGINNING

Now it is time to re-focus our emphasis and re-order our priorities. An opportunity now exists for new and dynamic strategies to meet changing world conditions. The United States should formulate and pursue new strategies to ensure that it remain the mightiest nation in the world militarily, while developing its human and material resources to advance its position as the dominant economic power in the world.

By this combination of economic and military strength, the U.S. will provide the national security base upon which the realization of the larger goal of being the greatest nation in pursuit of human dignity, freedom and opportunity depends.

It is time to begin. The challenge is to develop a comprehensive, yet realistic, multifaceted approach to the extraordinary opportunities we now have as the Cold War and the war in the Persian Gulf are ending.

The process requires that we (1) understand clearly where we are, (2) express our vision for the future, and (3) define and implement specific steps which will lead to the attainment of our objectives of military and economic strength adequate to nurture, stimulate and advance our ideals of equal justice, individual freedom, and human dignity which have made our nation the greatest in the history of the world.

We need to develop strategies for America as appropriate for our needs, as those we employed with such success in rebuilding Europe and Japan—in short, we need a Marshall Plan for America.

III. WHERE WE ARE

Many studies show that our economy, although strong, is losing ground in several areas of competition. Our commercial and technological infrastructure has slipped badly in several important fields. Our roads, bridges, and other means of communication and transportation, as well as facilities used in providing human services have been allowed to deteriorate, rather than keeping pace with increasing demands. Support for education has eroded.

The nation has abandoned policies of energy conservation and stimulation of production of alternate and renewable fuels, imposing enormous costs measured both by damage to a fragile environment, and also by the requirement of defending overseas sources of fuel. Agriculture, once a dominating force in attaining favorable trade balances, has been neglected.

Competitiveness in manufacturing new, high-quality products is hampered by emphasis on short-term rather than long-term market goals, as well as by policies which dis-

courage cooperative approaches to problem-solving. Erosion of manufacturing employment hollows out American enterprise and results in unemployment—and underemployment—of the work force.

As a result of these negative forces many people feel that they have no hope of realizing any kind of personal attainment and slip into patterns of poverty, drug-abuse, and crime.

IV. WHERE WE WANT TO BE—OUR INTERWOVEN GOALS

America should be the mightiest nation on earth militarily and the strongest economically in order to remain the greatest in terms of personal freedom, dignity, and democracy—ideals which are inspiring and transforming the world.

V. HOW TO GET THERE

Constructive and dynamic management of change will not be possible if only static, piecemeal, and inflexible reactions to short-term challenges are used. New comprehensive and continually updated strategies must be employed.

A. National security: The military successes of the Persian Gulf demonstrated the enormous capability of highly mobile forces using advanced technologies and rapid deployment through air-lift and sea-lift capacities. New strategies to emphasize flexibility and quick response should be developed. An advantage of this approach will be a significant reduction in the requirement for a large standing army.

But national security also depends upon well-educated and highly trained citizens capable of using advanced technologies, whether those technologies are in a battlefield or in a modern workplace.

National security demands that the nation be substantially energy and resource independent, never again being held hostage to threats of interruptions of vital needs. National security requires that our transportation, communication, and services networks be strong. National security can be attained only if our economy is strong and vibrant, harnessing the energy of our well-trained and well-paid work force to the abundant resources of our lands and to the inventive genius of our scientists and entrepreneurs. National security can be advanced through comprehensive new strategies like those which will emerge from the process of creating a Marshall Plan for America.

B. A strong and vibrant economic base: The following represent a few examples of some current strategies which should be pursued. Other needs and strategies will emerge as the process moves forward.

1. Make a substantial investment in rebuilding roads, highways, transportation facilities, and communications networks. Speaker Tom Foley has said that we should invest 30 billion dollars each year for the next ten years in order to meet this vital need.

2. Reverse the unfavorable balance of trade by enhancing America's competitive stance through such initiatives as:

a. Encouraging, and reassessing some of the regulations which impede, cooperative programs between domestic companies engaged in similar or complementary endeavors;

b. Providing strong educational, training, and re-training programs which form the foundation of a competitive and well-paid work force;

c. Identifying areas of emerging and critical technologies—i.e. high definition television, high-performance computing, fiber

optic communications, super conductivity applications, etc.—and “clearing the path” for American industries to become or remain the world leaders in these fields;

d. Facilitating the application and commercialization of innovative technologies through emphasis on American technology preeminence and encouragement of manufacturing within our own borders rather than “exporting” such technologies abroad; and

e. Stimulating savings and capital investment through appropriate tax incentives.

3. Establish a national policy for energy conservation and the development of alternative fuels. The programs which were started during the Ford and Carter administrations and abandoned during the past ten years should be reevaluated in light of the expense of securing a dependable supply of overseas oil.

4. Forge agriculture policies which provide our people with an abundant supply of high quality food and fiber at economical cost, and encourage international trade and market development.

C. Human dignity, freedom, opportunity, and democracy: We remain a great nation only as long as our military might and economic power are used as a foundation upon which to establish and advance worthwhile values, principles, and goals. Our nation's values are woven throughout the fabric of our democracy. They are present in the ideals expressed so powerfully in the Declaration of Independence, the Preamble of the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Such principles as individual freedom and responsibility, equality of opportunity as well as justice, respect for the rights of others, and compassion for the needy reflect important and lasting American values. However, the attainment of such goals requires diligent attention and effort.

Freedom of the press means little to those who cannot read. Equality of opportunity to get a good job is meaningless if the job has moved overseas. Respect for the rights of others is fragile when there is no hope for personal achievement. Compassion for the needy is empty if no provision is made for addressing issues of health care or poverty.

A common thread connecting each of these social ills is the need to establish education as a true national priority. A democracy “for the people, by the people” will fail if “the people” are not educated. It is vital that a Marshall Plan for America promote strategies for education which provide access for all people, which establish achievement standards that meet and exceed the highest standards demanded by our economic competitors, which foster a learning environment that encourages and stimulates students and teachers to meet the challenges of global competition, and which provide the necessary resources to accomplish these objectives.

Similarly, education is a vital component in the pursuit of an acceptable standard of living, the basis for our values and human dignity. Only an educated work force can secure well-paying jobs and attain the levels of productivity that create wealth for our nation. An acceptable standard of living also depends on strategies which protect the environment that sustains us, which promote affordable housing and health care protection for all citizens, and which demonstrate realistic and attainable alternatives to lives of drug-abuse and crime.

These strategies are interdependent and vital components of a comprehensive Marshall Plan for America.

VI. WE CAN AFFORD IT

A. At a time when our national debt was 260 billion dollars and our annual GNP was 212 billion dollars, we allocated nearly 2% of our GNP to a Marshall Plan for the rebuilding of Europe and Asia. Today our national debt is 3 trillion dollars and our GNP is 5.5 trillion dollars (a much better ratio of GNP-to-debt than at the end of WWII), and 2% of our GNP would amount to less than 110 billion dollars. We are in a better position today to afford the costs of a Marshall Plan for America than at the end of WWII when we helped rebuild Europe and Asia. The cost of this national commitment will be high, but not as expensive as the failure to make such an investment.

B. Last year we spent more than 130 billion dollars defending Western Europe against a non-existent Warsaw Pact threat. We should carefully study our national security needs, refocus our military emphasis toward high-technology weaponry, rapid-deployment forces, and air-lift/sea-lift capabilities. We should analyze whether maintaining great land armies on the European continent remains a vital component of national security, or whether some of the expenditure could be redirected toward improving our country's competitive position in world trade and manufacturing.

C. New revenues could be obtained by placing fees on certain imported goods when national interests would be advanced by such actions. For example:

1. An import fee on foreign crude oil, carefully weighted to encourage energy efficiency and conservation and the development of alternative sources of energy, would shift a portion of our tax burden to the overseas countries which would then face market limitations upon their own cartel-established crude oil prices.

2. Selected import fees could encourage a level playing field with countries which prohibit or restrict American products from entering their market places, which employ manufacturing processes that degrade the environment, or which disregard human rights in their employment practices.

VII. CONCLUSION

World events provide us with an historic opportunity to affect our future as a nation and as a people. By the approach outlined here, strategies should be developed which stimulate action by the states, by the private sector, and by cooperative groups of individuals and institutions.

As a people we are once again confident of our ability to set great goals, and to achieve them. Our “can-do” spirit is ready for this task, and we should match that spirit with vision and leadership.

SALUTE TO AN AMERICAN HERO, CAPT. STEPHEN PHILLIS, USAF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, time and time again throughout our history our country's Armed Forces personnel have responded to our country's call and performed bravely in protecting our freedoms. Some have gone beyond that in sacrificing themselves and giving, as Lincoln said, their last full measure of devotion to our Nation.

I rise today to salute such an American hero, Capt. Stephen Phillis of the U.S. Air Force is one of those who gave his all to our country. While flying a mission over Northwest Kuwait, Captain Phillis' A-10 warplane was shot down as he was protecting his parachuting wingman from enemy fire. According to military officials, Captain Phillis flew through thick fire to make sure his wingman, whose own plane had been hit, landed in a safe area. As his comrade was parachuting to safety, Captain Phillis continued to fly cover for him by firing at enemy ground targets.

At his funeral last week in Rock Island, his family was presented with the Silver Star for extraordinary heroism, and I think we all know the Silver Star is one of the Air Force's highest honors recognizing combat bravery.

During Operation Desert Storm, Captain Phillis also earned four air medals.

My brother, who has known Captain Phillis from the time they were in grade school together, said that as long as he remembered Stephen Phillis wanted to be an Air Force pilot, and quite a pilot he was.

According to his commander, he was one of the most experienced and respected pilots in the Black Panther Squadron of the 304th fighter wing and he was considered one of the best pilots in his wing, extremely dedicated and highly competent.

Captain Phillis' strength, I believe, came mostly from his family who instilled in him the values that he had upheld in combat. I know those values are also shared by his brother, Michael, who also served as well in the gulf serving with the Navy Seabees.

I know that all my colleagues join in expressing our deepest sympathy to the Phillis family. America is America largely because of the dedication of people like Capt. Stephen Phillis. Every freedom, every value we cherish, I believe we owe to such people as Captain Phillis and the other Americans who protected us and died in the Persian Gulf area.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]. He, of course, brings a special perspective to the floor on this issue today. As a pilot in the United States Air Force during the Vietnam conflict, he flew some 66 combat missions. On his 67th mission, he was shot down and captured by the North Vietnamese. He spent 6½ years as a POW there. He knows as well as anyone here in this body the price of freedom, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me and offer these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the death of Capt. Stephen Phillis of Rock Island, IL, reminds us all, of the uncommon bravery

and valor that is the hallmark of America's military men and women.

Captain Phillis served in the best tradition of Americans who are willing to give their lives in the name of freedom and democracy. He was a true professional who distinguished himself in his final act of bravery.

Although I did not know Captain Phillis personally, I share a special feeling over his loss because we shared similar experiences and backgrounds.

I grew up just a short distance from his hometown of Rock Island and like Captain Phillis was a fighter pilot in the U.S. Air Force.

I am well aware of the courage, dedication, and strength which is required of every combat pilot. These qualities defined the character of Captain Phillis.

Captain Phillis' death symbolizes what America's fighting men and women have done for this country throughout the past two centuries. We are, forever, indebted to him and all the other courageous Americans who gave their lives during the Persian Gulf war.

Today, I join with my colleague Congressman LANE EVANS in expressing our deepest sympathies to the family of Captain Phillis and all those who lost their loved ones in the Persian Gulf.

WHEN IS A FISH NOT JUST A FISH?

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor today to pose a question for the editors of Time magazine.

That question is: When is a fish not just a fish?

The reason I must ask and answer this question is because this magazine has seen fit to attack a laboratory facility in my State which has been instrumental in building and sustaining an industry providing thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in income.

When is a fish not a fish?—when it's a new job, more income and increased tax revenue, that is when.

The Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory in Stuttgart, AR has, since its establishment in 1958, conducted research which has provided growers with the knowledge necessary to expand the aquaculture industry.

In fact, it has expanded to the point that it is a major economic boom to the economy of the lower Mississippi Delta region—an area which desperately needs the jobs and income the industry provides.

In its April 22 issue, Time published an article entitled "A Catfish That Oinks And Other Tales Of How Con-

gress Wastes Money On Dubious Projects."

I have rewritten their headline to read: "A Magazine Article Which Stinks And Other Tales of How Time Magazine Wastes Money On Dubious Projects Which Serve Only To Mislead the Public."

In my view, creating jobs is a proper role of public policy especially when those jobs are located in one of the poorest areas of the United States.

And, the aquaculture industry has created more than 9,000 of them—with the able assistance of the staff at the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory.

In just 9 short years, it is estimated that as many as 27,000 people may be employed in the industry.

Time magazine, using information provided by a Republican Member of the other body, branded this project as pork. I proudly proclaim it—not pork, but progress.

The article referred to this serious research facility as a "catfish farm," indicating the writer does not even understand what the laboratory is and certainly does not understand what it does for the aquaculture industry.

Mr. Speaker, America is hemorrhaging jobs at an alarming rate—losing them to foreign countries—and any effort which puts our people here at home to work will have my support to the last day I serve in Congress * * *

and beyond.

A study by Mississippi State University showed that 230 jobs are created for each 10 million pounds of catfish production, for example.

I invite the editors of Time to visit the Delta of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana and to ask those working in the aquaculture industry if the money spent to support the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory is wasted.

I invite them to talk to producers such as Joey Lowery of Weiner, AR who operates 200 acres of catfish ponds and plans on a 30-percent expansion.

He calls the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory "an invaluable tool." To Joey Lowery and hundreds like him the laboratory means business, not boondoggle.

And, the same is true for Steve Carpenter, Donald Cain, Al Bray, Neal Anderson and many, many others.

In fact, last year 14,878 producers in 35 States contacted the laboratory for technical assistance.

The Time magazine piece was based on a \$2.7 million appropriation to help construct and equip a "state-of-the-art" 18,000 square foot research laboratory at Stuttgart.

Expansion of the lab, which was built in 1960, is necessary because the current facilities are outdated and assistance to fish producers must keep pace if the aquaculture industry is to grow and continue to be profitable.

It is through research done at Stuttgart that yields are increased, speedier weight gain is achieved and diseases are controlled.

This means more profit for the producer and lower cost for the consumer.

If this industry does not remain competitive, it could wither and die—leaving thousands of workers out of jobs.

We in America have allowed this to happen too often—losing our competitive edge to other countries and allowing them to take over our markets.

It was the shortsightedness exemplified by the Time article which allowed this to happen. If we do not invest in America, we cannot remain a player in a very competitive world market.

The editors of Time may be ready to concede the game, to continue to see industry after industry move elsewhere because we were not willing to make the investments necessary to keep them—and the jobs they provide—here in America, but I am not.

Dr. Harry Dupree heads the laboratory at Stuttgart. He says that aquaculture is now entering a new era which will emphasize higher production levels and efficiency and a better quality product. Expanded research is critical to achieving these objectives.

I believe that my friend Harry Dupree and his staff deserve praise for their tireless efforts, not snide and uninformed comments such as those published by Time.

Last year, in my State alone, catfish, baitfish and other fish products contributed \$79 million to the economy. And, there are beneficial spinoffs. In 1989, for example, the U.S. catfish industry used 200,000 tons of soybean meal and another 400 million pounds of other domestic grain products.

Where would that grain have gone had it not been used by this industry, would there have been a market for that grain?

The catfish that oinks?

No, it's the catfish that sells—providing jobs and economic growth to an area which needs both.

In Arkansas, Mr. Speaker, we actually do not care if these fish oink, whistle, bark or hoot as long as they continue to provide the underpinning for a multimillion dollar industry.

It is good to support investment in America and her people, if we can forgive billions of dollars in foreign debt, surely we can afford \$2.7 million to support an industry which produces many millions more in jobs and tax revenue.

To the editors of Time, I would only say that a fish is not always a fish—and invite them to take time to find out why.

□ 1620

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a number of pieces of correspondence relating to this matter.

CATFISH FARMERS OF ARKANSAS,

Carlisle, AR, April 23, 1991.

Representative BILL ALEXANDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: We, the Catfish Farmers of Arkansas, were very displeased when we read the article "A Catfish that Oinks and other Tales of How Congress Wastes Money on Dubious Projects" that was published in the April issue of Time Magazine. As you know, fish farming is an important industry to Arkansas especially in the Mississippi Delta region where unemployment is high and the standard of living is low.

The Stuttgart Fish Farming Laboratory has assisted the fish farming industry for over 30 years. It has made fish farming a very profitable industry and created many jobs. Many people presently employed would not have jobs if not for the fish farming industry, and if not for these jobs, they would have no alternative but to be on welfare programs.

Please inform the writer of the Time Magazine article that the Stuttgart laboratory requires modern facilities to meet the research needs of our growing industry. We need up-to-date research in feeds, diseases, breeding, and water quality so that the industry can continue to grow and in return yield more tax dollars. Based on governmental predictions, the catfish industry is projected to be worth over \$1 billion in the next ten years, and will employ 18,000 citizens in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

We appreciate all that you have done for our industry and your foresight to help provide the tools we need to make our catfish industry even better. We support you and send our thanks from all of us in Arkansas.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FARMER,
President, CFA.

CATFISH FARMERS OF AMERICA, Indianola, MS, April 22, 1991.

(Attention of Philip Launius).
Representative BILL ALEXANDER,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR HON. BILL ALEXANDER: Catfish Farmers of America is the national trade association representing the catfish industry. CFA was formed in 1968 and currently has paid membership from thirty-five states, making it the strongest national aquaculture organization.

I was distressed to read in the April 22 issue of Time magazine, an unjustified attack on Senator Dale Bumpers concerning his work and support of our emerging aquaculture industry.

Within just the catfish industry, it is well known that nearly \$20 million worth of fish are lost each year to disease. The 1988 report from the Task Force on Therapeutic Compounds (consisting of representatives of six federal agencies) to the Joint Subcommittee on Aquaculture, identified as a significant obstacle to aquaculture, the lack of federally approved therapeutics to reduce disease-induced fish mortality. Also, to reinforce this finding, was the determination by federal and state agency representatives and the private sector during Aquaculture Summits 90 and 91; that the number one priority for the benefit of aquaculture was in the area of fish health. I have said all of this to make the point that this is what the Fish Farming Laboratory in Stuttgart is all about. This Laboratory provides diagnostic examinations and fish health inspections for farmers

and assists in certifying fish for transportation across state boundaries. The research staff conducts experiments and research into all segments of fish health, disease control and aquatic ecology.

The nations fish farmers are proud of the quality work done for them through the Stuttgart Laboratory and desperately needs the anticipated results of its continuing research into fish health issues.

Further it is unfortunate, whether intentional or not, that the Fish and Wildlife Service, Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory was identified only as the catfish farm in Stuttgart, Arkansas which will lead readers to assume incorrectly, the funding of a private farm.

We can also show Senator Smith several out-of-business processing plants that have recently been forced to close in this "flourishing industry."

This letter is for your information from my frustrated perspective.

Respectfully,

HUGH WARREN,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ASSOCIATION, Shepherdstown, WV, April 23, 1991.

Representative BILL ALEXANDER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: On behalf of the National Aquaculture Association, I would like to express our irritation in the recent Time Magazine article that criticized the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory in Stuttgart, Arkansas.

The National Aquaculture Association represents fish producers and service industries from all over the United States. Because research and development is a major need in maintaining competitiveness and accelerating industry growth, we were dumbfounded when we read that one of the nation's major aquaculture research facility is classed as "pork". Without the Stuttgart facility and all that it has contributed to fish farming during the last 30 years, it is unlikely that fish farming would exist today.

We are happy that the modernized facilities are under construction and we are looking forward to being able to utilize the new information produced. Regardless of what the Time Magazine said, a very viable fish farming industry knows that the Stuttgart laboratory fills an essential place in the growth of the Nation's fish farming industry.

We appreciate all that you have done to provide funds for laboratory construction which will enable our industry to grow and become an even greater asset to the state and nation.

Sincerely,

MIKE FREEZE,
President.

STRIPED BASS GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, San Diego, CA, April 23, 1991.

Representative BILL ALEXANDER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: Our organization, the Striped Bass Growers Association, represents the striped bass producers nationwide. When we read the article in Time Magazine about the Stuttgart Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory, we felt that the facility and staff were being unjustly treated.

The Stuttgart Laboratory has provided our industry considerable assistance and research information. Without their assistance, our future would look bleak. However,

we have a promising future due to the research we have received in disease control methods and culture techniques. We also believe that the new state-of-the-art facilities will be of great importance, and the research developed there will be a great asset to our growing industry.

Your efforts on this project have been greatly appreciated by all of us.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. CARLBERG,
President.

STEVE CARPENTER FARMS,
Waldenburg, AR, February 27, 1991.

Hon. BILL ALEXANDER,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: I would like to let you know how much my fellow farmers and I appreciate the help you have given the fish experiment station in Stuttgart in the past. Especially with the new funds you have helped them to obtain for new construction and operating expense.

I farm 200 acres of fish at Waldenburg. I raise Catfish, Big Heec, Buffalo, and Amur. As you know I have been farming fish for the past 5 years.

Learning in the fish business has been very costly to me. I feel that if it wasn't for the Fish Experiment Station I would not have grown and expanded like I have. They have helped with disease, marketing, new technology and just good advice. They are always there trying to help, doing anything they can for the farmer. David Sample has even given me his home telephone number when I was having serious problems, so I could call him on the weekend. This is the dedication that runs through the whole operation, from Bo Collins down.

One thing that I will ask is that with the processing plant going in and production increasing, I hope that extra funding will be available to help the Fish Experiment Station grow to accommodate the Arkansas Fish Farmers, keeping fish a thriving business.

Sincerely,

STEVE CARPENTER.

LOWERY AQUA FARMS, INC.,
Weiner, AR, April 8, 1991.

Hon. BILL ALEXANDER,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your support and efforts toward the construction of the new fisheries experiment lab in Stuttgart. This facility will be an invaluable tool to further develop the catfish industry in Arkansas.

I presently operate 200 acres of catfish in northeast Arkansas located approximately 15 miles east of Newport. I'm in my sixth year of production and planning a 30% expansion this year. From the beginning, I've heavily relied on the personnel in Stuttgart for technical information relating to practically all areas of the business. The ongoing assistance the present facility has provided me makes me excited about the completion of the new lab. I believe if adequate funds are provided to staff and operate the lab, this facility can predominately serve the fish producing areas of the state. I believe in order for the lab to meet its potential; there must be personnel in the field working close to the farmer dealing with actual farm situations so a more coordinated effort can exist between production and research to solve production problems.

I appreciate your support for the development of aquaculture in the state evidenced not only with this project, but also by securing funds for the upcoming processing plant in Cotton Plant, and more personally with the assistance of your office in helping me obtain a Section 404 permit that will make my expansion possible. I'm convinced that your continued support will be a key factor in the expansion of aquaculture in Arkansas.

Sincerely,

JOEY LOWERY.

DONALD CAIN INVESTMENTS, PLANT-
ER, LAND DEVELOPER,

McCrory, AR, April 15, 1991.

Re New fish laboratory, Stuttgart, AR.

Congressman BILL ALEXANDER,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: With your help and others the new fish laboratory at Stuttgart is in the process of being built. Now we desperately need your consideration and help in getting the funding for the full operation of this unit. It would not be of any benefit for us to build the unit, then wait for a year or two in order to fund the operation.

Bill, the fellows at Stuttgart are really doing a good job in helping us with the disease control in our fish. They also do research work and other things to benefit the fish farmers.

With this new facility and the funding of the operation, we will continue to establish more ponds and raise more fish. There seems to be some future in the raising of catfish, which is unlike some of the row crops we have been trying to raise.

I fully support you and you know how much I appreciate the fine job you are doing for us in Washington. You can certainly count on me to help you in any way I can. With best personal regards, I am

Yours truly,

DONALD CAIN.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman BILL ALEXANDER, for reserving time and for inviting me to participate in a special order to discuss Time magazine's erroneous reference to funding for the Stuttgart Laboratory as an example of pork barrel politics. I want to associate myself with Congressman ALEXANDER's remarks.

Since I have been a Member of Congress, I have made it a priority to promote the catfish industry which means 6,000 jobs and an estimated \$2 billion in economic development for Mississippi. The benefits are even greater throughout Arkansas and the entire lower Mississippi Delta region. Now there are over 9,000 people employed in the aquaculture industry. By the turn of the century, it is estimated that 27,000 people will be employed.

Four years ago, I was joined by 220 of my colleagues in support of a resolution to commemorate "National Catfish Day." To some people it may have been just another commemorative. But to the people of Mississippi and the lower Delta region, "National Catfish Day" brought some positive attention on a growing industry which means jobs and income to the poorest region in our country.

"National Catfish Day" was instrumental in changing the way people think about catfish. Farm-raised catfish is not a bottom dweller, or a scavenger, as was its ancestors. Farm-raised catfish is a superior fish, fed soybean

meal, corn, fish meal, vitamins and minerals in clean freshwater ponds.

Because of its great taste and nutritional value, the Department of the Army decided to increase its annual purchase of catfish. I have hosted several catfish dinners in the Longworth cafeteria so that my colleagues and their staffs could learn first hand just how delicious farm-raised catfish can be.

Much of the credit for the growth of the catfish industry goes to the farmers and workers who grow, produce, and process the fish for the market. Their hard work and dedication has made the aquaculture industry the fastest growing segment of agriculture in the United States.

But the research done at the U.S. Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory in Stuttgart, AR is also crucial to the growth of the industry. Stuttgart has pioneered much of the research in catfish farming, saving many farmers from serious epidemics and saving the industry from serious economic losses.

Research at the Lab has led to increases in fish yields, which has allowed farmers to become more profitable. It has also held down the price of the fish. Other research has been done to develop harvesting and transporting techniques which are also important to the industry. It's no accident that 80 percent of the catfish industry is within a 150-mile radius of the Stuttgart Laboratory. That's because the work at this laboratory helps to ensure that a quality product is produced to the benefit of the farmers, the workers, and the consumer.

The \$2.7 million in Federal funding this laboratory received for this year is not pork barrel politics—it is critical to the health and development of a major industry in the poorest region of this country.

It's not pork barrel politics. It is vital to help produce jobs in a region where the unemployment rate is almost twice the national average—and in some counties where it is four times the national average.

This is not pork barrel politics. But this funding does translate into real bacon on the tables in a region where the per capita income is some \$3,400 less than the national average, where 21 percent of all the people live in poverty, and an astounding 41 percent of African-Americans and women headed households are in poverty.

Mr. Speaker I want to thank my friend from Arkansas again for reserving time for this special order and for giving me an opportunity to participate. I repeat: it's important for the Nation to know that this time, Time magazine got it wrong.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EASTER UPRISING OF 1916 IN IRELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAROCO). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved this special order today to commemorate the 75th anniversary of Ireland's Easter uprising.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Easter uprising in Ireland. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON], the cochairman of our ad hoc Committee on Irish Affairs, for organizing this special order.

The 1916 Easter uprising declared Ireland to be a sovereign and independent state, guaranteed civil and religious liberties, and proclaimed equal rights and opportunities for all citizens. Although the uprising failed, it eventually led to the withdrawal of British troops from 26 of the 32 counties in Ireland.

Many of my constituents in the 22d Congressional District of New York are of Irish descent, many of whom have relatives who fought in and believed in the principles underlying the 1916 Easter uprising. They fought to be a free and united nation. My constituents honor and respect those men and women who sacrificed their lives to the cause of the Easter uprising.

April 20, 1916 through April 30, 1916 was a significant chapter in the Irish revolutionary history.

In the 18th century, Wolfe Tonne formed the organization called the United Irishmen. This group attempted to unite all Irishmen, regardless of religious persuasion, financial status, or social class. The United Irishmen made two attempts to expel the British from Ireland. Wolfe Tonne was eventually arrested and he committed suicide.

In the 1840's, Daniel O'Connell formed the Young Ireland Movement. However, that rebellion also ended in defeat. The 1840's also were the time of the great famine. Millions of people either died of starvation or fled the country, many to the United States; a nation, which itself had once been under the control of the British crown.

During 1865 and 1867 the Irish Republican Brotherhood, or fenians tried to break away from Britain's control. But, by the end of 1867 the Irish Republican Brotherhood's movement was decimated by the executions of several of their members who participated in a prison break.

Once again, in 1916, the rebels attempted to break away from Britain's domination. In the beginning of the 20th century the Irish Republican Brotherhood reorganized and grew stronger. Its members were becoming prominent and influential in other political and cultural organizations.

Patrick Pearse, one of the leaders of the uprising was the man who read the proclamation of the Irish Republic. He was also the man who signed an order for the other commandants; James Connolly, Thomas Clarke, Sean

MacDiarmuid, Thomas MacDonagh, Eamonn Ceannt and Joseph Plunkett to lay down their arms. This marked another defeat in the Irish revolutionary history.

However, after the Easter uprising, 16 republicans, including the seven members of the provisional government were court martialed and executed by shooting. In total, there were 160 court martials and 122 sentenced. As many as 2,000 men and women, were interned in jails in England and Wales.

Pearse and the other commandants were backed by people who fought and made the ultimate sacrifice for their cause. On this, the 75th anniversary of the 1916 Easter uprising, the Irish people honor the men, women and children who fought for a free, united Ireland, which would cherish all its children equally, and whose people could live in peace and harmony with each other. "Without Freedom," Patrick Pearse said, "Ireland unfree will never be at peace."

The world has come a long way in its drive for peace throughout the world. Today we witness the achievements of the United Nations, the Red Cross efforts, the tearing down of the Berlin wall, the ad hoc efforts, peace in the Persian Gulf, the initiatives for democracy in the Soviet Union and South Africa. We can all hope and pray that in the near future there will be peace throughout the world and throughout Ireland.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to recognize the aspirations of the Irish people and of their struggle to be free.

Mr. MANTON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, on this day 75 years ago a group of brave ordinary men and women seized the general post office in Dublin and proclaimed an independent Ireland. Although the rising was shortlived, it signaled the rebirth of Ireland's desire for freedom. In the words of the Irish poet W.B. Yeats, Ireland had "changed, changed utterly: a terrible beauty is born." Today, 75 years later, Yeats' characterization is still appropriate. Sadly, because the goals of this revolution were not realized, and the conflicts which it spurred have never been settled to the satisfaction of all interested parties, Ireland, a land of incredible natural beauty, remains scarred by bloodshed and conflict.

Mr. Speaker, the seeds of the 1916 Easter rising, were planted a few years earlier, in 1914, when England's Liberal Party Government proposed a limited form of self government to Ireland. The home rule bill would have established an independent Irish parliament but retained the British Government's control over finance and defense matters. Many Irish Catholics agreed to fight for the British in World War I in the belief that this would help bring about

home rule and eventually, independence.

Supporting the British and home rule would bring about freedom for small nations, such as Ireland. Conversely, the home rule act was vehemently opposed by both the House of Lords and the Protestants in Ulster. The political Ulster unionist council and the paramilitary Ulster volunteer force formed to resist any disassociation from Great Britain. It was at this time the basic structure of today's political conflict in northern Ireland between unionist Protestants and republican Catholics was created.

By 1914, the Irish nation was becoming well organized. One group, the Gaelic League was devoted to bringing the Irish language and culture back to the people. More than a language or literary organization, the league promoted the idea of national self reliance and self respect. It was through the league's efforts that St. Patrick's Day became an Irish holiday and Irish was taught in schools. By helping to reacquaint the Irish people with their culture and language, the Gaelic League fostered a renewed nationalist spirit. Another important Irish organization came about as a reaction to the terrible plight of the working class in Ireland which faced the worst living and working conditions in all of the United Kingdom. In an effort to improve the working man's plight, James Connolly and Jim Larkin organized the Irish Transport and General Workers Union. These Irish nationalist organizations, continued to gain strength during the next few years.

It was in this climate 2 years later, on Easter Monday, 1916, a coalition of members of the citizens army, Irish volunteers, and the Irish Republican Brotherhood took possession of the government post office and many other buildings in Dublin and raised the Irish flag. Their leader Patrick Pearse, a schoolteacher, read the declaration of the provisional government of the Irish Republic to the people of Ireland. Overwhelmingly outnumbered and out armed, the rebels lasted less than a week.

To be truthful, on that Easter Monday, the rebels did not enjoy the popular support of the Irish people. The tide of public opinion quickly changed, however, as a result of the British reaction to the uprising. In a rush to justice the British Government summarily executed 15 people purported to be leaders of the rising, including James Connolly who because of his wounds had to be propped in a chair to be shot. The British imposed martial law; and hundreds more people than had actually taken part in the uprising were arrested.

In July of 1921, the British Government and the Irish leaders agreed to a truce under which the 26 counties, excluding the 6 counties in Ulster where

the Protestant population continued to oppose independence, were granted dominion status.

Mr. Speaker, I organized this special order on the subject of the Easter rising because I believe the struggle which occurred 75 years ago can teach us something about Ireland today, particularly because many of today's conflicts had their genesis during the rising. Therefore, it is my hope that a peaceful resolution of the ongoing strife in northern Ireland can be reached through an examination of the past three quarters of a century. From the historical record it is evident that no peace will come to northern Ireland without a determined effort to solve the dispute which arose more than 75 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, this year, the government of the Republic of Ireland decided to mark the anniversary quietly, in sharp contrast to the week long celebration which occurred on the 50th anniversary. I think Tim Pat Coogan, an Irish historian and the author of a biography of Michael Collins, put it well when he said, "You get the feeling they'd—the Irish Government—would like it better if the anniversary didn't exist. But you ignore history at your own peril, especially in Ireland."

Mr. Speaker, the Easter rising is also noteworthy because of the impact this failed revolution had on the history of this century. It can be argued the Easter rising marked the beginning of the end of the colonial era, not only for Great Britain but for all European colonial powers. Soon after the rising, colonies in Africa, Asia and Latin America began to press for their independence. A New York Times editorial last month described the importance of the rebellion this way, "Now that old western empires have gone, and their communist successors have crumbled, one can look back with awe at the small band of teachers, poets and trade unionists who rose up for Ireland. In a real sense we live in a world they helped bring into being in a season of Christian sacrifice and ascension in 1916."

The proclamation which the provisional government of the Irish Republic released on the steps of the post office on this day 75 years ago is a document which has withstood the test of time. The peoples of other British colonies, like India for example, looked to this document when they began their struggle for independence. Also, I think it's important to note that in at least one way the leaders of the Irish rebellion were more forward thinking and democratic than the people of the United States at that time. The republic conceived by the rebels would have granted voting rights to all Irish people, both men and women, a full 4 years before the United States passed the 19th amendment, granting women the vote.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert the entire text of the proclamation in the RECORD.

POBLACHT NA HEIREANN

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF THE IRISH REPUBLIC TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND

IRISHMEN AND IRISHWOMEN; In the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom.

Having organised and trained her manhood through her secret revolutionary organisation, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and through her open military organisations, the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army, having patiently perfected her discipline, having resolutely waited for the right moment to reveal itself, she now seized that moment, and, supported by her exiled children in America and by gallant allies in Europe, but relying in the first on her own strength, she strikes in full confidence of victory.

We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people. In sovereignty; six times during the past three hundred years they have asserted it in arms. Standing on that fundamental right and again asserting it in arms in the face of the world, we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a Sovereign Independent State, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades-in-arms to the cause of its freedom, of its welfare, and of its exaltation among the nations.

The Irish Republic is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. The Republic guarantees religious and civil liberty, equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens, and declares its resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally, and oblivious of the differences carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from the majority in the past.

Until our arms have brought the opportune moment for the establishment of a permanent National Government, representative of the whole people of Ireland and elected by the suffrages of all her men and women, the Provisional Government, hereby constituted, will administer the civil and military affairs of the Republic in trust for the people.

We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the Most High God, whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that on one who serves that cause will dishonour it by cowardice, inhumanity, or rapine. In this supreme hour the Irish nation must, by its valour and discipline and by the readiness of its children to sacrifice themselves for the common good, prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called.

Signed on behalf of the Provisional Government:

THOMAS J. CLARKE.
SEAN MACDIARMADA.
P.H. PEARSE.
JAMES CONNOLLY.
THOMAS MACDONAGH.
EAMONN CEANNT.
JOSEPH PLUNKETT.

Mr. Speaker, on a day when we celebrate the courageous men and women who risked their lives to improve the quality of life for all citizens in Ireland, it is appropriate to recognize the tireless efforts of one Irish-American, Mr. Michael J. Roarty, to promote the rich heritage of Ireland. As many of my colleagues know, Michael J. Roarty, vice president of marketing and corporate communications for Anheuser Bush Co. was named Irish-American of the year 1991 by "Irish America" magazine.

Michael J. Roarty is a first generation Irish-American like me. In a recent article in the "Irish people" I think he captured what our parent's generation found upon their arrival here in a recent article in the Irish people. He said, "the Irish were told that the streets here were paved with gold (but) when they got here, they found out that not only were the streets not paved with gold, they weren't paved at all and they (*the immigrants*) were the ones who were going to pave them." His parents, John and Brigid Roarty, who were born in County Donegal and County Mayo respectively, settled in Detroit, MI. Although they left their homeland, the Roarty's steeped their children in Irish culture and traditions. On weekends, the Roarty's often rolled back the carpets for Irish music and step dancing.

Michael Roarty is an Irish-American in the finest sense of the phrase. He has a rich understanding of the people of both nations. As he puts it, although a proud American, when he goes over to Ireland, he is at home. Throughout his thirty one year career at Anheuser Busch, his special kinship with Ireland has been self evident. During his tenure, Anheuser Busch has funded a film entitled, "Irish Americans: Heart of a New Land" and has underwritten a college sponsored lecture series about Irish-American culture.

Mr. Roarty and his wife Leigh return to Ireland every year to attend the Irish Derby and spend a few days with family and friends in Mayo and Donegal. Michael was instrumental in Anheuser Busch's sponsorship of the Irish Derby weekend of events in Curragh which includes the John Roarty Memorial Railway Stakes, named after his late father. Mr. Roarty also helped develop the impressive relationship between Budweiser and Guinness breweries. It may surprise my colleagues and fellow Irish-Americans to learn that Budweiser, which is brewed at Guinness' Kilkenny Brewery, is now the number one lager in Ireland.

Besides his business acumen, intelligence, and famous wit, Mr. Roarty is best known for his tireless work on behalf of various charities and philanthropies. Mr. Roarty is a member of the Ireland United States Council for Commerce and Industry and is a founding charter member of the Ireland

Chamber of Commerce. He also serves on the board of the American Ireland Fund, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Gateway chapter, the USO international board, the orchestra and chorus of St. Louis, the Variety Club, the Starlight Foundation, and Boys Hope, A Jesuit learning center for displaced boys. Mr. Roarty is also a dedicated leader of the Anheuser Busch Co.'s work on behalf of the Muscular Dystrophy Association. Through these efforts in the last decade more than \$34 million has been raised to support MDA treatment and research.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a story related in Irish-America magazine best describes Mr. Roarty's deep ties to the Irish-American community. A few years ago, Mr. Roarty received a call from the president of a small Catholic college in Massachusetts. The president of the college, a Father McPhaidin, asked him for a donation for a new Irish studies program. When Mr. Roarty, who did not know the priest, explained that he had never heard of the school, Father McPhaidin in a heavy brogue, insisted that Roarty's Aunt Biddy and Uncle Mike in County Donegal had already committed him to the cause. Mr. Roarty then knew he would become involved. Faithful to this image as a champion for the Irish, Mr. Roarty helped raise more than \$250,000 for the Irish studies program at Stonehill College.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to list all of Mr. Roarty's accomplishments here today. I have only shared some of the highlights with you. It is fitting that today when we honor the memory of leaders of the Easter Rising, we also honor an Irish-American, whose father was involved in this quest for Irish nationhood, who today works to bring attention to the rich history of Irish-Americans and promote friendship and understanding between the people of the United States and Ireland.

□ 1640

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I will just rise very briefly to associate myself with the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON], and congratulate him for taking this special order this evening commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rising, and those brave men in Dublin 75 years ago this past Easter who took part in that at the General Post Office to stand up against hundreds of years of oppression, beginning a process that allowed at least a portion of the island of Ireland to reach the same point of self-determination that the rest of the nations of Western Europe had achieved prior to that time. It is entirely fitting

that we take a few moments this afternoon to pay tribute to those individuals and to others who gave their lives over the course of that rebellion and in the cause of Irish freedom.

As every Irish-American knows, that Easter Rebellion and the Easter Rising holds great significance for us, most especially those of us whose parents and grandparents were forced from Ireland because of economic, social, religious persecution, and came here to the United States seeking opportunities in the United States that were not available for our people in that beautiful old country.

Let me also note that I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] regarding Mike Roarty, who in 1991 was named the Irish-American of the Year.

Having been so honored last year by the Irish-American magazine, I know on a personal basis what an enormous tribute that is to an Irish-American. There is no individual, of the millions of Irish-Americans that live in the United States, that I know that is more fitting of that tribute than this individual. He is the son of Irish immigrants, who is the epitome of what an immigrant wants their children to be, to succeed and to act as a citizen of the United States of America. So I think all Irish-Americans rise today and will, during the course of this year, to honor him and to honor his parents and to congratulate him for this tremendous honor.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I join with him in commemorating not only the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rising but also to pay commendation to Michael Roarty, the 1991 Irish-American of the Year.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONNELLY] speak, one of our own, who was an Irish-American of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to commemorate the 75th anniversary of Ireland's Easter Rebellion. I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] for calling this special order to commemorate this important event in Ireland's history.

On Easter morning in 1916, a small army of 1,200 men joined together in Dublin to challenge the British Empire and fight for home rule in Ireland. Led by a union leader, James Connolly, and Patrick Pearce, a school headmaster, they marched up Sackville Street and seized the General Post Office. Unorganized, with many factions, but brought together by the common goal of nationalism, they knew they would be defeated. In the early morning hours of

that day, James Connolly stated, "We are going to be slaughtered." Still, they seized the post office, raised the Irish flag, and declared independence.

A week later, a few dozen men remained in the post office, defending themselves against artillery fire of the British Army, until Connolly was forced to surrender and the rebellion was put down; 64 rebels, 134 soldiers, and over 200 civilians were killed, with many more wounded.

The rebellion itself was not supported by the people of Dublin, who were not prepared to bear the burden of bloodshed in the name of home rule. But their anger with the rebels turned to outrage toward Great Britain a few days later, when the British Government executed 15 of the rebels, including Connolly and Pearce. Their deaths became a symbol of the struggle against British rule and the fight for self-determination. The poet William Butler Yeats wrote, "A terrible beauty is born."

The Easter Rebellion, and its tragic aftermath, began a long and bloody battle for an Irish republic. Led by Eamon de Valera, a survivor of the 1916 rebellion, this battle ended with the formation of an Irish Free State in 1921.

Ireland's Easter Rebellion was the first national movement for freedom and self-determination of the 20th century. Many people in many nations have followed in the footsteps of Connolly, Pearce, and those they led in Ireland's struggle for independence. The world has seen the legacy of those brave, determined men and women in nations everywhere, and today, the vision of those who fought in Ireland in 1916 is shared in Eastern Europe and in the Baltic States. In Lithuania, the fight for freedom took place in a parliament building instead of a post office, and the government crushed the movement with tanks instead of artillery fire. But the principles at stake in Lithuania in 1991 are the same as in Ireland in 1916: the right of self-determination and freedom from imposed rule.

Today, Mr. Speaker, self-government is a right that many in Ireland are still struggling to achieve. As we commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rebellion, I remain hopeful that in 1991, the newly proposed talks for a peaceful solution to the conflicts in Northern Ireland will be successful. The delicate negotiations that have been agreed to by all parties in Northern Ireland and Great Britain are the first signs of hope for peace to come out of the region in 15 years. As the negotiations begin, let us not forget the passion and conviction felt by those brave few who gave their lives in Ireland's Easter Rebellion, and let us pray that the conflicts in Northern Ireland will be resolved and the violence will end.

I wish again to commend Mr. MANTON for having this special order, and I thank him for the opportunity to speak about this important moment in Irish history that will not be forgotten. Thank you.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Ms. HORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Ms. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would also like to commend Mr. MANTON for making this possible. I am very proud to rise today, Mr. Speaker, to honor a man who lives in my district as the Irish-American of the Year, Michael J. Roarty. Many have been honoring Mr. Roarty, some already mentioned: Anheuser-Busch, the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Starlight Foundation, Irish-Americans, and the city of St. Louis are all very thankful to Michael J. Roarty. He is truly an Irish-American today, certainly, but when you take just a short look at some of the honors he has received in the past, you wonder which part of the melting pot he came from.

For example, he is the only non-Italian member of the Italian Sports Hall of Fame. He has received an honorary degree from the rabbinical college in St. Louis.

He has been named an honorary Black Prince of Africa, and now he has been named Irish-American of the Year by Irish-American magazine.

When the Roartys came to America, it is certainly true that Ireland lost a great national asset, at least temporarily. Now, a generation later, Michael Roarty has already taken back to the Irish people a great American product, the products of Anheuser-Busch, and he has brought back a new meaning to the richest classic race of Europe, the highlight of Irish horse racing, the Budweiser Irish Derby at the Curragh Racetrack.

Ireland's loss has been the gain of us in this country, and especially those of us in the St. Louis area. We are very proud of Michael Roarty as Irish-American of the Year. We are very grateful to have him in our community, adding to the riches of our community, working on many wonderful causes. He is always there for kids, for good causes, for sports, for young people, and especially for Irish-Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the Irish have struggled very hard since the Easter Rebellion. Mr. Roarty is an excellent example of what the Irish can do, and I treasure my own heritage in that respect, too.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, TOM MANTON, on hav-

ing this special order commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rebellion.

As a cochairman, with Speaker TOM FOLEY, of the Friends of Ireland, I understand the importance of the Easter Rebellion to Irish history.

I have an appreciation of the ideals fought for in the streets of Dublin on that spring day in 1916. These ideals included a love of freedom, a willingness to sacrifice, and a determination to fight despite overwhelming odds. These lofty visions are not continued with the current vicious warfare that has created such widespread suffering in Northern Ireland.

The Irish rebels, poets mostly, had a burning desire for freedom and self-determination. Unlike other revolutions of this century, the Easter Rebellion was not driven by Marxist ideology. Inspired by the American model, this first revolution of the 20th century was predicated on a simple desire for that basic American principle: Freedom.

Today in Ireland, the greater sacrifice is not attained with violence, but with understanding. The heroes in the current struggle are not masked gunmen, or armed ideologists. The Irish heroes in 1991 are those who are willing to cast aside their partisan hatreds, reach out to their enemies, and work to build a peaceful society, respecting both Irish traditions.

The difficult fight today is not shooting another opponent. The difficult, but courageous, decision is to choose the peaceful way to freedom.

I have learned in my tenure here in Congress that constantly throwing bombs, in the figurative and literal sense, instead of sitting down with the other side and talking it out, is counterproductive to the cause of democracy. The tragedy of the current situation must stop, and both sides must realize that their battles do nothing to further the cause of freedom. In recent months we have seen some tentative, but hopeful, signs of a willingness to talk, and we hope this is only the beginning.

So, while I salute those individuals who fought for Irish freedom 75 years ago, I also call for an end to the fighting in Ireland today and a continuation of the peace process. While the Irish rebels of 1916 fought with ideals that all Americans could understand and respect, those who kill today, on both sides, have no such lofty principles and earn no such respect.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. MANTON, for arranging for this special order today so that we may take the time to reflect on the events of an Easter Monday in Dublin 75 years ago.

On that day, a small army of Irish rebels and patriots undertook an effort which was doomed from the start. These men, numbering less than 2,000, took possession of the main post office in Dublin, raised the tricolor flag and declared Irish independence from Great Britain.

Their occupation of that building, along with several others in Dublin, lasted only a week. When the surrender order was given, 64 rebels and 134 soldiers and police were dead. But the highest toll was among civilians. Over 200 dead and 600 wounded. Initial public reaction was anger toward the rebels, who were held responsible for the destruction and death.

However, that anger was redirected toward the British when 4 days after the rebellion was crushed, the British began executing the ring-leaders. The 16 men executed became martyrs in the eyes of the public; and, by their deaths, gave the revolution the widespread support which it was unable to attain during the occupation.

Most of the men who planned and led the uprising never knew of the success of the rebellion or of its long-term effects. A new wave of nationalism swept Ireland, and one of the rebels, Eamon de Valera, became the Prime Minister and President of independent Ireland.

Today, Ireland is moving closer toward talks on the future of Northern Ireland. The spirit of independence must burn as fiercely as it did 75 years ago. However, the proof of triumph today will be in negotiations and a resolution without bloodshed. For as we ourselves have seen in recent months, armed conflict has appropriately been defined as failed negotiations.

Ireland deserves to be rid of the turmoil and bloodshed it has endured for so many years. The revolution for Irish independence which started 75 years ago must be ended without further loss of life. This, indeed, would be a tribute to those leaders of the Easter rising of 1916.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rebellion. Under the leadership of Sir Roger Casement a nationalist rebellion in support of Irish independence was scheduled for Easter Sunday, 1916, but on Good Friday of that year, Mr. Casement was arrested by British authorities. Nevertheless, a brave group of nationalists proceeded with the planned uprising and proclaimed the independent Republic of Ireland on Easter Monday, 1916.

Although the Easter Rebellion did not succeed, it began the long fight for an independent Republic of Ireland which continues to this day. The Irish Parliament reaffirmed independence in January 1919, and the British offered dominion status to Ulster and Southern Ireland in December 1921. The Constitution of the Irish Free State, a British dominion, was adopted on December 11, 1922, but Northern Ireland remained part of the United Kingdom. On December 21, 1948, an Irish law declared the country a republic rather than a dominion and withdrew it from the Commonwealth. The British Parliament recognized both actions, but reasserted its claim over Northern Ireland. The results of that claim still tragically haunt us today.

The pain and frustration of the people of Ireland are too familiar to us. The struggle to create an independent Republic of Ireland has brought countless suffering to the people of that beleaguered country, and their fight for independence and democracy still continues.

I hope that we can use the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rebellion to help find a lasting peace for Ireland, and end the suffering of the people of Ireland that has existed for far too long.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Easter Uprising in Dublin, Ireland and also pay tribute to Irish-Americans in my congressional district of Hudson County.

The Easter Uprising, in which a small band of Irish rebels took over the main post office in Dublin and proclaimed the birth of the Irish Republic, was initially unsuccessful. Many of those who participated were arrested and then brutally executed. The Easter Uprising led to events that ended centuries of British Imperial rule throughout most of Ireland.

The daring and spirit of those who took over the Dublin Post Office and declared "The right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies" became an inspiration to people struggling for self-determination. While those who took part in the Easter Rebellion made their mark through armed insurrection, many of their countrymen who came to America made their mark through a different way. These newcomers fought for political empowerment through the ballot box.

They battled prejudice and overcame the obstacles designed to keep them an impoverished minority. In the history of the work and political activities of the Irish in America, one can find the same drive and fighting spirit that led to the proclamation of independence on Easter Sunday, 1916.

This is especially true in Hudson County, NJ.

Hudson County has stood as the gateway to America for many of the Irish. After passing through Ellis Island, many of the new immigrants settled in Hudson County, where they contributed greatly to its industrial, economic, and cultural base.

These new immigrants worked in the factories of Hudson County and on its docks. They formed strong communities and became active in all facets of life in the county, especially politics.

The Irish quickly rose to prominence in many of Hudson County's communities, playing major roles in its political organizations and labor unions and were active participants in the clubs that are such focal points of the community's life.

Many of the descendants of these early immigrants have now moved out of the county, to settle in other parts of the State. But Irish-Americans still make up nearly 9 percent of Hudson County's population.

And although new ethnic groups have moved into the county and are engaged in their own battles for empowerment, the Irish still play an active role in our Government.

While only naming a few, I would like to note some of the Irish who continue to work for the good of our county, State, and Nation through government: Jersey City Mayor Gerald McCann, State Senators Edward O'Connor and Thomas Cowan, Jersey City Councilman William O'Dea, and Hudson County Freeholder Anne O'Malley.

These and many other officials continue today to work for freedom and justice. By remembering the struggle of Easter, 1916, these officials and all Irish are reminded of a time when their forefathers were not free. It is also a reminder that freedom comes with a price. And those who took part in the Easter Rebellion paid that price with their own blood.

I would like to close this tribute, Mr. Speaker and my distinguished colleagues, by quoting from William Butler Yeats' ode to the uprising "Easter 1916."

I write it out in a verse—
MacDonagh and MacBride
and Connally and Pearse.
Now and in time to be,
Wherever green is worn,
Are changed, changed utterly:
A terrible beauty is born.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago, a group of Irish patriots earned a place in history when they staged the Easter Rebellion of 1916. While this rebellion was short lived, it ignited a new explosion of nationalist fervor in Ireland which led within 6 years to the end of British rule over most of Ireland and the rebirth of Ireland as an independent nation.

As Americans, we understand the drive for freedom and independence which motivated those who led and fought in the Easter Rebellion. Our Nation's own war for independence was led by individuals who marshalled public support against a British Government which turned a deaf ear to colonial claims for liberty and overcame loyalist opposition from within the 13 colonies. It is worthwhile to reflect on how radically different our country's history could have been if the British Government had been willing to respond to the demands of the colonialists or if loyalist opposition had been able to deter the drive for independence.

When Patrick Pearse and other Irish nationalists led the Easter Rebellion, they were opposed not only by British arms but also a large number of the Irish people. After decades of struggle for self-determination, many in Ireland had been encouraged by the passage of a home rule law by the British Parliament in 1914. Even though this political victory had been deferred when World War I began, many still held hope for a gradual emergence of home rule.

Still, the legacy of centuries of British domination led a group of Irish nationalists to question the idea that liberty would ever be given freely by the British Government. Rather than wait for the outcome of an uncertain future, these men determined to seize a moment in history to proclaim Irish independence. On Easter Monday in 1916, Patrick Pearse, James Connolly, and some 1,200 other Irishmen began an armed rebellion in the streets of Dublin against British domination.

From the beginning, it was clear that this rebellion offered little hope of success. As a nation mobilized for war in Europe, Great Britain had ample military resources to crush the Easter Rebellion. In addition, those who led the rebellion had not mobilized Irish national opinion behind the cause of armed rebellion.

After a week of battles in the streets of Dublin, the Easter Rebellion was put down by the overwhelming force of British troops. Patrick Pearse emerged from within the barricaded General Post Office building to surrender himself and his men to British authorities.

The toll of the Easter Rebellion was significant. Some 64 rebels and 134 soldiers and police had been killed and scores more had been wounded. Still more tragic was the suffering inflicted on the civilian population of Dublin, with roughly 200 killed and over 600 wounded. While this moment in Irish history was cause for great mourning, its ultimate significance lay in the aftermath of the rebellion.

Within days of crushing the rebellion, British authorities began executing the leaders of this nationalist uprising. The first to be executed

was Patrick Pearse and the last, 9 days later, was James Connolly, who was shot while sitting in a chair because of the wound he had suffered during the revolt. In the end, 16 men were put to death by British authorities who sought to smother the flame of Irish nationalism. Instead, these men joined the ranks of martyrs in the cause of Irish independence.

The result was an outburst of popular support for an immediate end to British control over Ireland. This wave of public demands for independence was fed by a general disgust over the executions of the leaders of the Easter Rebellion. In many ways, this growth in support for full Irish independence mirrors the period of the American Revolution when the outcry over the Boston massacre led many to accept the fact that British domination must be overturned. The end result was similar in both nations: Men took up arms and engaged in a lengthy period of armed combat to seize the rights of liberty and independence for their nations.

Today the Republic of Ireland exists as a free and sovereign nation. This fact has its roots in the events of the Easter Rebellion and its aftermath. Still, the path to independence was shaped also by the decisions taken in London over the decades preceding the Easter Rebellion and decisions taken long after. The denial of home rule and the withdrawal of this promise after it had been finally made in 1914 followed a pattern that over the centuries had led many in Ireland to dismay over the chances of taking a peaceful road to independence.

The Easter Rebellion was one borne in large part out of this distrust in the will of a great power to give up dominion over a subject nation. This distrust is one which our Founding Fathers knew well. We see this same distrust in the eyes of the Kurds who seek to gain at least some measure of autonomy from the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein.

Seventy-five years after the Easter Rebellion, many in Ireland continue to struggle for their belief that British control over Ireland should end. In the end, this decision will be made by the people of Ireland. Whatever the final result, we hope that it will be achieved through peaceful means. The legacy of the Easter Rebellion shows what can be borne of decades of denial and distrust. We should remember the Easter Rebellion because it stands as a point in time when anger and distrust overcame hopes for a peaceful settlement. We should also remember the Easter Rebellion because it serves as a reminder of what a people denied their liberties and independence can be moved to attempt.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rebellion, and I thank my cochairman of the Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs for arranging this opportunity to do so.

At this point, I would like to submit for the record a copy of an article from the Easter edition of the Washington Post, entitled, "A Dublin Easter, 75 Years On." This article relates the story of 1,200 brave Irishmen who rose up on the morning after Easter 1916, against the British troops which occupied their country. They were outnumbered, underarmed, and extremely disorganized, and

sadly, they knew their revolution was doomed from the start. They held out for nearly a week, but in the end, 64 rebels and 220 civilians were dead, more than 600 were injured, and hundreds of others were led away in chains.

While this sounds like a tragic tale, the efforts of these rebels led by a union leader, James Connolly, and a school headmaster, Patrick Pearse, were not in vain. This small, defiant uprising began a movement which within 6 years, brought about an end to British rule in most of the island and gave birth to the Republic of Ireland.

Today, British troops still occupy the six counties of Northern Ireland. While there have not been any uprisings in recent history such as the Easter Rebellion of 1916, periodic incidents of violence do continue. This was prophesized in a statement by Patrick Pearse before his execution. He said, "If you strike us down now, we shall rise again and renew the fight. You cannot conquer Ireland; you cannot extinguish the Irish passion for freedom."

The Irish now face an unprecedented opportunity to bring a lasting peace to that troubled nation. British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Peter Brooke, has announced that there is now a basis for formal political talks to achieve a new beginning for relationships within Northern Ireland, within the island of Ireland and between the people of Ireland and Britain. I only hope that more will be accomplished with words than were with bullets.

A DUBLIN EASTER, 75 YEARS ON—THE "TERRIBLE BEAUTY" OF IRELAND'S 1916 RISING HAUNTS THE MODERN WORLD YET

(By Glenn Frankel)

DUBLIN.—On the morning after Easter 75 years ago, some 1,200 brave and foolhardy Irishmen rose to challenge the might of the British Empire on the streets of Dublin. Within a week their wildly disorganized rebellion was crushed, dozens were killed and hundreds marched off in chains. But within six years their lonely act of defiance helped bring an end to British rule in most of the island and the birth of the Republic of Ireland.

The men and women who fought in the Easter Rising have long gone to their graves, but the buildings they seized and fought from remain, standing straight as soldiers and scattered like monuments across the urban landscape of modern Dublin. The memory remains too, complex, ambiguous and dangerous. It haunts modern Ireland and the modern world as well.

The government of Ireland will commemorate the 75th anniversary this weekend with a brief ceremony, a new postage stamp and a large measure of ambivalence. Officials say that at a time when talks are soon to open over the future of Northern Ireland, they do not want to be seen celebrating an event that could be exploited by the outlawed Irish Republican Army as justification for its own violent campaign to oust British rule from the province.

"The right note has to be struck—dignified and low-key, without in any way allowing it to be misinterpreted," said a government spokesman.

But those who sympathize with the IRA will stage a series of parades and social events designed to celebrate the rising and to declare themselves the rightful heirs of a revolutionary tradition whose ultimate goal of an independent and united Ireland they see as betrayed by the conservative South.

Its critics contend that by its inaction, the government is effectively allowing radicals to hijack the rising.

"Instead of putting forward a mature analysis of the rising, the government is trying to sweep it under the carpet," says Tim Pat Coogan, a historian and author of a new biography of Michael Collins, a leader of the Irish independence struggle who fought in the revolt. "But by running away from it, they undercut the historical and philosophical underpinnings of the country and they leave the field open to the IRA and its supporters."

The rising, which took place just a year before the Russian Revolution, was both the last child of 19th-century romantic nationalism and the father of a new kind of urban guerrilla warfare. And like the Boer War in South Africa a decade earlier, it demonstrated that in the modern struggle for nationhood, victory did not automatically go to those who won the shooting war.

Its leaders knew the rising was doomed before it started—one of them, labor union leader James Connolly, somberly told a friend, "We are going out to be slaughtered" as he prepared his paramilitary Irish Volunteers on the morning of the revolt. Because of divisions in their own ranks and a series of almost comic blunders, most rebel supporters outside of Dublin had been instructed to stay at home. Meanwhile, a German ship loaded with guns and ammunition for the revolt lingered for three days off the Irish shore, waiting in vain for someone to collect the arsenal, and finally scuttled itself when faced with capture.

Nonetheless at exactly noon, Connolly and Patrick Pearse, the school headmaster who served as official commander of the rising, led their men and a pushcart, full of weapons up Sackville Street, Dublin's main commercial thoroughfare, to the stately General Post Office. Within minutes the green, white and orange Irish tricolor was waving from the roof and Pearse stood out front, reading a proclamation of independence to a largely indifferent crowd of passersby.

On a recent blustery afternoon, Coogan retraced the steps of the rebels through the streets of downtown Dublin past some of the principal sites of the rising, including: St. Stephen's Green, central Dublin's foremost park, which the Volunteers occupied and barricaded, then quickly abandoned for the nearby Royal College of Surgeons building after loyalist snipers poured rifle fire from the adjacent Shelburne Hotel; City Hall, where the rebels traded fire with soldiers in neighboring Dublin Castle, seat of imperial rule in Ireland; and Parnell Square, where the captured Volunteers were held on the night they surrendered. Many of these sites are still pockmarked by bullet holes.

Still, the General Post Office was the main focus and symbol of the rising. Pearse, Connolly and a few dozen men held out for nearly a week as the British commander, Gen. Sir John Maxwell, poured withering artillery and machine gun fire at the building and the surrounding area. Finally, on a Saturday afternoon, Pearse emerged from the burnt shell to surrender his sword, while a messenger went around to the other sites to pass the order to submit.

Some 64 rebels and 134 soldiers and police had been killed and hundreds more wounded. But the biggest toll was among civilians: at least 220 dead and more than 600 injured. Sackville Street, today renamed as O'Connell Street, lay in ruins. A photograph shows dazed onlookers walking through a desolate cityscape that looked like San Francisco after the 1906 earthquake.

At first public reaction was one of anger and scorn for the rebels who were held responsible for the destruction and the bloodshed. Many who had relatives fighting for Britain in World War I were incensed that the volunteers had sought to take advantage of the conflict and had allied themselves with Germany. As the captives were marched in chains through the streets of Dublin, they were jeered and pelted with garbage.

"They were regarded just as the Provisional IRA is regarded today," says Coogan. "They would have been torn limb from limb if it had not been for their English guards."

Then the government made a crucial miscalculation. Four days after the revolt was crushed, it began executing the ringleaders. Beginning with Pearse and ending, nine days later, with Connolly, who was shot while strapped to a chair because of a bullet wound he had suffered during the revolt.

Altogether, 16 were executed, transformed overnight in the public eye from bloody-minded fools to martyrs for a cause. "A terrible beauty is born," wrote W.B. Yeats in one of the hundreds of poems inspired by the rising.

Every Irish school child, it seemed, memorized Pearse's address to the court martial that condemned him. "If you strike us down now, we shall rise again and renew the fight," he told the judges. "You cannot conquer Ireland; you cannot extinguish the Irish passion for freedom."

The Irish moderates who had preached peaceful accommodation within the empire were soon vanquished by younger, more ruthless graduates of the rising. Michael Collins, who fought inside the post office and was pardoned after serving six months in prison, became commander of a guerrilla army that used assassination and ambush to stalemate and eventually drive out British forces. Eamon de Valera, a school teacher who had held off British forces for a week at a local mill during the rising, became political leader of the republican forces and eventually prime minister and president of independent Ireland. He helped negotiate the deal that led to partition—and ultimately to the era of civil strife in Northern Ireland that began in 1969.

Virtually all of modern Ireland's main political parties owe their birth to figures who participated in the rising. Nonetheless, the General Post Office this past week was swathed in scaffolding as work continued on a long-term restoration project. The plaque marking the reading of the independence proclamation was discretely hidden behind construction materials and cordoned off from public view.

"The government is acting a bit shamefaced about the whole thing," says Coogan. "You get the feeling they'd like it better if the anniversary didn't exist. But you ignore history at your peril, especially in Ireland."

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rising, one of the most important events in Irish history. In particular, I would like to thank Congressman TOM MANTON, one of the cochairmen of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, for calling us together for this special event.

On Easter morning in 1916, 1,200 Irish citizens rose to declare the independence of the Irish Republic. These rebels certainly did not fit the image of the stereotypical rebel. They were not trained soldiers driven by revolutionary ideology. These rebels were school teachers, poets, and union leaders—ordinary Irish folk who simply sought a national identity.

The leaders of the rising knew from the start that their audacious insurrection was destined to be crushed, but proceeded nonetheless. James Connolly, the labor union leader who organized the rising, told a friend, "We are going out to be slaughtered," as he prepared his Irish Volunteers. Indeed, the disorganized rebellion was crushed by British troops, but this brief act of defiance helped to bring about the end of British rule throughout most of Ireland.

At exactly noon on that Easter day, Connolly and Patrick Pearse, a school headmaster, lead their men up to Sackville Street, Dublin's main thoroughfare, to the general post office. Within minutes, the Irish tricolor was waving from the roof, and Pearse proclaimed the independence of Ireland to a crowd of passersby.

Meanwhile, the Irish Volunteers occupied and barricaded St. Stephen's Green, Dublin's main park. After loyalist snipers fired upon the volunteers from the adjacent Shelburne Hotel, the Volunteers abandoned the park for the Royal College of Surgeons building. Other Volunteers occupied city hall, where they were fired upon by British soldiers from Dublin Castle, the seat of imperial rule in Ireland.

At the general post office, Pearse, Connolly, and a few dozen men held out for nearly a week as the British commander, Sir John Maxwell, bombarded the building and surrounding areas with artillery and machinegun fire. Finally, Pearse emerged from the post office to surrender, while a messenger went to the other sites to pass the order to submit.

Dublin lay in ruins, and the casualties resulting from the rebellion were astounding. Some 64 rebels and 134 soldiers and police had been killed, and hundreds more had been wounded. In addition, 220 civilians were killed in the conflict. Any visitor walking through the streets of Dublin today can still see the bullet hole pockmarks on the buildings that were occupied by the rebels.

During the rising, most of Dublin's citizens were indifferent to the cause of the rebels, regarding them as foolhardy amateurs. While the Irish were shocked at the level of bloodshed involved in the suppression of the rising, they mostly blamed the rebels. In fact, as the captives were marched in chains through the streets of Dublin, they were jeered and pelted with garbage.

But Ireland's anger quickly shifted to the British Government when it began to impose its vengeful sentence on the participants of the rising. Four days after the revolt was crushed, the British executed 15 rebel leaders—one by one—beginning with Pearse and ending 9 days later with Connolly. The executions quickly transformed the public perception of these rebel leaders. The poets, school teachers, and labor leaders, who dared to face the consequences of standing up to the mighty British Empire, were now, in the eyes of the Irish, martyrs for a just cause.

The Easter Rising lasted less than a week, but its impact on Ireland's future was dynamic. What started as a small rebellion sparked a full-scale war, the effects of which are brutally evident today. After the rebellion, British rulers imposed martial law, which led to a 2-year civil war throughout the countryside. The British recruited a supplementary army, the Black and

Tans, to suppress rebellion and restore order. The rebellion then reached its climax on Bloody Sunday, November 21, 1920, when British troops fired indiscriminately at a soccer crowd, killing a dozen and wounding many more.

Finally, in 1921, the British compromised with Irish rebels and took the first step toward the recognition of Irish sovereignty. A treaty was signed creating an Irish Free State as a self-governing dominion. Later, Dublin's remaining ties to the British Empire were severed, and the Republic of Ireland was proclaimed.

There were, of course, unfortunate consequences to this treaty. In return for Irish independence, the British retained rule over the six counties in Northern Ireland. Today, while their neighbors to the south enjoy peace and self-rule, the residents of the six counties continue to live in a state of unrest.

As we commemorate this momentous event in Irish history, we should not forget its important lessons. As Patrick Pearse proclaimed shortly before his execution: "You cannot conquer Ireland, you cannot extinguish the Irish passion for freedom." These words are as relevant today in Northern Ireland as they were 75 years ago in Dublin.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the lessons of the Easter Rising will help us to better understand the conflict now occurring in Northern Ireland. I am sure you join me in my hopes that this conflict will someday be peacefully resolved and that all Irish citizens will enjoy the benefits of freedom and independence.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on the 75th anniversary of the Easter Rebellion, to recognize the bravery of the individuals who fought for Irish freedom.

Few events in Irish history have been as momentous as the 1916 Easter Rebellion, the day which marks the beginning of Ireland's War of Independence. While the treaty that ended the war in 1921 left in its wake persistent problems—civil war and partition—which are cruelly apparent today, this should not impede our efforts to recognize the 1,200 brave Irish rebels and patriots who were committed to the principle of Irish independence.

This small band of teachers, poets, and trade unionists proclaimed the birth of the Irish Republic and the end of England's imperial rule when they took possession of the main post office in Dublin, 75 years ago. Tragically, their rebellion was short-lived. The British arrested all participants and executed every leader in the uprising, including Sir Roger Casement, who was hanged for high treason. The rebellion was crushed within a week and hundreds were marched off in chains.

Following the implementation of martial law, the rebels formed an underground army. The violence reached a climax November 21, 1920, known as Bloody Sunday, when British troops fired indiscriminately at a soccer crowd, killing a dozen and wounding many more.

Despite the great odds against defeating the British Army, which was the mightiest and best armed force in the world at the time, those 1,200 men and women who led the rebellion on Easter Monday began a historic chain of events that ultimately led to an independent Republic of Ireland.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to participate in this special order in recognition of those who died 75 years ago in the Easter Rebellion. Their singular act of defiance helped lead to the birth of the Republic of Ireland.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in today's commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the 1916 Easter Rebellion in Dublin.

Over the years, historians have described that ill-fated uprising as a makeshift effort by Irish patriots to throw off the yoke of British rule.

Few would deny that the nearly 1,700 volunteers who stormed the General Post Office and other government buildings on that Easter Monday in 1916 were poorly armed and badly organized. Their rifles were no match for British artillery and machineguns, which mowed down the rebels during their 6-day revolt.

Not long after the April 24 uprising was crushed, the British Government ordered the executions of 15 rebel leaders. However, the organizers of the Easter Rebellion, including James Connolly, Patrick Pearse, and Tom Clarke, did not die in vain. In fact, by making themselves martyrs to the cause of Irish autonomy, their deaths galvanized public support behind the drive for independence. This movement culminated in a 30-month war from 1919 to 1921 that led to the signing of an autonomy treaty with Britain. Today, the Easter Rebellion endures as a symbol of dedication to the cause of Irish independence.

Sadly, we now know that the removal of British troops in 1922 did not bring peace to Ireland. Injustices remain today in an Ireland that is divided by political and religious conflicts. Civil strife regularly erupts into violence between Protestants and Catholics in the six counties of Northern Ireland, which is still tied to Britain. Disputes also rage between the people of Northern Ireland and those citizens who live in the independent Republic of Ireland, which is located in the south. This Congress owes it to the heroes of the Irish Rebellion to make every effort we can to help bring peace to the troubled nation of Ireland.

For example, we must make our concerns known to the British Government on human rights issues such as the case of six Irishmen who were falsely accused in 1974 of complicity in a terrorist bombing in Birmingham, England. Those men spent almost 17 years in jail before regaining their freedom last month.

In the United States, prompt action is needed to settle the case of Joe Doherty, an Irishman who is imprisoned here. Mr. Doherty hopes to gain political asylum to protect him from British authorities. U.S. law enforcement officials have kept Mr. Doherty in jail for nearly 8 years, although they have never charged him with a crime.

On a more positive note, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the spirit of success symbolized by the tens of thousands of Irish immigrants who have contributed so much to our great country.

One son of an Irish immigrant who has achieved great success in America is Michael J. Roarty, a business executive from St. Louis who was recently named "Irish-American Man of the Year" by the magazine *Irish America*.

Born in Detroit, Mr. Roarty now serves as executive vice president for corporate marketing and communications at Anheuser-Busch Co. Mr. Roarty has received numerous professional awards in the field of marketing, and he also has earned praise for volunteer work with charitable groups such as the Cystic Fibrosis Association.

Finally, once again I would like to pay tribute to the independence movement that inspired the 1916 Easter Rebellion in Dublin. As for the people in today's Ireland, I pray that a peaceful solution can be found to resolve that nation's political and religious conflicts.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the Easter rebellion in Ireland. I would like to take a moment to recognize the importance of the Easter rebellion in the history of Ireland.

Seventy-five years ago, the Irish Republican Brotherhood and James Connolly's Citizen Army joined to rise against British rule and to obtain independence for Ireland. This small group of rebels bravely fought for these ideals for 6 days during the week of Easter. At the time, their efforts were not supported by the Irish populace and were quickly crushed by the government. Most of these courageous individuals were executed, imprisoned, or deported, along with others who had not participated in the uprising. Indeed, the government's harsh response to the rebellion led to a swing in popular support for the rebels and for Sinn Fein. The Republican majority of Ireland's members in Britain's Parliament then refused to meet with the other members in England, and the Anglo-Irish war ensued. Almost 3 years of conflict resulted in the Irish-British Treaty, which established the independent Irish Free State.

Clearly, the Easter rebellion played a monumental role in changing the direction of Irish history, and I am certain that my colleagues here in the House join me in honoring the 75th anniversary of this historic event.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in marking the 75th anniversary of Ireland's Easter rising. This 1916 rising against British rule has been called by some, "the last child of 19th-century romantic nationalism"; but this child did not die when Patrick Pearse and James Connolly were executed for their thirst for national identity. The romantic nationalism which played itself out on the streets of Dublin in 1916 lives on today in Ireland and among proud Irish-Americans here in the United States.

When Pearse and Connolly unfurled the green, white, and orange colors of Ireland at Dublin's General Post Office that Easter Monday 75 years ago, they gave voice and vision to a centuries-old Irish spirit which no bullet could smother. Before the court martial which would condemn him to death, Patrick Pearse said, "You cannot conquer Ireland; you cannot extinguish the Irish passion for freedom." It was this "live free or die" determination of common, Irish teachers, poets, and trade unionists which won Ireland self-governing dominion in 1921. It is a similar determination for justice which compels the Irish and their friends here in the United States Congress to continue the untiring struggle against British

repression of the Irish Catholic minority in Northern Ireland.

Recently, this struggle has realized some important victories. After 16 years of wrongful imprisonment, the "Birmingham Six" were at last granted their freedom on March 14. In the 101st Congress, I sponsored a congressional resolution calling for an investigation into the 1974 Birmingham bombings and urging that the conviction of the six men wrongly held responsible be quashed. Now that these men have been freed and justice has finally prevailed, I am hopeful that the British judicial system will look inward and guarantee that such gross abuses of human rights and equal justice do not occur in the future.

The case of Joe Doherty indicates that the United States judicial system has some housecleaning of its own to do before we can truthfully claim to support fully the rights of the Irish. Mr. Doherty, from Belfast, has been incarcerated in New York City for nearly 8 years without being charged for any violation of American criminal law. He has been denied by the U.S. Attorney General his right to a hearing on his request for political asylum. In Congress, I have asserted Mr. Doherty's right to a hearing because I believe our constitutional rights to due process and equality under the law are fundamental, universal principles not subject to the political agenda of passing administrations. In 1980, Congress passed the Refugee Act to protect the rights of asylum seekers to full and fair hearings on the merits of their claims. Consistent with the Congress intent in approving the Refugee Act, I am pleased to join the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs in submitting to the United States Supreme Court an *amicus curiae* brief which argues Mr. Doherty's right to an asylum hearing. I am encouraged by the Supreme Court's decision to hear case of Joe Doherty and I am hopeful that Mr. Doherty's claims will soon be judiciously resolved.

During his recent visit to the Capitol, His Holiness the XIV Dalai Lama of Tibet reminded us that peace, in the sense of the absence of war, is meaningless to someone who is cold and hungry. The disenfranchised, impoverished, and chronically unemployed Catholic families of Northern Ireland know the truth of this statement all too well. For decades, British policy in Northern Ireland has generated poverty and despair for the Irish Catholic minority. Legislation has been introduced in the United States Congress to ensure that our own business practices in Northern Ireland do not abet and perpetuate religious discrimination against Irish Catholics. I am proud to cosponsor once again legislation enforcing the MacBride principles for fair employment practices in Northern Ireland. H.R. 856 calls upon United States companies doing business in Northern Ireland to comply with the MacBride principles which seek to end workplace discrimination against Irish Catholics. A second bill, H.R. 87, further stipulates that organizations receiving financial support from the American contribution to the International Fund for Ireland would be required to abide by the MacBride principles. America's tax dollars must not be party to religious discrimination in any form against any people.

Not only is the Catholic minority in Northern Ireland victimized by institutional job discrimi-

nation, but tragically, Catholics are also subject to the indiscriminate violence of illegal paramilitary groups. Last year, it was disclosed that British security forces have cooperated with these paramilitary groups in their attacks against civilians. It is incumbent upon United States Congress to speak out publicly against these crimes and the British Government's complicity. I have cosponsored H.R. 88, which makes a policy statement by the Congress deploring all violence in Northern Ireland and imposes a statutory ban on United States sales of defense articles and crime control equipment to the Royal Ulster Constabulary [RUC] and the Ulster Defense Regiment [UDR]. The bill also requires the State Department to investigate further the extent to which the RUC, UDR, and United Kingdom militias cooperate with the illegal paramilitary groups in Northern Ireland.

The time has come when a new world order must be built upon an unwavering commitment to the respect of basic human rights. Stability alone must not be the objective of U.S. foreign policies, and strategic interests should not blind us to repression and human suffering. As a free and democratic nation, we have a responsibility to speak up for human rights in all corners of the globe, including Northern Ireland.

I am pleased today to give voice and volume to the concerns of the proud Irish-American community in my upstate New York district. The Irish-Americans of the greater Rochester area are an active group committed to the pursuit of justice for their brothers and sisters in Ireland. I am honored to represent them in Congress and am proud to join them in this noble pursuit.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today we remember an event in Irish history equivalent to July 4, 1776. On Easter Monday 75 years ago, just over 1,000 Irish nationalists ignited the struggle for freedom in British controlled Ireland. While their initial struggle was quelled by an overwhelming British armed force, the Easter rebellion, as the conflict is known today, was the opening salvo in Ireland's fight for independence.

Immediately following the uprising, many were outraged at the freedom fighters for a failed rebellion that led to the death of over 200 civilians. Additionally, many were disgraced that the rebellions faction was aligned with Germany, who at the time was at war with England. However, when those responsible for the revolt were mercilessly executed, public sentiment immediately turned against the ruling British Government and the revolution that was silenced again erupted. On December 11, 1922, 6 years after the quest for Irish independence began, the constitution of the Irish Free State was adopted.

Usually, an anniversary marking 75 years of freedom is cause for merriment and celebration. However, negotiations between the Governments of Britain and Ireland and the political parties of Northern Ireland, are slated to soon take place. It is imperative that the Easter rebellion is indeed remembered but the peace in Northern Ireland is fragile. I applaud the Government of Ireland for properly recognizing the delicate nature of current events, while at the same time appropriately recognizing the founding of Irish independence.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman TOM MANTON for calling this special order, one that is truly special to Irish-Americans. Also, I am urging all House Members to support the promising developments in Northern Ireland and promote the call for peace and justice in the region.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to join my esteemed colleague from New York, Congressman THOMAS MANTON, in tribute and memory to the brave Irish rebellion of 1916.

While I am not Irish, I feel very close to the people and events of the Easter rising, as it is known. The bravery and suffering, the lonely act of defiance amidst continuing oppression resonate in the history of every people.

Seventy-five years ago on Easter Monday in Dublin, a small but fiercely brave band of Irish patriots took control of the general post office in the center of town, proclaiming independence from Great Britain and the birth of an Irish Republic.

These were unlikely rebels: teachers, trade unionists, and poets led by a schoolmaster who never expected to win, they hauled what few weapons they had in a pushcart. The pitched battle ranged from the beautiful St. Stephen's Green to city hall to Dublin Castle, seat of the British Empire in Ireland.

For 7 days the rebels withheld against the awesome might of the British Empire, which poured artillery and machinegun fire into them. When they finally surrendered, the central part of Dublin had been reduced to rubble. The buildings that remain today still bear the scars and bullet holes of the fight.

The brutality of the British should be remembered. Four days after accepting the surrender, the British began executing the rebel leaders, including a wounded man who had to be propped up in a chair in order to be shot.

But the Irish refused to relinquish their dream of independence. As the rebel leader Patrick Pearse said to his executioners, "If you strike us down now, we shall rise again and renew the fight. You cannot conquer Ireland; you cannot extinguish the Irish passion for freedom."

And so, like the Americans before them and the Indians after them, the Irish continued the struggle. In 1921, Britain conceded to creating an autonomous Irish Free State that later became the Republic of Ireland.

Seventy-five years ago, hundreds of Irish lost their lives in the Easter rising. Let us now today honor their struggle against colonial repression and massacre, their emergence from prison to liberty, and their tenacious grasp on freedom. And let us look with greater concern to the many peoples still oppressed in countries throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I close with the following poem by William Butler Yeats, "Easter, 1916":

EASTER 1916

(By William Butler Yeats)

I have met them at close of day
Coming with vivid faces
From counter or desk among grey
Eighteenth-century houses.
I have passed with a nod of the head
Or polite meaningless words,
Or have lingered awhile and said
Polite meaningless words,
And thought before I had done
Or a mocking tale or a gibe

To please a companion
Around the fire at the club,
Being certain that they and I
But lived where motley is worn:
All changed, changed utterly:
A terrible beauty is born.

That woman's days were spent
In ignorant good-will,
Her nights in argument
Until her voice grew shrill.
What voice more sweet than hers
When, young and beautiful,
She rode to harriers?
This man had kept a school
And rode our winged horse;
This other his helper and friend
Was coming into his force;
He might have won fame in the end,
So sensitive his nature seemed,
So daring and sweet his thought.
This other man I had dreamed
A drunken, vainglorious lout.
He had done most bitter wrong
To some who are near my heart,
Yet I number him in the song;
He, too, has resigned his part
In the casual comedy;
He, too, has been changed in his turn,
Transformed utterly:
A terrible beauty is born.

Hearts with one purpose alone
Through summer and winter seem
Enchanted to a stone
To trouble the living stream.
The horse that comes from the road,
The rider, the birds that range
From cloud to tumbling cloud,
Minute by minute they change;
A shadow of cloud on the stream
Changes minute by minute;
A horse-hoof slides on the brim,
And a horse plashes within it;
The long-legged moor-hens dive,
And hens to moor-cocks call;
Minute by minute they live:
The stone's in the midst of all.

Too long a sacrifice
Can make a stone of the heart.
O when may it suffice?
That is Heaven's part, our part
To murmur name upon name,
As a mother names her child
When sleep at last has come
On limbs that had run wild.
What is it but nightfall?
No, no, not night but death;
Was it needless death after all?
For England may keep faith
For all that is done and said.
We know their dream; enough
To know they dreamed and are dead;
And what if excess of love
Bewildered them till they died?
I write it out in a verse—
MacDonagh and MacBride
And Connolly and Pearse
Now and in time to be,
Wherever green is worn,
Are changed, changed utterly:
A terrible beauty is born.

There was no objection.

□ 1650

A PROCESS FOR A SUCCESSFUL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAROCCO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk today about a process for a successful America. I believe it is possible to have a process for success, success both for Americans as individuals and families and communities, for Americans as workers and businesses, and for America as a country. I believe that that process is very different from an agenda. I believe it is not possible for us to develop an agenda in the near future, because, frankly, people in Washington do not know enough to reform health care and education and the welfare state, to reform the inner city, to reform our process of dealing with drugs and violent crime, or to reform the bureaucracy on the scale we would like.

So I want to suggest very strongly to Members that we need to shift our thinking from developing an agenda, to developing a process. I will come back to that concept of "process" as I outline these ideas.

I think we also have to recognize that a great deal of the current agenda in Washington is an agenda that props up the failures of the past, an agenda based on the special interests that dominate the city of Washington, that dominate many of our biggest cities, and that those special interests are wedded to a process of protecting their particular activities, their particular jobs, their particular positions of power and prestige, at the expense of the country, and at the expense of the American people.

Finally, I want to suggest today that by following a process which can lead to a successful America for the future, we cannot only serve the national interests, but we can help individual Americans; that each individual American can have a better chance to have a good job, a better chance to have adequate health care, a better chance to be truly educated, a better chance to live in a safe neighborhood, by following a process for a successful America.

One of the things which should most encourage us as a nation is the recent result in Iraq of the Desert Storm campaign to drive Saddam Hussein and his army out of Kuwait.

We saw in 5½ weeks of bombing and 100 hours of ground war one of the most decisive victories in military history. We saw a victory in which a 21st century military defeated a 20th century military. We saw a victory in which literally the allied coalition, led by Gen-

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAROCCO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

eral Schwarzkopf, in a plan approved by General Powell and Secretary Cheney and by President Bush, decisively defeated an opponent who never fully understood the resources, the techniques, the doctrine we use, to drive them off the battlefield.

Probably in the history of warfare, there has never been a more one-sided victory than the alliance loss of 400 individuals in return for 60,000 captured Iraqis and over 100,000 dead Iraqis.

Yet, Gen. Royal Moore of the Marine Corps pointed out, the Chief of Aviation for the Marines in the Persian Gulf, that this is a victory that was 1 percent smart weapons, and 99 percent smart people; that it was the mechanics who maintained the Tomahawk missile or the Stealth fighter bomber or the M-1 tank; it was the logistician who got the food and fuel and water and ammunition to the right place at the right time; it was the photo analyst who read the satellite photography and made sure that we had either hit a target or ordered another bombing attack against a particular target; it was the planner, the leader, the coordinator, who brought together 28 different countries and alliances; it was the people who made a difference.

In fact, the allied team as a team, was so much superior to the Iraqi team, that if we had swapped sides, if we had swapped equipment, a week before the war, we still would have won, although it would have taken longer. But it was the quality of the human beings which mattered.

That, I think, poses a tremendous challenge to the American people. Because the objective fact is that we today have a failed bureaucratic welfare state, most obvious in the inner city, but with manifestations everywhere, a welfare state which has weakened America with schools that produce people who are still illiterate when they graduate and has all too many people dropping out of school, particularly in the inner city; a welfare state that has failed in the very process of welfare, by creating a system which discourages work and encourages dependency, which undermines the very moral code which is necessary, and the cultural values which are necessary, for people to be productive and self-governing.

We have a welfare state which has failed because it produced a health care system which is too expensive, too chaotic, in which bureaucrats increasingly are replacing health care professionals as the decisionmakers, and in which all too many Americans are undercovered or not covered at all, while other Americans are paying too much for their health care.

We have a welfare state that has failed to produce a healthy, safe, and productive inner city, and, in fact, has abandoned large parts of the inner city

to barbarism, violent crime, and drug addiction.

So, all of us as Americans have to confront that the time has come to replace the bureaucratic welfare state with a more powerful model.

My suggestion today is that we approach that process of replacement by developing a process for a successful America; that we accept the reality that we here in Washington frankly do not know enough, that we are not going to be able to develop any series of magic legislation which in and of itself is going to replace the welfare state, but that what we can do, what we are capable of doing, is initiating a process by which 250 million Americans, day after day, find better ways of doing things, more successful procedures, more effective activities, and, by investing in success, that we can in fact over the next few years, dramatically improve education, health, replace the current welfare system with a workfare system that helps human beings, and regain our inner city streets and neighborhoods and make them safe once again for human beings.

In that setting, I want to suggest that if you study what has worked in America in the past, it is very clear that there is what I would describe as a circle of American success, which you can literally represent as a circle with two lines crossing each other, dividing the circle into four parts.

That circle of American success, I think, does have four different quadrants or four different areas. The first one is technology. You think of it as going around the clock. The section that runs from noon to 3 o'clock would be technology. But technology, which is very, very American, technology goes back, for example, to Benjamin Franklin inventing the bifocal lens, inventing the Franklin stove, inventing the lightning rod, founding public libraries, founding volunteer fire departments, founding the American Philosophical Society, the energetic churning idea of developing a better future.

Thomas Edison, with the electric light; the Wright brothers, with aviation; Henry Ford with the assembly line. America has always prospered by inventing a better future faster than anybody else.

Yet, we have to remember in this technology section, that it is about 75 percent human beings, and only 25 percent hardware; that it is learning how to use the computer, learning how to use the most modern medical technology, learning how to use the best equipment, that makes a big difference.

It is far better, as the Japanese discovered and are teaching us once again, it is far better to have workers who are very, very well trained with enthusiasm working an old machine, than it is to have a brand new machine with people who do not quite know how to

use it and are not committed to solving the problem.

So the first section or quadrant of the circle of American success is technology.

The second quadrant, the one running from 3 o'clock down to 6 o'clock, is economic and management principles. Now, it sounds fancy, and yet I think it is very simple. Imagine, I would say to my colleagues, you are invited to go to Russia, now faced with a depression, possibly worse than the 1930's.

Imagine that you were asked to give a speech to the Russian people in which you outlined what you thought would help Russia become prosperous. My guess is that virtually every American, if they were asked to list the 10 most important things Russians could do, would have at least 6 or 7 of those be very similar.

They would say that you have got to have less bureaucracy, less centralization, less redtape. You have to have private property. You have to have incentives for work and for investment. You have to have some kind of free market so prices can be set so people know what they ought to buy and they know what they ought to work for and they know where they ought to invest.

□ 1700

You have to have decentralization so that you do not have office buildings of bureaucrats telling you what to do.

Some broad set of economic and management principles would occur in 90 percent of the American people's list of what the Russians ought to do. Imagine then after you had outlined your list of good ideas for Russia that we called you and we said, "We loved your speech, we think it is terrific, exactly right, but instead of giving your speech to the Russian people, we would like to ask you to go to the Post Office and give it there," or "We would like to ask you to go to the Health Care Financing Administration," or "We would like to ask you to go to the Pentagon or ask you to go to the New York City government." A lot of the audiences when I say that laugh, and yet if our advice and our principles of how to manage the economy and how to manage business, if that advice is good enough to give to Poland, to Hungary, to Czechoslovakia, if that advice is good enough to give to Russia, or the Ukraine, or Latvia or Lithuania, why is it not good enough to take here in America? Why should we not ask our own systems of government from school boards, to county, to city, to State, to Federal to follow the same medicine that we are trying to give to Eastern Europe? And why should we not listen to our own principles?

The third quadrant, from 6 o'clock up to 9 o'clock is quality. Quality is not just producing the best item. Quality is not just creating a Cadillac or a Rolls

Royce. Quality is something much deeper.

I was very, very impressed recently by an opportunity to spend 2½ days with Milliken Industries in their management retreat. They have an annual management retreat and this was the 13th pursuit of excellence retreat. They normally take the top 280 managers for 3½ days, and my wife, Marianne, got to stay for all 3½ days, but I only got to stay for 2½ because we were in session. And I got to see how senior American firms are dealing with the process of management in the age of the computer and the world market, and in competing with the Japanese. And Milliken has just opened a factory in Japan. I was astonished by the degree to which they were working at the process of quality.

Quality is an idea initially developed by Edwards Deming, a man who is now 90 years old and living near Washington, DC. Dr. Deming, born in Wyoming, developed an approach to how human beings can work together to maximize their productivity. This is more than just a gimmick; it is more than just a project or more than just a slogan. It is a fundamentally different way of thinking about human beings working together, thinking about solving problems and thinking about productivity, whether it is industrial or it is service or it is government.

As I watched very sophisticated managers at Milliken working with the problem of quality, and they had worked on it now for over 10 years, I began to understand that this was a fundamental cultural revolution, that quality as preached by Edwards Deming is as big a change for the 21st century as Taylor's concept of scientific management and Henry Ford's invention of the assembly line was for the 20th century, that just as if we were standing at the edge of the 20th century trying to shift from being a carriage maker who is working in hand craft industry to being an automobile manufacturer working with an assembly line, you would have to study Taylor and Ford. Today I believe if you want to compete in the 21st century, if you want to create jobs and pay good salaries in the world market tomorrow you have to study Edwards Deming.

So this concept of quality I think can be broken down into five basic ideas. Dr. Deming in his book has 14 implementation steps, but I think there are five core ideas that basically are for people just getting introduced to the concept, to explain it.

The first is ask the customer what they want, a very important idea. It is the customer who defines quality. After all, if you are going to go to McDonald's, and this is, by the way, something that changes with each individual. If it is the middle of the day and you are going to McDonald's, the definition of quality at McDonald's is

different than if it is Friday evening and you are going to go out for an expensive dinner at a fine restaurant. At McDonald's you value service, you value speed. You want a good, solid, minimum standard hamburger that is quality as defined by the price at McDonald's. If you go out to a gourmet restaurant, you pay a lot more and you expect a totally different experience. So even for the same human being, quality gets redefined all day long, depending on what they are doing and when they are doing it.

So the first principle of quality is finding out what the customer wants. Imagine if we had a government that woke up each morning with the civil service saying, "Gee, I wonder what our customers, the taxpayers, want. I wonder how we should deal with quality as defined by the taxpayer?" It is very important to define quality first, because as Dr. Deming points out, you can very efficiently do the wrong thing and go broke. You can very effectively do the wrong thing and not have anybody buy your product or your service. You can think you are doing exactly what is right based on your training, or what you learned in college, or what you learned in trade school and find out the customer has no interest in it.

So first you have to start, whether the customer is the taxpayer or the Government, or the customer is the paying customer for business, you have to start and ask your customer what do they want.

Second, once you have defined quality, you have to set zero defects as the standard. As Syl Crosby explains it in his book, "Quality Is Free," you want to do the right thing right the first time. It is estimated that somewhere between 17 and 35 percent of all work in America is repairing and redoing something we did wrong the first time, retyping a letter, rebuilding a car, fixing once again a product we almost sent out the door. The whole point of Deming and Crosby is that if you do the right thing right the first time, you save tremendous amounts of lost energy and lost effort. That makes you much more productive, that increases the quality and customer satisfaction, and the result is you have a bigger profit margin to reinvest in a more modern plant to become even more competitive in the future by having better technology.

So if you set zero defects as the right standard, this is not 99.9 percent, the reason is very simple. If you start out in the morning giving yourself some slack, your whole attitude, your whole tone, your whole commitment is different than if you start out in the morning saying I do not want to make a single mistake.

There are corporations in America today which have gotten good enough that they actually have less than three

mistakes per million operations. That is an extraordinary level of quality, and it is doable, and people can get to it, but they have to start by setting the standard at the right level. And zero defects is the right standard.

Third, having defined quality, and having set zero defects as the standard, we want to work to meet the customer's desire in the shortest possible time, what manufacturing calls a cycle. We want the shortest cycle time we can get, and there is a very profound reason for that.

First of all, a short cycle of order to delivery tends to minimize errors, and second, it maximizes customer satisfaction. If you are a customer, and everybody listening knows in your own case when you order something, the sooner they get it to you the happier you are. If that is true when you are the customer, then when you are the worker serving the customer, the same thing ought to be true. The quicker we can deliver, the shorter the cycle time, the happier the customer tends to be.

We discovered a fascinating second fact, and that is that the shorter the cycle from order to delivery, the fewer mistakes that are made. People used to think that if I take a longer time, if I really focus on it, if I really think it through, that will work better. It does not work that way. It turns out that in fact if you can have a very short cycle and really focus on getting the job done, in order to get the job done you have to shorten the number of steps, and the fewer steps you take the better off you are.

Motorola, one of the leaders in quality, reduced their cycle time for orders for a particular beeper they manufacture in a factory in Florida from 42 days to 36 hours. In order to do that they had to take hundreds and hundreds of steps that they used to make, they used to take in order to make the beeper, and they had to compress them, they had to make it simpler, they had to reduce the number of steps so that there are many fewer steps to make the beeper. The result, every step you eliminate will reduce the chance of making an error, and therefore you are better able to get the product out quickly with fewer mistakes.

Fourth, the real improvements that come will come from improving the system rather than on personal behavior. If you focus on improving the system, improving the way you do things, you get about 97 percent of your productivity improvement. Only about 3 percent comes from focusing on people.

The simple, obvious old-fashioned example, imagine somebody who is shoveling with a normal shovel, and you come along with a bulldozer. Huge increases. Not teaching them to shovel faster, not teaching them to shovel better, but giving them an entirely new way of dealing with the problem of moving dirt. The bulldozer is a totally

different league of productivity than a faster shovel.

In a world—in fact most of the history in the world in the 20th century was the process of getting better approaches that were so much more powerful that they eliminated any competition with the prior job, so much of the manual labor of the 19th century disappeared as machines replaced even the fastest and the most skilled worker. The same thing will be true in the 21st century. Thinking through the system by which we do things leads to 97 percent of our improvements in quality and productivity.

□ 1710

Focusing on what the individual person did wrong only improves about 3 percent. Yet, for most of us, most management most of the time focuses on individual behavior, "Why did you make a mistake? Why did you fail to do that correctly," instead of looking at the underlying structure and saying, "Gee, how could I improve the system that you are working in?"

One of the great advantages, frankly, of focusing on systems improvement is that rather than having people hide their mistakes and try to avoid criticism, it encourages people to surface their problems, to bring them out in the open and to talk about what is not working. It encourages them to say, "Gee, here is a systems problem that we have to change," so that management, instead of being angry at workers, works with the workers in what is almost a detective story trying to deduce what solution will make us all more productive.

The last step: The customer has defined quality. We have set zero defects as a standard. We are meeting the delivery in the shortest possible time. We are focusing on improving systems to get the 97-percent improvement of productivity. The last step is the key. Every employee, every worker, every participant has to see themselves as a stakeholder in achieving quality. We have to get across the message to every American, whether you are a civil servant or whether you are a worker in a hospital or whether you work in a factory, that you have a stake personally and your family has a stake in how well we are productive in America, because if your company is not productive, you are going to go out of business, and if you go out of business, you are going to lose your salary, your health care, and your pension. So all of us have an investment, have an interest in being involved as stakeholders.

The Milliken Co., to go back to that example, has worked at the process of involving every worker to such a degree that today they average 23 recommendations for improvement per employee. Just think about that. They have 13,000 employees. They get 300,000 recommendations for how to improve

their company every year. They implement about 90 percent of them. That is 270,000 improvements, and that is over 1,000 changes per working day somewhere in the Milliken Corp.

That gets me to the concept of process. Now, let me say that the Milliken process, which is not to have a giant improvement once a year, but it is to have 1,000 or more improvements every day, not to have an improvement designed by an outside planner or consultant but to have thousands of improvements from people working in the factory, working on the floor, working as salespeople. That process is very different than either the old-time assembly line or the government bureaucracy.

When I talk about the concept of a process, replacing the agenda as the way we focus in Washington, this is one of the key points, that to get to quality you have to involve human beings in a process of constant change and constant improvement and constant growth that requires a personnel attitude, a teamwork, an openness, a management system which is very, very different than the current civil service laws, the current structure of running the Federal Government.

In addition, I want to point out Milliken is not at the top of the list. They are a very, very good American company. In Japan, they would be about middle range for big corporations. Toyota, compared to Milliken's 23 recommendations per employee, Toyota averages 39.

Let us now focus these ideas on the Post Office. What if our goal for the Post Office was not 39, the Toyota standard, was not 23, the Milliken standard; what if our goal for the Post Office was two recommendations per employee for 1991? That would come to about 1,500,000 recommendations. I mean, two recommendations per employee in a system the size of the Post Office is a lot of ideas, 1,500,000 new ideas.

Let us say that we decided that we were not going to try to reach the Milliken goal of 90-percent implementation. We would accept 20 percent for the first year. That is 300,000 changes in the postal system.

That currently would be illegal. We would have to rethink the union contracts. We would have to rethink the system of management. We would have to rethink the civil service laws. We would have to rethink the whole process of the way in which we manage personnel in the Federal Government. It would be a totally different approach.

Yet, you are never going to get to the kind of productivity we need in the postal system to compete with United Parcel Service, to compete with Federal Express, to deliver the mail as efficiently and as effectively as is possible technically in the modern world. You will never get there without going to

some kind of process of quality and some kind of encouragement.

The reason is very practical. Nowadays, for most companies, we hire a consultant. We bring them in, and they fly in first class, they stay in a nice hotel, they interview the people who are doing the work, they then summarize the interviews and write a paper on what the people who do the work told them.

What this process of quality, as defined by Deming, suggests is that the person who best knows how to deliver the mail in Carrollton, GA, is probably the person delivering the mail. They probably have more ideas per year about how to improve the mail system than anybody else, because they are actually living it every day. The person who best can improve the mail in Griffin, GA, is working in the Griffin Post Office, and if we could liberate and engage as a stakeholder every person currently working in the system, possibly by giving them a bonus at the end of the year, and if we said, "Look, get to a postal system which actually breaks even, and which meets certain quality standards, then you get a bonus. Everybody in the system gets a bonus," or some other approach which allows us in a positive way to begin to encourage every single postal worker in the process of developing the best possible process.

Let me make it clear. I am not picking on the Postal Service. I would say the same thing is true for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for NASA in terms of space, for the Department of the Interior, for every part of the Federal Government, and it is also true for State governments, county governments, city governments, and local school boards. It is true for hospitals. Every institution in America has to engage their employees and their participants as a stakeholder and get them committed to a routine process of recommending changes so that the people who are actually doing the work are involved in the process of improving the work.

In addition to technology, which is the first quadrant; economic and management principles, which is the second; and the concept of quality, the fourth and last quadrant, if you will, from 9 o'clock until noon, or from 9 to 12 in terms of a circle, is traditional American culture. Now, I want to emphasize I think this is both the most abstract and the most powerful of the four parts of the circle of American success.

Traditional American culture is what generally makes us American. It is optimism, belief in a better future, it is the right to pursue happiness, it is incentives, it is opportunity, it is the dream of an endless frontier, whether that frontier is geographic or economic or intellectual or just personal success, it is the ability of people to try to de-

velop a better future. It is what brought people to America in the first place. It is why today more people want to immigrate to the United States than any other country in the world, because there is an American dream of a dynamic, better, expanding, open-ended future.

But traditional American culture has very unique characteristics, and yet for the last 50 years, we have tried to impose a bureaucratic welfare state which cuts right across American culture. We have tried to impose a system which would make Americans into little bureaucrats. We have tried to design a system where redtape and government employees would define the structure and, in effect, trap America.

We ought to be honest. It has failed. Americans are smarter, more energetic, more creative, more willful than any bureaucracy. They work their way around it, under it, through it, and they are extraordinarily inventive at finding ways to find loopholes.

We keep trying to find better, tighter, narrower rules, and people, frankly, simply outsmart them. You finally get so many rules that even the bureaucrats cannot figure out what it was they were supposed to enforce, and they cannot remember any more who did what, and the books are so thick that nobody actually knows what the devil is going on, the Tax Code being the best example.

I now want to suggest that that fundamentally has got the world upside down. Bureaucracy can work. In Confucian China, bureaucracy worked. In Germany, bureaucracy worked. Bureaucracy will work anywhere that the local culture reinforces the bureaucracy. Anywhere on the planet where people wake up in the morning and they say, "Gee, I wonder what the rules are. I want to know so I can obey the rules," bureaucracy works perfectly. People say, "The government said these are the ground rules, and I will obey the ground rules."

My favorite example is the Autobahn. People who have been in Germany instantly remember this. The German people have a contract with their politicians. They will not allow their politicians to set a speed limit on the Autobahn, because if they did, they would obey it, but they do not want to obey it, so they do not have one. It is very clear. Any German politician who suggests that they set a speed limit on the Autobahn would be defeated at the next election.

On the other hand, everywhere else in Germany where they have speed limits, they expect them to be obeyed, and they are so obedient that the way the German police stop traffic violations is they photograph your car license with the picture of the radar speed next to it, they send you the photograph along with the bill, and you dutifully send

your fine in. It makes perfect sense in a rule-abiding society.

The American people have a very different approach to dealing with speed limits. In America, there are two speed limits virtually everywhere. There is the de jure speed limit, which is the legal posted number, and there is the de facto speed limit, often between 5 and 10 miles an hour faster, which is the speed at which the police pull you over.

□ 1720

In virtually every American, in every audience I have talked to this about, 30 audiences, I say, "How many of you now in the last 30 days looked at a speed limit to see how much faster you can go?" Virtually everyone gets a sheepish grin and admits the truth is that the speed limit was the beginning point of how fast they would go. It was not the ceiling. It was the basement. It was the measuring point.

I apply the same technique in high schools. I walk into high schools and say, "How many of you know somebody who cheats?" Every hand goes up, every time. Why? Because we have turned education, which has to be a missionary vocation, it has to be a vocation of passion, it has to involve the pursuit of knowledge, it has to involve the acquisition of skills because a person wants to be able to learn. We have turned education into a bureaucracy. The more bureaucratic we make it, the more paperwork we have, and the more we drive out good teachers, and turn teachers into bureaucrats, the more students rebel. So students arrive, and they know it is not about learning, but about paperwork. If it is about paperwork, they are good Americans, their job is to cheat.

There are teenagers who spend three times as much time figuring out how to get around the rules than to obey. Why? Because it is a core American value. Anyone who has seen Arnold Schwarzenegger or Clint Eastwood movies understands the underlying principle. The rules are there, but getting it there is more important. Opportunity transcends bureaucracy. The duty transcends petty paperwork, and that ultimately America is about the individual doing what they have to, not what they are told. That theme goes through our literature. It goes through our detective novels. It goes through movies.

I remind audiences who have seen the movie "Pretty Woman." That was not about obeying the rules, but one of the most popular movies we have had.

Again and again, when we come back to the basic pattern, the fact is the American people strongly, deeply, have an irresistible urge to control their own destiny and resist deeply the process of a bureaucratic welfare state controlling it.

I want to propose to my colleagues, and I have to admit I do not understand the full details of how this will work, but I want to propose to my colleagues that we want to literally turn the process upside down. Instead of having a bureaucratic welfare state which tries to define being American, we want to start with traditional American culture, and then rethink the entire government. We want to design a government which reflects American values and American habits, and American patterns, so that the government is reinforcing and strengthening what works in America, instead of obstructing and narrowing and controlling what works in America. In that process, I want to suggest 10 basic values of traditional American culture.

First, national safety. I think we have learned the lesson in the last decade, that the world is dangerous. There is evil in the world. We want America to be stronger than those dangers, that we do not want America to ever look like Kuwait City, or Lebanon, or Afghanistan. So the American people are prepared and committed to being stronger than any potential danger.

Second, personal safety. I think Americans are angry at being frightened. They are tired of a drug culture existing, and defying civilization, and tired of turning on the evening news to see who got killed in the large cities. They are ashamed and furious. More young people were killed in America during the 100 days of the ground war of Desert Storm than were killed in Desert Storm. It is an outrage that we have given up large parts of our inner city to barbarism. I think most Americans believe that the very first entitlement under the Constitution is that a person is entitled to be physically safe. They are entitled for their children to be physically safe. The idea that a person cannot send their child to the playground because they might be shot, or they might run into a drug dealer, is an outrage. In a very real sense, it is as treasonous to the American dream as an outside enemy. I think Americans want to reestablish and reimpose personal safety as a value rivaling national safety.

Third, Americans believe in family and community. If we go back and read de Tocqueville's classic book on Democracy in America, written in the 1830's, he said that what made America unique, what made it a tremendously powerful country was not the government. It was the family, the neighbors, the voluntary organization, the church or synagogue, the thousands of ways, as President Bush says, "the thousand points of light by which Americans organize themselves." Not organized by the Government. The Soviet Union was organized by government. America is organized by volunteers in their own way. As President Bush put it so bril-

liantly in the State of the Union, "Doing the hard work of freedom, creating a community of conscience." The instinct, as President Bush, said, "If you have a hammer, find a nail." I think it is that concept that Americans have a natural instinct, because they love their family, because they love their community, because they are excited about their voluntary organization, whether it is the Girl Scouts or the Boy Scouts, or the American Cancer Society, or whatever it is, that Americans want to be involved, and that America, for most citizens, is not just a flag and a National Capitol and the White House. America is our right to have our family that we love, our right to belong to our community that we are committed to.

Fourth, Americans believe in working, despite all the efforts of the welfare state. Even people who are third generation of welfare, when they are interviewed, they will tell the interviewer that they believe that work is morally necessary. They believe people should work, and they are very frustrated by the welfare system. Yet, what do we do as a government? Here may be the best example of how the government of the bureaucratic welfare state cuts across and cripples the very core values of a traditional American culture, and how it cuts across and cripples a successful America. The bureaucratic welfare state says that if a person is 65 and earns more than \$7,000, that the Government will take away \$1 in Social Security for every \$3 they earn. Now this is foolish. It is foolish in terms of human cost. It is foolish financially. It is foolish first of all in human cost. We absolutely know as a fact that the longer a person stays active, the healthier a person will be. We know they will live a longer life, spend fewer days in a nursing home, fewer days in the hospital. Mathematically, most people are better off to stay busy. Yet, what is the ground rule of punishing a person for work at 65? It says, "Do not stay active."

Now, it is not only foolish in the human values, that we want people to be healthy and involved and psychologically committed to life, but also very foolish financially. Why? Because if a person becomes inactive and they get sick, Medicare pays for their illness. So, we will spend more on these people in health care costs for the illnesses the government encourages, by encouraging passivity, then we will save in Social Security money by not having them stay busy.

Now, every senior citizen I know, and every person over 55 is thinking about this, and thinks it is outrageous. Yet the bureaucratic welfare state cannot find a way to replace that, even though there are 22 bills in the Congress today to repeal it. Clearly, a step toward the traditional American culture would be to encourage people over 65 to work.

There is a second half of that. Look at what it did to the poor. We say to the poor today, "Gee, you really ought to get a job. By the way, if you go and get a job, you will pay taxes. We will take away Medicaid, so you and the children won't have health care. We will take away your aid to family and dependent children. We will take away your food stamps. We will start charging you for the public housing projects you have been getting in housing, for free." What is the net result? If we have any business sense, and I have said this directly to businessmen who are in contracting, where they bid on a job. I said, "If you had a job opportunity that costs you as much as getting a job does when you are on welfare, you would never bid on it, because you would go broke." Poor people are not dumb. Poor people are not stupid. Poor people are not unable to figure out what happens. They say, "I can do nothing, I will get food stamps, free housing, aid to family and dependent children, and I will get Medicaid, or I can work," which is what the culture says they should do, "and I lose all that. I don't think so."

So, we have to rethink the entire welfare state system, starting with the principle that every person under 65 who is able bodied should be required to work if they get money from the Government. Any money. As long as they are physically and mentally able.

Now, in that set, if they are able bodied under 65, once they work for their money, we want them to have a savings account. If they want to moonlight at night on the weekends, we want them to. If they want to increase their hours to have a better future, we want them to, instead of having created the welfare state ceiling so expensive to rise above for the poor, what we want to do is create a long-term opportunity, an escalator, in which every time a person goes to work they are slightly better off than if they did not. Every time they take a second job, they are slightly better off than if they didn't, which means changing the welfare system, food stamps, the Tax Code, so that net advantage of doing something is that the margin is always better than not doing something.

Fifth, Americans believe in savings. When we work, we want to save something, partly because of the Bible, the fact talked about 7 fat years followed by 7 lean years. Partly Walt Disney's fable of the grasshopper and the ant, where the ant saved up and survived the winter, and the grasshopper got in trouble by not saving. Partly common sense that a person is better off, has more power, more control over their life, if they save. That is why over 80 percent of the American people want individual retirement accounts. We want to save. What is the Tax Code of the bureaucratic welfare state saying?

It says if a person borrows enough, they can deduct it.

□ 1730

If you save, we are going to tax it.

We have exactly the wrong incentive system in our Tax Code to be a healthy culture.

When we save, by the way, we want to invest. A lot of my friends who believe in the bureaucratic welfare state find this hard to believe, but the fact is almost no Americans when they save hide it in their mattresses or bury it out in the back yard.

Americans believe deeply that they want to invest, first of all because they want a return on their money. They want it to grow. They want to have more of it in the future. They are pretty smart about that.

Second, because they know instinctively that if you do not invest in the next factory, if you do not invest in the next machine tool and the next computer, if you do not invest in the next job, there is not going to be work, that a healthy economy requires that somebody invest their savings which they earn by working.

The seventh value in the traditional American culture is learning, not necessarily education, but learning. You walk into a room and say you have a Ph.D., people may or may not be impressed. If you walk in a room and you know what they need to learn, they are impressed.

This is a country which believes in learning what you need when you need it as easily as possible and as fast as possible. That is why, for example, we buy more self-help books than any other country in the world. We buy books on how to cook. We buy books on how to repair cars. We buy books on how to be healthy. We buy books on how to take vacations. The fact is that to an extraordinary scale, Americans believe in learning and want to learn and want to be better off, but they do want to learn at their own speed.

One of the remarkable problems of the last 30 years has been the gap between the technologies available for a user-friendly learning society and the system of bureaucratic education.

Imagine, we have audiotapes, videotapes, computers that are available at home, you could offer an entire summer school by cable television which people could take when it was convenient. They could set their VCR's to record things. You could tie every rural high school in America by television into the finest education in America. We are doing this. In Carrollton, GA, students are learning Japanese from the University of Nebraska by television. In Carrollton High School, students are participating directly in a specialized CNN program where every morning, and CNN broadcasts I believe at 3:45 in the morning,

there is a 15-minute specialized news program with a backup computer package so that students are learning about Iraq by studying Iraq because it is in the news.

The result has been phenomenal increases in the amount of learning, and yet our capacity to go beyond the current system is unbelievable. I attended recently a program in Jonesboro, GA, where young people were going in and their parents were paying \$19 an hour to have access to a computer which at first assessed their skills and then allowed them to teach themselves at their own pace, and yet students were getting a year's improvement in 6 weeks.

Now, there is something wrong if we have that difference between what we could do and what we are doing, and so we need to think through, and I want to commend President Bush and Secretary Lamar Alexander for the extraordinary first steps they have just introduced last week, because I think the steps that Secretary Alexander and President Bush have announced are a major first stride toward the kind of process for a successful America that I am talking about. They want to have the kind of flexibility, experimentation, and openness to real change and real improvement that we are talking about here today.

Eighth, Americans believe in health. Notice I do not say health care. Americans are less interested in getting well than they are in avoiding illness, and yet the whole system works backward. The system does not encourage any health care. The system does not encourage the right behaviors. The system does not reward people who do the right things.

The system basically says, "Look, if you go ahead and drink as much as you want and eat as much as you want, smoke as much as you want, avoid any activity, truly get into a bad case, Medicare will pay for all your bypass operations; but by the way, we won't do anything to prevent the necessity of the bypass operation."

One suggestion, just as an example that has been mentioned, is the idea that maybe we ought to have a \$200 tax credit so that every person 55 years and older who has an annual physical where their cardiovascular system is above the danger level for heart disease automatically gets rewarded for eating right, exercising right, doing the right things, taking care of themselves, and frankly, if you took from 55 to 95, that is 40 years, add \$200, that is \$8,000 over that period of time, that would be incredibly cheaper than one heart operation and you could afford to pay a lot of people to be healthy at the cost of one person becoming sick.

But the deeper point I am making is that we want to become a society which focuses on good health and then takes care of those who have a genetic

defect or happen to catch a disease. We do not want to be a society as we are today which ignores all the requirements of good health and then spends billions and billions of dollars more than any other country in the world, a higher percentage of gross national product, than any other country in the world for a very chaotic bureaucratic and uneven medical health care system. So we need fundamental rethinking from the ground up. We need a process of change in health care to get to health, rather than simply to take care of disease.

Ninth, Americans believe in the environment. The environment means two different things to Americans. First of all, it is quality of life. We are a wealthy enough society that if we want to save the buffalo or the elephant or the rhinoceros, if we want to have a wilderness area, we can afford it. Well, we may only go and visit a wilderness once or twice in our lifetimes, but we feel psychologically richer by the act of going out and knowing that every day we could go there if we wanted to.

But there is a second part of the environment. It is public health. Americans instinctively know that in the age of chemicals, in the age of very sophisticated worldwide manufacturing, that our public environment in health terms is beyond our control. We want a government which regulates and monitors and watches the health aspects of what is happening around us.

It is fascinating, for example, I have yet to meet a single conservative who does not become an environmentalist the morning you tell them that they are going to have a toxic waste dump next to their home. At that minute they decide that the environment is important and they want to protect their homes by ensuring there are adequate standards of public health.

Tenth and last of the values of traditional American culture is honesty and trust. It is fascinating to study it, but the truth is that politicians today, despite all the scandals of the last 10 years, are not more dishonest than they were 30 years ago. They are in fact more honest. The difference is that the culture has moved to a level of honesty and trust dramatically faster than the political system or the bureaucracy.

This was pointed out to me by Congressman PAT ROBERTS of western Kansas, when you talk about the problems his wheat farmers face, and he drew this contrast. You walk in anywhere in the world today with a driver's license and a piece of plastic called a credit card, you see a stranger across the counter and they will give you an automobile and they expect when you are done to return the car, automatically. Two hundred years ago you would have had to bring them gold in large quantities and they would have checked the

gold to make sure it was not counterfeit. Today they trust you.

A similar example, you call an 800 number for an airline reservation in a city you do not know about, talking to a person you will never meet whose name you do not get. You are told what time the plane will leave, what seat you will have on it, and how much it will cost. Five or six weeks later you show up at the airport, trusting the airplane to be there and expecting to have a seat on it. That is an extraordinary level of honesty and trust. It is a 99.999 level of trusting the system to be there and to be honest.

Congressman ROBERTS pointed out to me that his wheat farmers are faced with 1,300 pages of agricultural legislation, 4,000 pages of regulations, and they have to go to the Agricultural Soil Conservation Service Office to get permission as to when they can plant wheat, that the bureaucracy is not trusting, is not built on the notion of a contract of honesty, and in fact is just the opposite.

So I think we have to think through honesty and trust.

To summarize the 10 traditional values of American culture, they are national safety, personal safety, family and community, working, saving, investing, learning, health and environment, honesty, and trust.

Now, my recommendation is that we rethink all of American government from the school board to the White House in the context of dropping the bureaucratic welfare state model and building a new American model built around the traditional values that work for America.

□ 1740

And we tried an experiment last year through West Georgia College, which is a model as an example of how we might end up developing things. It was called earning by learning. Dr. Mel Steely would be glad to share with anyone interested their experience how in your own community you could develop an earning by learning program.

The goal of the earning by learning at West Georgia College was to help second- and third-graders who were poor and who were likely not to learn how to read, to help them develop a reading ability. It was based on the idea that if you learn how to read in the information age, you could learn everything else sooner or later. But if you did not learn how to read, then you are not going to learn anything else, and you are in deep trouble educationally.

We went out to five counties, to public housing projects, to students in the second and third grades who had been identified by their teachers as at risk. That is, students who were likely not to learn how to read.

We wanted something which in the traditional American cultural system

would be an incentive for these children to learn how to read because we wanted them to read a lot of books during the summer. Andy Young, a liberal Democrat, was running for Governor, and he had a great slogan. He said, "The most important color in Georgia is not black or white, it is green." What he meant by that is that in America economic activity, making money, getting ahead, building a bigger shop, baking a bigger pie is what makes America unique. We do not care who you were, we care who you want to be. We do not care what you have done, we care about what you want to do in the future.

Americans working together to produce a better economic future is why we do not have the kind of problems that you see in some countries.

So we thought about the concept of green, as Andy Young was describing it. When we went to these young people, second- and third-graders, we said to them, "We will pay you \$2 a book if you will read." Now, let me say first of all, as poor as they were, as young as they were, they understood the theoretical concept. Every young person we talked to understood the idea that if they would read a book they would get \$2. We did not have to explain it very much. They were a little doubtful. They felt that we were going to manipulate them. They said, "You are really promising us, but there won't be cash at the end. You just want us to do it, and you won't reward us."

We said, "Nope, we will give it to you as cash."

We had 282 students participate. The average student read 16 to 18 books. Our No. 1 reader was Stephanie Wynn of Villa Rica, GA; she read 83 books, was paid \$166. Her dad took a day off from work to protect her at graduation because at 8 years of age, \$166 is a lot of cash.

I saw Stephanie recently. She bought doll clothing, she bought back-to-school clothing, and has over \$100 in savings. She inspired us to go to talk to banks about the idea that this summer if West Georgia College develops an earning by learning program, maybe local banks ought to offer the students an opportunity to put their money in savings and if they keep their money in savings for 3 months, to double their money, or some other incentive, to give them a big incentive, a big desire to learn the concept that you can save your money.

The average student earning \$32 to \$36 spent most of their money on clothing because they were very poor and wanted back-to-school clothing. There is a wonderful story in the Newnan newspaper of a young girl, 9 years old, going into a store to buy the first sneakers she ever earned with her own money that she had gotten by reading.

The program was very thin in bureaucracy. We paid one adult \$500, Dr.

Verl Short, an education professor at West Georgia College. He held everything together. We had 47 adult volunteers fulfilling President Bush's concept of a thousand points of light, doing the hard work of freedom.

We had no investment in books because we used public libraries. That is what they are there for. The students checked the books out from the libraries. There was a simple principle: You had to come in once a week, bring in your books, talking to an adult who is not related to you, and you showed him the books and say, "I read these books." The adult—after all, these are second- and third-grade books—would read through the books and ask you questions. If you could not answer the questions, the adult would ask you to read the book out loud. If you could not read the book out loud, you did not get the money.

Over 70 percent of the students who participated, when tested in January, scored over a year improvement in their reading ability. And we intend to go back this summer.

But any American anywhere can run this program. There are some churches in Atlanta that are working diligently on the problem of how do you help young black males 9 to 13 that are now trying out this very same concept in public housing projects in Atlanta. We had had inquiries from, I think, some 25 States now of people who are interested in doing earning by learning.

Literally, you can decide how much money you have, that you want to spend helping young children learning how to read, divide by 2, and that is how many books that you can pay for. Then you decide how many books the average child could read, you divide that number, and you have a program that you can run. From 1 child to 100 children to 1,000 children.

But the key here is that we were accomplishing three things. First, we were teaching literacy by getting them to read. If you read 83 books, you read a lot better than if you have not read any.

Second, we were empowering. People have heard this fancy word empowerment. Having money in your pocket is power. Having money in your pocket gives you choices.

Third, we were introducing children to the concept of free enterprise. These were children in poverty, living in public housing. They were not used to the idea that you earn money. We were offering them something very radical.

It was child labor, it was piecework, and I am sure the Department of Labor would probably frown on it. But the fact was that to those kids it was proof that an honest day's work would get an honest day's pay; it was proof that you could do something other than prostitution or drug dealing or armed robbery or other kinds of things, that you could go out in America and do some-

thing intelligent and get paid for it and actually have money to spend the way you want to spend it.

So I think the idea of earning by learning is a nonbureaucratic, small experiment that shows there are alternatives that fit traditional American culture that are more powerful and more successful than the bureaucratic welfare state models.

You can test that. We spend at the Federal level on title I for disadvantaged \$6,100,000,000 a year.

Now, I am not suggesting seriously that that should all be earning by learning. But imagine if next year we paid for 3 billion books to be read by children. My guess is that at 3 billion books being read by children, we would have dramatically changed America overnight and we would be a totally different country within a very few years because every poor child in America would have a direct incentive that related to learning and put cash in their pocket, which taught them the whole concept of free enterprise. And it could be done—again, I am not saying it is a serious idea except as an illustration, we could spend \$6 billion through the bureaucracy and not be able to stop dropouts, not be able to stop illiteracy, not be able to get poor children to be able to succeed. Why not try very dramatic experiments? As I said, I think that Secretary Lamar Alexander and President Bush are on exactly the right track in launching a new process of developing a successful American education system.

Now let me bring this all down to what Americans can do and what my colleagues can do and how we can proceed.

I think there are five key steps in the process for a successful America. I think we need a movement for a successful America, a movement toward a decentralized, bipartisan, that has everybody involved who wants to be successful and wants their country to be successful. First, we need to find people and institutions who are succeeding. Who is doing things well? Not just getting rich, by the way, but successful. Some may be succeeding by recycling, some may be succeeding at helping people with disabilities, somebody succeeding at helping the poor learn, some may be succeeding at helping folks who might be on alcohol or on drugs. Who are the successes in our neighborhoods?

Second, we need to ask them how are they succeeding? What are the principles they use to succeed? Third, we need to network those who are succeeding with other successes to swap ideas, to reinforce morale and to build momentum. Get them in the same room so they see each other, so they share ideas about being successful, so they can know that it is possible to have an America that is going to work again.

Fourth, we want to publicize our successes. We want to remind other people

that we can succeed, so we can increase hopes, so we can educate people about the principles that work. That is very important, frankly, because the key problem in America today is that all too many people have no hope. They despair. If you are a 9-year-old black boy in an inner city and you watch the evening news every day, you see no examples of success, you see no examples of hope, you see no reason to build for a better future.

So we want to publicize success.

Fifth, we want to apply the principles that we taught by the people who are succeeding to our larger institutions such as education and health care and the structure of Government itself.

Let me say for those who are interested, they might explore these ideas further with the following readings: They ought to read President Bush's 1991 State of the Union speech, they ought to read Phil Crosby's "Quality is Free." They ought to read Director Darman's introduction to the fiscal 1992 budget; they ought to read Edward Deming's "Out of the Crisis;" they ought to read Peter Drucker's "The Age of Discontinuity" and his very important "The Effective Executive," and they ought to read a book that Marianne and I wrote called "Window of Opportunity" and Jack Kemp's "An American Renaissance." They ought to read the speech by Jim Pinkerton at the White House called "The New Paradigm." And they ought to read Alvin Toffler's "The Third Wave."

Anyone who is interested among my colleagues who want more information about this, if they want to contact Rachel Phillips at 1620 Longworth Building, and she will give them more information. That number is 202-225-0197. She will be glad to give them more information on the concept of a movement for a successful America.

I want to close with this note: We know from the last 11 years that we can change history. I have been on the escort committee for Lech Walesa from Poland, for Vaclav Havel from Czechoslovakia, and Violeta Chamorro from Nicaragua; I know that it is possible for Americans to do things to decisively change the future.

□ 1750

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have an opportunity to create a successful America with this process so that in the future we have the economic and cultural strength to lead the entire planet to self-government, to freedom and to safety, and I want to encourage every one of my colleagues, and everyone who is listening, to develop personally on their own a movement for a successful America that applies these principles so that together we can create a successful 21st century America.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 524

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from the bill (H.R. 524).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAROCCO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE 76TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. I have organized this special order so that we can collectively recognize the unspeakable loss experienced by the Armenian people during the years of 1915-23. I wish that I could find the words to describe my feelings of outrage and despair when I think of the tragic events that led to the death of two of every three Armenians then living in their homeland. Unfortunately, their tragedy continues in that a simple reverent commemoration of the genocide has become an item of political controversy.

On the night of April 24, 1915, over 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Istanbul were arrested, exiled from the capital city, and executed. In a single night's sweep the voice of the representatives of the Armenian nation in Turkey was silenced. This tragic event was only the beginning of the unfolding, systematic policy of deportation and extermination being implemented by the Young Turk government. Consequently, the 24th of April represents for Armenians the symbolic beginning date of the Armenian genocide.

In the following years from 1915-23, 1½ million men, women, and children were murdered in an attempted genocide of the Armenian people by the Government of the Ottoman Empire. Before 1914, over 2 million Armenians lived in Turkey. By the end of 1923, the entire Armenian population of

Anatolia had been either killed or deported.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today because I am committed to the truth about the Armenian genocide. The horror of the Armenian genocide is made worse by the refusal of the current Government of the Republic of Turkey to acknowledge that it ever happened. The Turks attempt to account for the vast decrease in the number of Armenians in Turkey as a consequence of war. Do they expect the Armenians to forget the trauma of war and the grim reminders of the atrocity simply because they have succeeded in tampering with history and denying the obvious facts.

To not recognize the Armenian genocide is to disregard history. The historical record is clear and irrefutable; it is our moral responsibility to acknowledge it. To ignore genocide only leads to global indifference and ignorance and human rights abuses. To forget those who died sets a dangerous precedent for abuse in future generations.

The truth about the Armenian genocide was very clear to Henry Morgenthau, our Ambassador to Turkey between 1913 and 1916, when he reported back to officials in Washington that, after visiting the Armenian territories in 1919, he had witnessed the "most colossal crime of all ages."

The great British historian, Arnold Toynbee, also in Turkey at the time, later wrote of what he saw:

The atrociousness of the two great twentieth century wars was aggravated by "genocide" (i.e. the wholesale extermination of civilian populations). In the First World War the Turks committed genocide against the Armenians; in the Second World War, the Germans committed genocide against the Jews.

In fact, most of the extensive evidence documenting this genocide has been uncovered not by Armenians, but by Jews, who found a chilling and compelling pattern of connections between the two events. The difference lies in the fact that Germany has owned up to its past while Turkey insists on ignoring historical reality.

President Carter once said:

It's generally not known in the world that in the years preceding 1916, there was a concerted effort made to eliminate all the Armenian people, probably one of the greatest tragedies that ever befell any group.

Perhaps if more people had known about the genocide of the Armenians when Adolf Hitler rallied his commanders in chief at Obersalzberg before the invasion of Poland in August 1939, that tragedy would have been prevented. Hitler asked, "Who remembers the Armenians?" To that, 1986 Nobel Peace Prize recipient and Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel responded, "He was right. No one remembered them."

Mr. Speaker, all we seek is the dignity of a truthful recognition of historical fact as a first step in the slow process of healing such a deep wound. The denial of history that has been

well documented by survivors, eye-witnesses, correspondents, U.S. Presidents, and even past Congresses clearly demonstrates the need for recognition of the Armenian genocide. The Republic of Turkey can help in this recovery process by acknowledging the crimes of its predecessor as our German ally has done.

As we reflect upon this tragedy, I cannot help but admire the strength of the Armenian people who have endured countless hardships in addition to the genocide. The earthquake of 1988 killed over 35,000 Armenians and has left over 500,000 people homeless today. Furthermore, the ongoing conflict in Nagorno-Karabagh has inhibited the international relief efforts to aid earthquake victims as well as resulted in another 300,000 homeless Armenians due to anti-Armenian violence. I am hopeful that today's special order commemorating those killed during the Armenian genocide will demonstrate America's concern for those Armenians in the Soviet Union as well as all over the world.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues that will be speaking with me today who will help me communicate that the genocide will not go unacknowledged and unmourned. As we gather here today to commemorate the Armenian genocide in which 1,500,000 human beings were brutally murdered, we comfort the survivors, and we keep alive the memories of those who were murdered and try to gain insight and learn lessons from this experience so that a similar episode may never be repeated again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], my colleague.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn remembrance of a great human tragedy, the Armenian genocide. It parallels the chilling Nazi Holocaust, but much of the world is still unaware of the suffering and misery that the Armenian people endured. Today is marked to call attention to this black chapter in the world's history.

One and one-half million Armenian people were massacred by the Ottoman Turkish Empire between 1915 and 1923. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from a homeland that their ancestors had occupied for more than 3,000 years.

As a result of the killings and deportations, the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire was reduced from 2.5 million to fewer than 100,000. A race of people was nearly eliminated, and the Turkish Government to this day refuses to acknowledge that this genocide ever happened.

Today, 77 years later, we commemorate those who lost their lives, and we urge the modern Turkish Government

to acknowledge the atrocities of the past.

Within the past year, the world's people have witnessed the dawning of a new world order. Much of this new configuration has taken place in a spirit of cooperation and unity.

However, the world still has elements of mistrust and destruction. On this anniversary of one of mankind's greatest atrocities we are once again witnessing a shameful human tragedy. Thousands of Kurdish refugees are dying each day.

The modern Turkish Government is to be commended for its humanitarian gestures and relief toward the Kurdish refugees. In fact, the Turkish Government of today is far removed from the Ottoman Empire of the early 20th century. Turkey is a crucial ally of the United States and a trusted member of NATO. A large part of the allies' military success in the Persian Gulf was a direct result of Turkey's compliance and participation in air strikes against Saddam Hussein's war machine.

But part of growing as a nation is credibility and integrity is recognition of events of the past—just as Germany has admitted its culpability in the Nazi Holocaust, and just as the United States Government has come to grips with its own atrocities against native Americans.

The enduring tragedy of the Armenian genocide is that to this day the Government of the modern Turkish state refuses to acknowledge that this crime ever took place.

The historical evidence surrounding the Armenocide, however, is as clear and compelling as the evidence surrounding the Jewish extermination of World War II, Stalin's destruction of the Kulaks, and Pol Pot's massacre of his own people in Cambodia.

The world is not searching for an indictment of Turkey, just an acknowledgement of a shameful era, whereby Turkey and the rest of the world can make a commitment that such events will never happen again.

The Armenian people are resilient and determined. The tragic 1988 earthquake left 30,000 dead and more than 500,000 homeless, but they are rebuilding their region and are committed to preserving their heritage and culture.

The Armenian-American community today now numbers nearly 1 million people, who deserve the same respect as the descendants of the Jewish Holocaust victims.

The Armenian people need to finally go to bed at night knowing that the modern Turkish Government, having acknowledged the sins of the past, will work with other nations to ensure that similar atrocities never occur again.

□ 1800

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the

gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY] for his thoughtful remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank and commend my colleague from California, Mr. LEHMAN, for arranging this special order to pay tribute to the Armenian martyrs, who were victims of one of the worst genocides of this century. On April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled and eventually murdered in remote places. In the following years from 1915 to 1923, 1½ million men, women, and children were murdered in an attempted genocide of the Armenian people by the governments of the Ottoman Empire. On the 76th anniversary of the Armenian massacre, it is appropriate that we observe this date as one of remembrance for all the victims of genocide, especially those of Armenian ancestry. Now that the German Government has recognized the Jewish genocide and the Soviet Union has recognized the extermination of millions who disagreed with their government under Stalin, it is time for Turkey to recognize the genocide of the Armenians under the Ottoman Empire. History must not forget that Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of 3,000 years and eliminated through massacres or exile. Those who survived became homeless refugees, whose descendants, with their painful memories, can be found in many countries today. As leaders of a free and democratic nation, I believe we must continue to acknowledge and deplore the events surrounding the Armenian genocide as vigorously as we deplore modern acts of terrorism.

Today, Armenians flourish and are prominent and successful citizens of our great Nation. Many of my Armenian friends who survived have related tragic stories of how the events beginning on April 24, 1915 affected their families and loved ones. I know how important this tribute is to them and to the memories of those who lost their lives in the slaughter.

Cruelty, murder, and genocide are terrible, terrible examples of man's inhumanity to man. We commemorate this date so as not to forget the suffering and pain that the Armenian world community has endured. We recognize April 24 as the day of man's inhumanity to man because we must remember that in modern times, similar atrocities have continued unchecked. The upsurge of violence in Azerbaijan has contributed to a recent surge of human rights violations against Armenians in the Soviet Union. Armenian families are among the Kurdish refugees in Iraq that have long endured persecution and suppression by Saddam Hussein. As we join with Armenians all over the world

in commemoration of this 76th anniversary, we offer encouragement to Armenians everywhere that acts of violent suppression committed against them in the past will not be allowed to continue in the future. We must commit ourselves to a future course that will prevent the terrible atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people from ever happening again.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for those remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in strong support of designating April 24 as a day of remembrance of the Armenian genocide.

The Armenian people have suffered not one, but two injustices. First, they were senselessly slaughtered by the Ottoman Turkish Government. Second, this same Government denied that the slaughter took place.

Some have said this designation of a day in memory of this genocide is a sensitive political issue. But this isn't a political issue, it's a humanitarian issue.

By setting aside April 24 as a day of remembrance, we will not only remember the genocide of more than 1 million Armenian people, but we will declare to the world that our country will not tolerate or forget such violations of human rights anywhere in the world, at any time, past or present.

I am proud to have a significant Armenian community in my district, and I honor them for their courage and for the positive contributions they have made to our society and to our world.

The children of this generation and of future generations should have the opportunity to truly see the events of the past, as well as our conscious efforts to ensure that history doesn't repeat itself. I urge you to join me in support of this day of remembrance.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for those words.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. While this anniversary may evoke painful memories, it would be worse if we did not remember the terrible atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people. April 24 is an important date because it was on this day in 1915 that over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Istanbul were executed. Sadly, April 24, 1915 marked only the beginning of a systematic policy of deportation and extermination of Armenians by the governments of the Ottoman Empire. Be-

tween 1915 and 1923, over half of the world's Armenian population, an estimated 1.5 million men, women, and children, were killed.

The Armenians are an ancient and proud people. In the fourth century, they became the first nation to embrace Christianity. In 1915, Christian Russia invaded the Moslem Ottoman Empire, which was allied with Germany in World War I. Amid fighting in the Ottoman Empire's eastern Anatolian provinces, the historic heartland of the Christian Armenians, Ottoman authorities ordered the deportation of all Armenians in the region. By the end of 1923, virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had been either killed or deported.

Today, it is important to remember this horrible fact of history to comfort the survivors, as well as remain vigilant to prevent future calamities. Only a fraction of the Armenian population escaped this calculated attempt to destroy them and their culture. Approximately 500,000 Armenian refugees fled north across the Russian border, south into Arab countries, or to Europe and the United States. Currently, it is estimated that fewer than 100,000 declared Armenians remain in present-day Turkey.

I am proud to say that a strong and vibrant Armenian-American community is flourishing in northwest Indiana. In fact, my predecessor in the House of Representatives, the late Adam Benjamin, was of Armenian heritage. There are still strong ties to the Armenian homeland among Armenian-Americans. Mrs. Vicki Hovanessian, a resident of Indiana's First Congressional District, helped to raise over \$1 million for victims of the devastating Armenian earthquake in December 1988. However, despite substantial international relief efforts, 500,000 Soviet Armenians are still homeless.

The Armenian genocide is a well-documented fact. The U.S. National Archives contain numerous reports detailing the process by which the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire was systematically decimated. However, there is an unsettling tendency among both individuals and governments to forget or blot out past atrocities. Less than 20 years after the Armenian genocide, Adolf Hitler embarked upon a similar extermination of European Jews. While the Jewish holocaust is certainly as terrible an event as the Armenian genocide, at least the Jews have had the catharsis of the world's recognition of what happened to their people. In search of acknowledgement of what happened to their families and ancestors between 1915 and 1923, regretfully, Armenians too often hear that their claims of genocide are lies or exaggerations.

Unfortunately, there is still a concerted effort to deny the existence of

the Armenian genocide. Responding to political pressure, in January of this year, the National Park Service removed a photograph depicting the victims of the Armenian genocide from the Ellis Island Centennial Photo Exhibit in New York. The captioned photograph had been previously vandalized, but was removed following an intensive political campaign targeted at Ellis Island officials. Representatives of the Armenian National Committee have contacted Ellis Island authorities to protest the removal of the exhibit, but have been told that the exhibit was removed to alleviate concerns, avoid controversy, protect the photo from further vandalism, and review the photo's authenticity. The removed photograph should be reinstated where it rightfully belongs, and attempts at historical revisionism must be condemned, whether done in ignorance or simply to avoid controversy.

In closing, I would like to commend my colleague from California, Mr. LEHMAN, for organizing this special order to commemorate the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. It is my sincere hope that this remembrance will not only console the survivors and their families, but also serve to avert future atrocities.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], one of the great leaders in this Chamber on the Armenian cause.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] for yielding and for taking out this special order to revisit this most important historical event.

Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1915 marked the beginning of one of history's darkest periods. On that day literally hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up, and they were exiled and eventually murdered in remote places throughout Anatolia. Within months a quarter of a million Armenians serving in the Ottoman Army were disarmed, and later they were starved or executed.

□ 1810

Hundreds of thousands of Armenians were then uprooted from their villages. Women and children were forced to march through the Syrian desert for weeks on end, and, of course, most of them did not survive that ordeal.

From 1915 through 1923 1.5 million Armenians lost their lives. American Ambassador Henry Morgenthau wrote:

When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race. I understood this well, and in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal this fact.

They made no attempt to conceal this fact.

Mr. Speaker, for years many people have tried to make the world forget about the Armenian genocide. However, generations of Armenians have struggled to keep the memory alive, in their churches, in their communities, in their schools, in their daily lives, and through their advocacy to their political leaders.

In gathering at such events as this, we remind people around the world of man's inhumanity to man. Remembering the genocide is much more than a matter of setting the historical record straight or correct. By remembering the genocide, we help prevent it from ever happening again.

As the gentleman from California quoted in his statement, Adolf Hitler asked who remembers the Armenians, before launching his plan to annihilate the Jews. Today we are seeing the brutality of another dictator, Saddam Hussein, who has ruthlessly persecuted the Kurdish people. Sadly, the suffering of the Kurdish refugees is amplified by the intransigence of neighboring Turkey.

I was proud, in fact, is one of the more proud moments of my legislative career, to introduce legislation commemorating the Armenian genocide last year. I remember very well during the Presidential campaign, President Bush, then candidate Bush, giving his commitment during the last election to support the genocide resolution. What great joy I took in that, because for 8 years, Ronald Reagan abandoned the Armenians throughout this world and in this country on this most basic, basic of human and fundamental freedom issues.

Frankly, I was thrilled that the President's endorsement. Unfortunately, the President and his administration did not carry through on this pledge, and the resolution did not have the support necessary for passage in the Senate and in the House.

It was a shameless abandonment of a very proud people. But it was not the first time. We saw a similar instance occur during the whole situation in China, when the President and his administration capitulated to the leadership of a regime in China that persecuted and killed its own people. We saw the same type of shameless abandonment of the Kurdish people to the hands of the treacherous Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, by gathering here tonight, and in many similar events around the world, we acknowledge the genocide, we mourn its victims, and we renew our cry, never again. As long as people come together in events like this, we will not forget those who have tried to cover up the Armenian genocide have not succeeded, and, Mr. Speaker, they never will.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for his stirring remarks, and for all he has done over the years in the cause of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also want to take note once again of the 76th anniversary of the genocide committed by the Ottoman Turks against the Armenian people. I join my fellow Americans of Armenian descent to pay homage to those countless Armenians, men, women, and children, who fell victim to the first genocide this century. The genocide, as has been mentioned here today, was not only a crime against the Armenian people, but also an unforgettable crime against humanity.

Presently there is an unconscionable and callous effort by the Turkish Government to distort or even deny outright the truth about the premeditated genocide of the Armenians. To justify such a denial, Turkish Government espouses the untenable argument that, although some Armenians were killed, this killing did not constitute a genocide, that the issue of genocide is debatable.

The fact of the matter is that the Armenian genocide is perhaps better documented than most such historical events. There are literally thousands of documents in the official archives of all major governments, including our own and Turkey's own ally at the time, Germany, as well as the testimony of many neutral observers.

We really do not have to go any further than read the diplomatic notes and memoirs of our own Ambassador to Turkey at that time, Henry Morgenthau, to establish that the Turkish treatment of Armenians was part of a deliberate plan of total extermination.

I want to reiterate again that the Armenian genocide is an undeniable fact. Political arguments cannot and must not outweigh our moral values and beliefs in justice and freedom. Those things are really truly the things that are in our national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to invite Members to join me on this day to acknowledge that a genocide was committed against the Armenian people, and to pay respect to the martyrs of this courageous people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] for putting this special order together this evening.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, there are a few remarks that I believe need to be made. One is that I and many others are personally outraged by the decision by the U.S. Park Service to remove a photograph at Ellis Island depicting the murder, the outright murder, of Armenians during the genocide. It carried a caption underneath it that in no way

even referenced genocide, but only said these people were victims of massacres and left for the United States to Ellis Island.

After repeated attempts by the Turkish Government to have that removed, the Park Service complied. I think that is an outrage. Many Members are working very hard to see that it is undone.

□ 1820

This is a day of remembrance for all of us who care about human values and for all of us who care about the truth.

I can only remark how sad it is that the official leadership of this Government has not seen fit to make this an official day of remembrance, but as the Congressman from Michigan said, we will continue that fight.

I thank all of the Members who spoke, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 76th anniversary of the genocide of the Armenian people and their widespread dispersion from the ancestral homelands they inhabited for over 3,000 years. From 1915 to 1922, 1,500,000 Armenians were killed through starvation and execution and more than 500,000 were exiled from their homes in the Ottoman Empire. Many of those Armenians came to the United States and they and their children and grandchildren now make up the proud Armenian-American community here today. As painful as these memories of genocide may be, we join the Armenian-American community and Armenians all over the world in remembering the massacre of 1915-22.

To fail to acknowledge the genocide of the Armenians would be to do an incredible disservice to those who died and to those who endured the horror and lived to tell the world. In the 1930's, Adolph Hitler used the lack of world outrage over the Armenian genocide as an indication that he could get away with the extermination of Jews in Eastern Europe. He said, "Who today remembers the Armenians?" We must remember the Armenians. We must hear the tale of the Armenian genocide and amplify it. Only when the world becomes fully aware of the magnitude of the genocide in Armenia, as well as of the Holocaust in Europe two decades later, can we hope to end these types of atrocities.

While it is important that we remember the lessons of the Armenian genocide, we must not let the transgressions of bygone days poison the future for ourselves and our children. We must use this memory as a launchpad for improving our relations with our fellow men and for building trust and brotherhood. Only then will the type of thinking that fueled the genocide against the Armenian people shrivel and die and become a memory of yesterday rather than a reality of today.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring Armenian-Americans and those around the world as they mourn the genocide of their ancestors by the Ottoman Empire. During this tragic period, during and after World War I, over 1.5 million Armenians were systematically eliminated. The survivors of this genocidal campaign were forced from

the homeland they had inhabited for the past 3,000 years.

The attempted annihilation of the Armenian people by the Ottoman government set the stage for what has tragically become an age of genocide. The systematic plan to eradicate all traces of the Armenian people and their culture set murderous precedent for future regimes in this century. One need only look at the Nazi Holocaust of 6 million Jews and countless gypsies, Russians, Poles, and others; the killing fields of the Khmer Rouges in Cambodia; as well as the campaign of annihilation which Iraq has undertaken against its Kurdish minority.

The crime of genocide is a crime against humanity. It is a crime also by humanity, Mr. Speaker, for its indifference. If such tragedies are to be averted in the future, those committed in the past must first be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, no words of outrage or tragic loss can describe the events of 1915 through 1923, which claimed the lives of 1.5 million Armenians. We haven't the vocabulary to capture the suffering or conjure the anguish. We haven't the capacity to give such words meaning.

The term "genocide" was coined in the aftermath of the Second World War to define in an academic, almost clinical way a phenomenon of the 20th century—the deliberate and systematic destruction of an entire people. It has no precedent in the barbaric annals of human history. It requires all of the organization and technology of our time.

I rise today along with my colleagues to remember the atrocities of 1915–1923. We join together to register an unspeakable loss, recognizing it as a singular event in history, a genocide. No manner of justice or atonement can be offered for the deaths of two out of every three Armenians living in their homeland. Mr. Speaker, the most we can offer, and the least, is our remembrance.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my indignation at the events of 76 years ago, when the falling Ottoman Empire sought to eliminate through mass murder the Armenian people.

The fact that over a 25-year period a government could commit such an inhumane act stands as testament to the crimes that can surface when a totalitarian government is allowed to stand.

On April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled, tortured, and murdered in remote places in Anatolia. Over a million others would also soon perish. Despite these mass murders, almost half a million Armenians escaped north across the Russian border, south into Arab countries, on west toward Europe and the United States.

Unfortunately, the world has not learned completely how to reverse this dark side of human conduct. With the Holocaust in Germany only 20 years later, Cambodia three decades after World War II, and the brutality the world has so recently witnessed from Saddam Hussein, it is clear that the battle for human rights and basic individual dignity is not yet won.

To question the authenticity of the tragic events of 76 years ago is a pathetic attempt to alter the records of history. American presi-

dents and statesmen from our Nation and from across the world have stated assuredly that these crimes against humanity truly occurred. It is time that all members of the world community acknowledge the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today to pay tribute to those Americans of Armenian descent who have worked so hard to contribute their talents to this Nation, while working to ensure that the world never forgets the atrocious fate met by their ancestors.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored, as I am every year, to join my colleagues in the April 24 special order commemorating the Armenian genocide.

I say I am honored because I sincerely appreciate that we are able to gather and remember this tragic event in human history, but I must confess that I also find it a little disconcerting. Every year we join the grieving of the Armenian people around the world and discuss openly the cruelty that the Armenians suffered, but somehow the word just doesn't get out.

These past few weeks much of our attention has been focused on the brutal suppression of the Kurds in Iraq and on the exodus and suffering which has followed. This event, which from the beginning has been closely compared to events in Nazi Germany, will occupy a prominent space in our minds whenever we consider the list of man's atrocities through history. But the Holocaust in Germany and the exodus in Iraq are just two examples. Others include, the Killing Fields of Cambodia, the horrible famine forced on the Ukraine by Stalin, the periodic pogroms against Jews in Tsarist Russia and, of course, the Armenian genocide.

The extermination of Armenians at the hands of the Ottoman regime in Turkey occupies a strange place in our consciousness. Very few such events are so well-documented, and very few received such wide acknowledgement at the time when they occur. Ambassadors from all over the world wrote to their governments and families about the tragedy. The United States Senate formally recognized the nature of the massacres in 1920. And every year we commemorate this event. But it is seldom talked about or studied elsewhere. Because of this, it seems vague and unimportant sometimes, almost as if it were just some nightmare—someone else's nightmare.

But make no mistake, the massacre of Armenians between 1915 and 1923 is solid fact; 1.5 million Armenians died during those years—about 500 per day; 1.5 million out of a population of 2 million. The existence of Armenian society and culture was wiped completely clean from the area that had supported it for thousands of years. The extermination was systematic. Like Hitler's final solution, the Armenian genocide was thought out and discussed. It was not some vague occurrence; it was concrete and constructed. In fact, according to Hitler's own writings it may have served as blueprint for the Holocaust.

Referring the impunity of the Ottoman regime and the short memory of the world as it headed toward war, an encouraged Adolph Hitler once asked, "who still talks nowadays about the extermination of the Armenians?" Well, thank God, we do here.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Remembrances like these are important because they help to prevent the occurrence of similar tragedies in the future, and I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for calling this special order today.

The Ottoman Empire's effort to eliminate its Armenian population, coupled with the world's indifference to that crime, set an example that has been emulated many times in the following decades. Around the world today, governments commit atrocities against their own citizens yet escape the consequences of their crimes for reasons of political expediency. Even when the evidence is clear and compelling, as it is in the case of the Armenian genocide, there are still those who would sacrifice the truth for political gain.

If we are ever to witness a respect for human rights, we must begin by acknowledging the truth. On human rights issues ranging from the detention and torture of political prisoners to the Armenian genocide to the genocide of the Kurds by the forces of Saddam Hussein, we must speak unambiguously. There is no place in the family of nations for governments that commit atrocities against their own citizens.

Both individuals and nations, if they are to realize their potential, must be able to make their own decisions. The Armenian people, after centuries of oppressive Ottoman rule culminating in the 1915–1923 genocide, followed by 70 years of Stalinist domination, have the right to shape their own destiny. Both in Armenia and in Karabagh, their right to autonomy must be affirmed.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson of the Armenian genocide is clear. To prevent such crime against humanity in the future, we must act now by fostering respect for the truth, countering efforts to deny human rights violations in the interest of expediency, and speaking out against all instances of man's inhumanity to man.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice to the memory of those 1.5 million Armenians massacred in one of this century's cruelest atrocities.

On this day in 1915, Turkey began a program of rounding up Armenian religious, intellectual, and political leaders and deporting them to Anatolia where they were systematically executed. In a single night, the leadership of Armenia was destroyed and the flame of the Armenian culture extinguished.

In the months following, over 250,000 Armenian soldiers serving in the Ottoman army were disarmed and placed in forced labor battalions. Those that did not succumb to the ravages of famine, disease, and exhaustion were executed by the Ottoman army.

The Armenian civilian's remaining, the women, seniors, and children left behind, were deported from the cities and towns. The men and older boys were separated from the groups, never again to be seen, and those remaining were forced on death marches into the desert of Syria. In all, over 1.5 million Armenians were massacred during the 7 years of genocide and more than 500,000 exiled from their homeland in the Ottoman Empire.

History tells us that those who do not study the past are doomed to repeat its mistakes. Nowhere in modern history is this lesson more poignant than in the case of the Armenian genocide. While we closed our eyes and let the painful memory of this atrocity slip from our collective memory, Adolf Hitler remembered the effectiveness of this systematic destruction of the Armenian people and rested secure in the belief that the Western Powers would not intervene in his Holocaust.

Let us not again forget the atrocities of the past.

Mr. Lehman, I thank you for hosting this special order on the Armenian genocide that began 76 years ago today. It is important that the memory of the Armenian genocide and its relevance be kept alive.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in a very important special order which commemorates the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Commemorating the Armenian genocide is a matter of utmost importance to all people who believe that the horror of genocide must not be allowed to happen again. If we permit genocide and inhumanity to go unacknowledged and unmourned, we leave open the possibility that this could happen again.

When Adolph Hitler planned the genocide against the Jews, he was quoted in a German newspaper as saying:

... and remember the extermination of the Armenians. One eventually reaches the conclusion that masses of men are mere biological plasticine...

Later he asked:

... and who still talks nowadays about the extermination of the Armenians?

The lack of a public outcry about the Armenian genocide contributed to Hitler's belief that his policies would go unpunished.

The facts surrounding the Armenian massacres are undeniable. On April 24, 1915, over 200 Armenian intellectual leaders were taken from their homes and executed. Armenian men in the Ottoman army were disarmed and placed in work battalions from which they were gradually removed and executed. The remaining women and children and the elderly were forced to participate in long marches through the desert with little hope of survival. By 1923, 1.5 million Armenians, over half of the world's Armenian population, had been slaughtered. It is a tragedy that we cannot allow to be forgotten and we absolutely must refute those who persist in trying to deny that the bloody massacres ever took place. The most recent example of this denial involved the removal of an important photo exhibit that had been displayed on Ellis Island. The photo exhibit depicted Armenians being executed by Turkish authorities. The Armenian genocide, as the primary cause of Armenian immigration to the United States during and after World War I, is an integral part of the story of Ellis Island. The exhibit was totally appropriate and should not have been removed. However, the exhibit, which had previously been vandalized, was removed by the National Park Service because of political pressure. That was a grave mistake.

As Members of the United States House of Representatives we have a responsibility to

speak up against injustice. Is the mere acknowledgement of the deaths of 1.5 million people too much to ask for? The answer should be a resounding no. I thank my colleagues for joining me today to show that the United States does understand what really happened to the Armenians.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I join my colleagues in rising to commemorate the Armenians who perished in this century's first genocide.

I am very proud of the fact that I represent the largest and most politically vibrant Armenian community outside of the Middle East. Throughout my 20 years in public office I have met repeatedly with survivors of the Armenian genocide. I do not see how any just and rational person can fail to accept their horrible eyewitness accounts. Indeed, many are still tormented by memories of the death marches of 1915.

The significance of this day is not simply a day of sadness and remembrance for the Armenian people. This single day serves as an expression of our commitment to historical truth and to universal principles of human rights. Indeed, the line from Armenia to Auschwitz to Cambodia is a direct one. Hitler, during an early meeting to map out the extermination of the Jewish people, was asked whether world opinion would not prevent such a plan from being carried out. Hitler laughed, "World opinion. A joke. Who ever cared about the Armenians?"

Mr. Speaker, because the world did not respond adequately to the needs of the Armenians this does not mean that we should not acknowledge and remember what happened to the Armenian people now. In fact, it is even more important that we never forget the story of the Armenian genocide. Despite attempts to revise history, even going so far as to declare that this tragedy never happened, we must not allow our moral outrage to be diminished by the voices of historical revision or denial.

The Armenian people, though scattered all over the Earth, have remarkably kept their culture, language, and religion intact. I salute their tenacity and spirit, and I join them in mourning those who lost their lives in the slaughter.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of a tragic period in European history. From 1915 to 1923, over 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children became victims of a massive genocide perpetrated by governments of the Ottoman Empire. By the end of the period, nearly 2 million Armenian citizens were systematically exterminated or deported.

The modern world now witnesses another genocide in northern Iraq, and it is appropriate that we take this time to revisit the horrors of the Armenian travesty in the hopes that our children will be prepared to prevent any similar acts in the future.

On the night of April 24, 1915, over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders were executed by the Turkish administration. This event marked the beginning of an 8-year policy of deportation and extermination of an entire minority population. Since that time, April 24 has been considered the symbolic date to remember the Armenian genocide.

The Armenian people remain a persecuted group. As I speak, the residents of Nagorno-Karabagh are surrounded by a hostile Azerbaijani state and remain vulnerable to the prejudices and hatred that is still pervasive in the region. Nagorno-Karabagh was split from Soviet Armenia during the Stalin regime, and while Armenians represent 75 percent of the population today, they are still forced to bear the repressive yoke of the Azerbaijani government.

These citizens could be protected by incorporating Karabagh within Soviet Armenia, but the Soviet Government has refused to consider such an option. President Gorbachev himself has stated a commitment to reform and correcting past injustices. Yet he has also rejected any correction to the miscarriage in Karabagh. Instead, the Kremlin has acceded to the will of the Turkish Government and maintained the status quo. The result has been violence, death, and destruction in the southern region of the U.S.S.R.

In Massachusetts, we remember this day as "Martyrs Day." It is a day when more than 40,000 Armenian Boston area residents, many in Watertown, MA, pay tribute to the brave men and women who gave their lives to protect what was rightly their own. It is a day when Armenian businesses and schools close in deference to their ancestors. And it is a day when American-Armenians everywhere are reminded that they live in a society where their fundamental rights as citizens are protected under law.

April 24 is an appropriate day to send a signal to the Kremlin that the people of Karabagh are Soviet citizens and should be afforded the same rights that any other citizen enjoys. The U.S.S.R. is signatory to several international human rights accords that stress this right, and therefore the world must insist that the self-determination for Soviet Armenians must be addressed.

The Persian Gulf has strengthened the international community's capacity to work toward a moral cause. And to this end, we have an opportunity to pressure the U.S.S.R. to do what is morally right and politically sound. I hope the world will adopt the worthy challenge in Karabagh; it would be a good start for the new world order. Thank you.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, there are some crimes against humanity which are so heinous that we may be tempted to disbelieve them. We want to believe that such atrocities couldn't possibly happen in our century, that somehow they belong to an era less enlightened than ours.

Yet, as hundreds of thousands of Kurds suffer in northern Iraq, we are reminded that man's capacity for evil is not bound by time. That is why it is so important for us to gather today in remembrance of the Armenian genocide.

In commemorating the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, we not only honor and remember the victims and survivors but recommit ourselves to preventing such inhumanities in the future. To remember is to defend against a recurrence; to forget is to condone.

Three-quarters of a century ago, the government of the Ottoman Empire rounded up and executed the leadership of the Armenian com-

munity in Istanbul. During the next 7 years, the Ottoman leadership was responsible for the deaths of over 1.5 million Armenians and exiling the remaining Armenian population from its homeland of 3,000 years. It was the first genocide of the 20th century.

Only a few hundred thousand Armenians escaped this attempt to erase the Armenian people and their culture from this Earth. I am honored to represent a district and State that has been enriched by Armenian-Americans. I am proud to stand with them today in commemorating this inhumanity visited upon the Armenian people, who continue to struggle against oppression. I salute their courage and perseverance in remembering this dark event so that others may never have to face such tragedy.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today we recall the tragic events of 76 years ago when the government of Ottoman Turkey, in an effort to rid the empire of its Armenian population, initiated a systematic and purposeful plan of genocide.

It is on this day, April 24, that Armenians from all over the world pause to pay tribute to the memories of the 1.5 million Armenians who lost their lives in this terrible atrocity. It was on this day, in 1915, that, as the first step of their genocidal plans, Ottoman authorities ordered the arrest of over 200 Armenian intellectual leaders in Constantinople and throughout the empire, taking them from their homes and summarily executing them.

The United States Ambassador to Turkey from 1913 to 1916, Henry Morgenthau, described the slaughter of the Armenians in his autobiography, "The Ambassador Morgenthau Story." "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact."

Despite the fact that the United States National Archives holds innumerable reports by Consuls and Ambassadors detailing the process by which the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire was decimated, there are still those who choose to ignore the tragedy that befell the Armenians.

Just recently, I learned of an unfortunate situation at the Ellis Island National Park. A photo display at the Ellis Island centennial exhibit depicting the execution of Armenians by Turkish forces, as part of an exhibit on immigration to the United States, was removed in late January by the park's superintendent following a pressure campaign by the Turkish Embassy.

I urge my colleagues to pause today and remember those Armenians that were uprooted from their homeland of 3,000 years and eliminated through massacre and exile during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in remembrance of a very dark day in 20th century human history. On April 24, 1915, the government of Ottoman Turkey set into motion a chain of events that would eventually lead to the deaths of over 1.5 million Armenians, and the exile of a nation from its homeland of 3,000 years.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations,

I firmly believe that in order to prevent genocides and other human atrocities in the future, we cannot forget those egregious occurrences of the past.

Respect for human rights is now a prominent issue in international relations, and it is a core component of American foreign policy. It is the concern for human rights which I believe is responsible for the international effort on behalf of the suffering Kurdish people.

Public exposure of human rights abuses might have been able to spare the Armenian population from one of the most brutal and systematic campaigns in recent history. That is why it is absolutely essential that this Chamber continues to view April 24 as a day of remembrance. Certainly, we do so out of respect for the Armenian people. But we also want to remind ourselves that we have a very critical role to play in preventing future atrocities and promoting respect for internationally recognized human rights.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, and to mourn man's inhumanity to man. Throughout their history, Armenians have been subjected to many tragedies, most recently the earthquake of 1988. But no tragedy has been more profound than the premeditated crime against the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. During the period between 1915 and 1922 approximately 1,500,000 Armenians were killed, and more than 500,000 were exiled from the Empire.

On April 24, 1915, hundreds of religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community were rounded up and eventually murdered in remote regions of Anatolia. The remaining Armenian population was then deported from their towns and forced to go on death marches. Most of the men and older boys were quickly executed. Those women who didn't die from forced starvation, disease, or outright murder were subjected to rape or forced into harems.

In 1918, Henry Morgenthau, the United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, said that the forced deportations were a "death warrant to the whole race," and that the Turkish authorities "made no particular attempt to conceal the fact" of this massacre. Before World War I, there were 2,500,000 Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. Because of this tragedy, there are fewer than 100,000 declared Armenians living in Turkey today, mostly in eastern Turkey far from their homeland in the western part of the nation.

Mr. Speaker, recalling Adolf Hitler's statement, "Who remembers the Armenians?" Elie Wiesel once said, "He was right. No one remembered them, as no one remembered the Jews. Rejected by everyone, they felt expelled from history." We must not let this expulsion from history persevere.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, ongoing events in Iraq cause us to pause and remember another terrible tragedy, the unforgettable Armenian genocide of 1915. The world has much to learn from a careful study of that first genocide against the innocent, and the Armenians of Greater Detroit are commemorating that horrible event today, April 24.

The history of the Armenian people is indeed a sad one. The mass killings of this

modern age got their start when Ottoman Turks decided to rid themselves of what they considered their "Armenian problem." From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire undertook the incomprehensible task of erasing any trace of the Armenian people. This atrocity opened the doors for the horrible genocide committed against the Jews during the Second World War. The concentration camps of Hitler had their seeds in Anatolia. The brutal massacres of Stalin, the killing fields of Cambodia, and the ongoing slaughter of the Kurds in Iraq—all the great terrors of the 20th century—grew out of the horrible holocaust in Anatolia.

We must pay tribute to those heroic Armenians who struggled against the well-armed Turkish forces. Over 1.5 million brave Armenians perished in the massacre. It is regrettable that many in Turkey still deny that this barbaric murder of the innocent ever happened. While ample evidence exists to document the events of those years, many Turks still claim that the Armenian genocide never happened. This should come as no surprise to those of us familiar with Turkish history. The Turkish Government still refuses to account for the whereabouts of over 1,500 innocent Greek Cypriots, including a number of American citizens, who disappeared after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974.

As we recall the terrible events that befell the Armenian people in the early years of this century, and mark the 76th anniversary of those dark days, we must all remember that respect for the rights of individuals and the groups which they comprise—whether religious, racial, ethnic, or national—must lie at the foundation of the relationship between a government and its people. We can and should ask for no less.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, April 24 is once again upon us and still we have no congressional resolution commemorating the horrendous Armenian genocide of 1915–23. April 24, 1991, marks the 76th anniversary of the beginning of the starvation, disease, and violence resulting from the Armenians' forced relocation. Sadly, our refusal to acknowledge this event perpetuates the myth that this genocide never occurred and trivializes the survivors' suffering.

We ought not to continue to succumb to modern Turkey's pressure to deny the massacre. International politics should have no bearing on exposing the truth. The Congress of the United States must do its duty by rejecting pressures to avoid conflict. As a freedom-loving Nation, our responsibility lies in ensuring that atrocities such as these not be hidden or forgotten but instead should serve as a reminder to the world that, unless we learn from the past, we will be doomed to repeat it.

We acknowledge that these violations of human rights in no way were the works of the present Government of Turkey, but rather were carried out by the governments of the Ottoman Empire. Turkey, with whom we have excellent relations, is not blamed.

Many of those who fled death came to the United States. These survivors and their descendants have become an integral part of America. Armenian-Americans are entitled to have their pain and suffering recognized. The victims of the Armenian genocide have suf-

ferred in vain if the world has learned nothing. They are to be victims once again.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. On the night of April 24, 1915, over 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Constantinople were arrested, exiled from the capital city, and executed. The representatives of the Armenian nation in the Ottoman Empire were silenced in a single night. This tragic event began the systematic policy of deportation and extermination of the Armenian community by the Ottoman Empire.

Prior to 1914, over 2 million Armenians lived in the region. Between 1915, and 1923, a million and a half Armenian men, women, and children were murdered by the government of the Ottoman Empire. By the end of 1923, the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had either been killed or deported.

Today the Armenian people continue to face hardship. The effects of the tragic 1988 earthquake which left half a million people homeless are still being felt, and the ethnic civil war with neighboring Azerbaijan in January, 1990, was quelled by Soviet troops. Many Armenians long for independence from the Soviet Union and desire freedom and democracy.

I hope that on this, the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, we can all take a moment to realize the importance of this historic day, and give serious consideration to the plight of the Armenian people.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today we gather to mark the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Each year, when I speak here about the genocide, I try to make a new point or strike a new theme. But each year I also come back to two constant themes.

The first is to memorialize those who died under Ottoman rule, to say they have not died unmourned and unnoticed, to shout that millions of us, Armenians and non-Armenians alike, will never forget.

The second theme is to declare that they shall not have died in vain, that the deaths of 1½ million people must serve as a giant warning flag to the world, alerting us to the threat of evil and uniting us to combat anyone who might again think of committing wholesale murder.

One only has to look at the film on the evening news these past weeks to despair, however. A million and a half Armenians died 76 years ago; an equal number of Kurds have fled their homes this month because they fear they too will become a statistic.

And in the intervening 76 years, we have had Hitler's genocide of the Jews and the gypsies. We have had the Cambodian Khmer Rouge genocide of their own people. And we have had the unnoticed and unremembered genocide of the 1970's in Equatorial Guinea in Africa where a madman dictator executed hundreds of thousands for the crime of being literate.

The world did nothing to stop the Ottoman crimes against the Armenians. We gasped when we learned about it. We wrote editorials. We pontificated. But we did not stop it.

The same can be said of the Nazi and Khmer Rouge crimes. Equatorial Guinea, on the other hand, was—and is—such a back-

water that we didn't even notice the murders of hundreds of thousands of innocents. We didn't even bother to editorialize. We didn't even raise our voices to pontificate.

Now we meet again on the floor of the House of Representatives, as we do each year at this time. But as we meet this year, we see the fear on the faces of the Kurds, and we hear the wails as they mourn their dead. And we know that once again we did not intercede to save a people from possible extinction. They had only their feet to protect them.

Has the world really learned anything from the genocide of the Armenians? Are we destined every decade or so to repeat the error of 1915—the kind of error that inflicts unspeakable horrors on innocents—the scale of error that leads us to round the death toll to the nearest hundred thousand?

Kurds and Shiites alike—Saddam Hussein and his minions machinegunned them in the streets. Helicopter gunships strafed them from the air. Artillery shelled them in their homes. Saddam's goal was to solve his problem by obliterating it. Only the problem was people.

How did this differ from 1915 when the Ottomans decided they would solve their perceived Armenian problem by obliterating the Armenian people—by driving them like cattle into the desert to die like animals?

One has to ask whether the horrors of 1915 have taught the world anything. I emphasize: the world. The United States cannot solve the world's problems unilaterally. But we can do a lot in concert with others—as we saw in World War II and most recently in Operation Desert Storm.

I fear—I despair—that we will see more 1915's in Armenia, more 1940's in Europe, more 1970's in Cambodia. We will see more 1991's in Kurdistan. We will see them until the responsible governments of the world wake up and decide to act responsibly. We will see them until the civilized world is prepared to face down murderous Ottoman rulers and other bloodthirsty autocrats. We will see them so long as human standards are a spotty occurrence. We will see them until the rule of law girds the world.

And so, in all honesty, I cannot stand here and say the men and women and children who died so horribly in 1915 and the following years did not die in vain. We meet today to memorialize them. And we will meet next year to memorialize them. And we will meet each year on this day to remind the world of what it did not do to save them from death. And we will continue to push and shout and cry out and remind those who would rather not remember, until some day—some day—the world will come to its senses and say: This must not be repeated again.

And then—only then—we can gather on this day and truly tell those who passed from the world under the boots of the Ottomans that, yes, they did not die in vain. They served as a beacon for the world—however, reluctant and slow that world was to see the light.

And I know that day will come.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 76th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. On April 24, 1915, the rulers of the Ottoman Empire began the systematic extermination of the Armenian people. Never before 1915 had a government been so committed

towards eliminating a culture, a language, and an entire race of people from the face of the Earth.

The extent and depth of the human tragedy and horror that unfolded, from 1915 until 1923, can be gauged by the sheer magnitude of the slaughter of over one million Armenians by the Ottoman government. As the conflagration of World War I engulfed Europe, the marches of forced starvation, disease, and massacres consumed the lives of the Armenian people.

In preparation for the Jewish Holocaust, Adolph Hitler was reputed to have asked, "Who remembers the Armenians?" Mr. Speaker, the American people remember the Armenians, victims of a deliberate, calculated campaign of mass extermination. The 20th century has borne witness to far too many such atrocities, crimes against humanity which will never be washed away by the passage of time.

As the leading democracy in the world, it is our solemn duty, our moral responsibility to remember the victims of this genocide. We must observe this anniversary to keep the memory and the truth about this catastrophic event in the annals of history. We owe it not only to ourselves and the Armenian-American community, but to the silent, fallen victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the world's attention is focused on the destruction of the Iraqi Kurds, I commend Congressman LEHMAN for calling attention to another oppressed people. Like the Kurds, Armenians are a long suffering people who were driven from their homeland and ruthlessly murdered. I am gratified the world has awakened to the slaughter of the Kurds, and it is time—on this day, the 76th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide at the hands of the Ottoman Empire—for the world to wake up to the persecution of Armenians during and following the First World War.

The Armenian genocide was a tragedy only matched by the depravity of Hitler and Pol Pot. Like the Jews of Europe and Cambodians that followed them, the Armenian community saw its people massacred in numbers that are inconceivable: 1.5 million murdered and 500,000 driven from their homes. In their attempt to eliminate any evidence of the proud Armenian heritage and culture, the Ottomans also destroyed thousands of churches and monuments.

Despite these incredible atrocities, the world knows nothing about it. Less than two decades after the genocide, Hitler himself noted that nobody talked about the extermination of the Armenians. The absence of attention in the 1930's may have convinced him the world would pay little attention to his even larger scheme.

Mr. Speaker, with more than 70 percent of the Armenian community of the Ottoman Empire killed between 1915 and 1923, it is shocking that doubts remain about the genocide. The genocide is a fact. Nobody can deny the photos and historical references, and nobody can deny the long memory of the Armenian community. Memories of the public hangings and destroyed churches haunt them. They look at their homeland of 3,000 years and see their community dead. There were 2.1 million Armenians in Turkey before 1915, now there

are only 100,000, and Armenia itself is nearly empty of Armenians.

It is our responsibility, our moral duty to keep the memories of 1915 alive. A world that forgets these tragedies is a world that will see them repeated again and again. The story of this and other genocides must be known by all, for only then is there hope to stop them.

We must also honor the victims who perished so brutally in the desert. We cannot right the terrible injustice inflicted upon the Armenian community between 1915 and 1923 and we can never heal the wounds. But by properly commemorating this tragedy, Armenians will at least know the world has not forgotten their misery. Only then will Armenians begin to receive the justice they deserve.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, this body commemorates today the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. We are joined in this observance by Armenians throughout the world who pause on this day to honor the memories of the 1.5 million Armenians killed by the Ottoman government in the years 1915 to 1923.

I am saddened that there are those who would forget this tragedy. To ignore the Armenian genocide is to desecrate the memory of those who lost their lives. Even worse, such denial sends the message that genocide is an acceptable form of behavior that will be tolerated by the world community.

The United States is a Nation which stands for the recognition of human rights, both within its borders, and for all peoples. To deny the genocide of the Armenians, or any atrocity of this scale, is to forsake the value we place on human life and the principles of liberty upon which this country is based. Those who turn a deaf ear to the Armenian genocide, knowingly or unknowingly, abet the future of genocide by failing to raise public consciousness about this tragic reality.

The surest way to honor the memory of the fallen Armenians and all crimes against humanity is to recognize their suffering and ensure that these acts are never repeated. Thus, as we pause to reflect upon this grievous example of man's inhumanity to man, let us strengthen our conviction that such atrocities never be repeated.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in memory of the 1.5 million Armenians massacred during and immediately after the First World War. We remember this crime against humanity to understand the event, and thereby preclude its repetition against anyone anywhere in the world.

The 24th of April represents for Armenians the symbolic beginning date of the Armenian genocide because on that date, in 1915, over 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Constantinople, and other centers of Armenian life throughout the Ottoman Empire, were arrested and systematically executed. In a single night, the voice of the representatives of the Armenian nation in Turkey was silenced.

Armenian men, who had been conscripted in the Ottoman Empire, were then disarmed and placed in work battalions from which they were gradually removed and executed. The remaining men, women, children, and elderly were forced on long marches through the desert, with little hope of survival. By 1923, when the slaughter finally ended, over half the

world's Armenian population had been murdered on the soil that they considered home for more than 3,000 years.

As we recognize today, I would like to share with you a statement made in 1918 by Henry Morgenthau, then U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire.

When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact. I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the suffering of the Armenian race in 1915.

These were the observations not of a revisionist historian but the thoughts of the official representative of the United States on the scene in Turkey at the time.

While, in the past, the genocide was officially recognized by the United States Government, since 1982, the Reagan and Bush administrations, bowing to pressure from the Turkish Government, have failed to officially recognize it. This both saddens and frightens me. I am saddened because the survivors of this tragedy, and their families, many of whom live in my district, are denied the legitimacy of their suffering. And I am deeply concerned because I see a world in which crimes against humanity are deliberately forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor the victims of the Armenian genocide by countering all such attempts to tamper with the truth, and strengthen our continued commitment to prevent such horrors in the future.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1915, a terrible 7-year period began for the Armenian people in Ottoman ruled Turkey. It was on that night that the Armenian leaders in Istanbul were rounded up and killed.

Over the course of the next 7 years, well over 1 million Armenians—including women and children—were killed. Between 1915 and 1923, many Armenians tried to escape to neighboring countries.

This wave of persecution began when the Ottoman leaders decided to disarm Armenian members of the military, then Armenian civilians and civic leaders. After that, Ottoman authorities began deporting Armenian leaders who could have formed an effective opposition against this Government plot. Their destination was the Syrian desert, where those on this journey either died or were killed.

Once the Ottoman Empire sided with Germany against the Allies in World War I, crimes against the Armenians increased, during which time an estimated 1.5 million Armenians lost their lives.

At the end of the War, the United States did make some effort to help evacuate Armenians from Turkey. At least one United States ship was dispatched to evacuate civilians from one of Turkey's port cities.

It is my hope that we have learned from this experience that genocide is not simply an internal matter for a country. It is a matter which should concern the entire world. I have been pleased that in our day, indeed, this month, our President has helped to provide military protection and humanitarian assistance to the Kurdish people fleeing from Saddam Hus-

sein's tyranny in Iraq. The Congress must make sure that events like those which cost the Armenians so much are never allowed to happen again.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in solemnly observing today as "National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-23." On April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian intellectual, political, and religious leaders were gathered up and brutally murdered. In the months that followed, the genocide of the Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire was put into execution. Today, of the more than 2,500,000 Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire before World War I, fewer than 100,000 Armenians remain in Turkey.

I have long been a vocal proponent of the need to commemorate the 1.5 million Armenians who lost their lives in the first genocide of the 20th century. We must not rewrite history by forgetting the 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who were massacred earlier this century. The proof and magnitude of the Armenian tragedy was established at the time by the records of this Congress and by our own Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire in 1915, Henry Morgenthau, who served as the United States Ambassador from 1913 to 1916. Henry Morgenthau stated, "I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915."

We observe this day of remembrance so that the truth survives the eyewitnesses. It was Hitler who cynically asked in 1939, "Who today remembers the Armenian exterminations?"

Fifty years later, it must be we who remember. To do otherwise brings shame to our great democracy. We must remember that many of the Armenians-Americans we represent are themselves survivors of the horrible massacres. Many others are the children of those who witnessed massacres. Many others are the children of those who witnessed the atrocity. Today we must pause and pay tribute to the memory of those Armenians who senselessly lost their lives in 1915.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate the 76th anniversary of the genocide of the Armenian people perpetrated by the governments of the Ottoman Empire.

Between 1915 and 1923, 1.5 million people of Armenian heritage died in the first genocide of the 20th century. This fact cannot be disputed any more than the virtual absence of Armenians from the eastern part of present day Turkey can be explained. This was the national homeland of the Armenian people, a people whose traditions and culture had survived for thousands of years.

Today the peaceful and freedom loving Armenian people are scattered throughout the world. Here in the United States, we embraced the refugees of persecution and invited them to join with us as Americans. Over 1 million Armenian-Americans—survivors and descendants of survivors—today contribute to the richness of our cultural heritage and the betterment of our country in many fields of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, if remembrance of the horrible fate that befell 1.5 million Armenian people between 1915 and 1923 will prevent such a crime from happening again, we must remember the Armenian genocide. Especially today, with the fears of genocide again in the news and again being faced by a minority people under domination by a hostile government, we must not let the memory of Armenian martyrs fade into the abyss of history.

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague today to join Representative LEHMAN and all Armenian-Americans in commemorating the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. We commemorate the victims of this horrible crime on April 24, because on that day in 1915, the Armenian intellectual leadership, in the capital city of Istanbul, and other Armenian centers of the Ottoman Empire were rounded up by the Ottoman authorities, taken to isolated areas and summarily executed.

Then United States Ambassador to Turkey, Henry Morgenthau, a witness to the genocide, described these deportations with the following words, "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact."

We must recognize these crimes against humanity if we are ever to put a stop to the cycle of genocide that has plagued the 20th century. Silence, in the face of such inhumanity, only encourages those who commit such atrocities. We can see today, in the plight of the Kurds, the terrible cost, in lives, of sacrificing fundamental human rights in the name of short-term political gain. Violations of human rights, whether past or present, must never be swept under the rug for the sake of expediency.

I am proud to know many Armenian-Americans as friends, colleagues, and copatriots; I have nothing but admiration for their strong faith, character, and cultural values. I am proud to join my colleagues today in remembering the Armenian genocide. Let us never forget the victims of all instances of man's inhumanity to man, in the hopes that such tragedies will never again be repeated.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from California, Congressman RICHARD LEHMAN, in commemorating the tragic Armenian genocide which occurred 76 years ago today.

April 24, 1915 marked the beginning of a deliberate persecution and execution of Armenians which claimed over a million and a half lives in just 8 years. These responsible citizens of the Armenian nation in Turkey were sought out and murdered because they were guilty of sharing a specific ethnic heritage. The Ottoman Empire attempted to completely erase this ethnic group. A healthy culture of over 2 million Armenians living in Turkey was completely destroyed by the end of 1923—the few Armenians lucky enough to escape death were deported from their homes.

This deliberate and premeditated maelstrom resembles the Jewish persecution of the Holocaust which occurred only a few years later. Because these evil events are so similar, I feel

not only sympathy for the Armenians, but a profound empathy.

When we commemorate the anniversary of a tragedy, we do so to remember the individual lives which were directly affected. But we also do so to educate generations to come—for those who have not learned the lesson of history are "doomed to repeat it."

On this solemn occasion, I extend my empathy to the Armenian people around the world and invite my colleagues and constituents to do the same.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my colleagues in recognizing the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, and to pay tribute to the survivors. I thank Congressman LEHMAN for his work in coordinating this special order.

Seventy-six years ago, on the night of April 24, 1915, tragedy struck the capital city of Turkey. Over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Istanbul were arrested, exiled from Istanbul, and eventually executed. The voice of the Armenian community was brutally silenced. However, this was only the beginning of what was to come.

Within several months of the initial executions, approximately 250,000 Armenians serving in the Ottoman army during World War I were systematically disarmed and removed to forced labor battalions. These men were sentenced to death by either starvation or execution.

In total, during the years 1915–22, 1.5 million Armenians were killed, and more than 500,000 were exiled from the Ottoman Empire. Deportations were carried out from every city, town, and village of Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia. The atrocities that took place during the death marches are unspeakable. With only a few remarkable exceptions, death and destruction prevailed.

The United States shares a special relationship with the Armenian people. The Armenian-American community now numbers nearly 1 million. I am proud to note that California has an Armenian population of nearly 300,000—the largest single population outside of the Armenian homeland. Armenian immigrants and their descendants have contributed and continue to contribute to the unique fabric of American life.

Today, it is fitting that we pay tribute to those people sacrificed in the Armenian genocide and to survivors whose legacy has made it possible for the Armenian people to prosper and thrive.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues to mark the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, the first genocide of this century. We commemorate this tragedy on the 24th of April because on this day in 1915 the Government of Ottoman Turkey arrested over 200 leaders of the Armenian community in Istanbul and executed them in the first step of a premeditated campaign that eventually took 1.5 million lives and exiled the Armenian people from their historic lands.

More than half of the world's Armenian population was destroyed in the years from 1915 to 1923. Those that escaped this attempt to erase forever the Armenian people and their culture, fled to the four corners of the Earth. These Armenians and their children and

grandchildren who settled in the United States while maintaining their heritage have enriched our society in every field of endeavor and have become part of the fabric of America. I join with these proud Armenian-Americans, and with all Americans in honoring the memories of the victims of this crime.

Unfortunately, there are those, even within our own Government who either ignore or choose to deny the Armenian genocide, despite the fact that it is thoroughly documented in the American, French, British, and German archives. There are those that will sacrifice the truth for short-term political gain. We must speak clearly on the issue of genocide. If we do not, we will only encourage those who would commit such crimes in the future. Less than two decades after the Armenian genocide, Adolf Hitler, seeing the world's indifference to the Armenians, determined that he could kill millions of Jews and escape the judgment of the world, because, as he said, "who still talks nowadays about the extermination of the Armenians."

The most recent example of denial of the Armenian genocide took place at no less a historic shrine than Ellis Island. Responding to a campaign orchestrated by the Turkish Embassy, the National Park Service has removed a photo depicting victims of the Armenian genocide from the Ellis Island Centennial Photo Exhibit. This act of historical revisionism, whether done in ignorance or simply to avoid controversy, must be condemned. The Ellis Island authorities must reject the heavy handed tactics the Turkish Embassy has used to rewrite the history of American immigration. The Armenian genocide, as the primary cause of Armenian immigration to the United States during and after World War I, is an integral part of the story of Ellis Island. The removed photograph should be reinstated where it rightfully belongs.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Armenian Genocide, an event which must never be forgotten by the citizens of America or the peoples of the world. A little less than a century ago, Armenian citizens of the Ottoman Empire became the target of murder and persecution by their rulers. While it is important to avoid equating the Ottoman Government with the present day Republic of Turkey, it is, nevertheless, our responsibility to remember this tragic crime perpetrated against the Armenians in order to prevent others like it from ever happening.

The number of victims of this murderous campaign is staggering. Between the years of 1894 and 1896, during the reign of the Sultan Abdu-Hamid II, approximately 300,000 Armenians were massacred. Later, in the year of 1909, 30,000 Armenians in the area of Cilicia were murdered. And between the years of 1915 and 1922, when the genocide reached its bloody peak, approximately 1,500,000 Armenian men, women, and children were killed and more than 500,000 others were exiled from the Ottoman Empire.

Numerical figures will never adequately impart a sense of the pain and loss suffered by the Armenians. I ask my distinguished colleagues to attempt for a moment to consider the awesome scope of a genocide: the attempt to systematically murder an entire people. Genocide means the murder of families,

the extermination of a people's culture, tradition, and way of life. Genocide destroys a people's paintings and songs, their stories and myths. It is an attempt to erase from the pages of history the wisdom and accomplishments of past generations and the promise and potential of those of the future.

To ignore or forget events like the Armenian genocide is to aid those who would repeat such crimes. Unfortunately, many forms of genocide still continue around the world. To preserve the memory of the Armenian genocide is to thwart the perpetrators of these crimes and to remind present and future generations that only they can prevent genocides from happening again.

On April 24, Armenians all over the world will mourn the Armenian genocide. Let us join them on this day of remembrance. Let us also pledge our efforts to never again allow the crime of genocide to destroy the lives and culture of any group of people.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, each night we turn on the television to see horrifying scenes of the plight of the Kurds. We are able to sit in our living rooms and see the death and destruction of government gone mad; a government intent on annihilating an entire people. The suffering of the people, especially the innocent children, has caused an outpouring of compassion which has forced the international community to put aside geopolitics and to concentrate on humanity. My hopes and prayers are with the men and women who are now battling the odds to struggle and save the lives of the Kurd refugees.

Just as importantly, it is my hope that the effort on behalf of the Kurds will truly spell a new world order, one in which the governments of the world act together to prevent such atrocities from ever happening again. Let this be a symbol that no longer will the world stand by while a government attempts to destroy a people.

Unfortunately, the world has not always reacted so compassionately to the plight of a small race of people facing destruction at the hands of the ruling government. Those who ignore history are condemned to repeat it.

In the shadow of World War I, the Ottoman Turk Government embarked on a plan to systematically eliminate the Armenian people from their ancestral homeland.

The Armenian men who had answered the call to join their country's armed forces were isolated and shot. On orders from the central government, Turkish soldiers rampaged from town to town, brutalizing and butchering the remaining Armenian population. Women and children were then forced on a death march into the Syrian desert. By the end of the war, the Ottoman Turks had been successful in exterminating two out of every three Armenians. A million and a half Armenians had perished at the hands of the Ottoman Turks.

Henry Morgenthau, Sr., then United States Ambassador to Turkey, wrote: "I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915."

Only 20 years later, Adolf Hitler asked rhetorically, "Who remembers the Armenians?" as he began his master plan to annihilate the

Jews. Those who fail to remember history are condemned to repeat it.

Over the last 3 years the Armenian people have suffered once again at the hands of a larger nation only for the world to turn a blind eye. In Sumgait and Baku, organized pogroms were unleashed on the Armenians. Over 300,000 Armenians were forced to flee their homes in terror.

I have had the privilege of serving in Congress for the past 10 years and each year I have risen on the floor of the House to urge my colleagues to recognize the atrocities suffered by the Armenians at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. The facts do not change; my words do not change. Each year, those efforts have failed. I ask my colleagues, "How many more Bakus; how many more Sumgait must we witness before we tell the truth?"

The years cannot mute the voice of those Armenian survivors whose individual accounts of savagery combine to form a bedrock of irrefutable evidence. Despite the attempts to hide the records and to distort the facts; despite the world's preoccupation with politics and strategy, the truth of the Armenian genocide remains.

We commemorate April 24 as the National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-23, and pledge that their deaths were not in vain, that their suffering will not be forgotten. We must use the truth of the Armenian genocide to help prevent such a tragic event from ever occurring again.

But we also use this day to rejoice in the continued survival of the Armenian people, for while the Turks crushed the fruit, the seed remained. I am reminded of a passage that William Saroyan wrote:

I should like to see any power in this world destroy this race, this small tribe of unimportant people whose history has ended, whose wars have been fought and lost, whose structures have crumbled, whose literature is unread, and whose prayers are no more answered. Go ahead, destroy this race! Destroy Armenia! See if you can do it. Send them from their homes into the desert. Let them have neither bread nor water. Burn their home and churches. Then, see if they will not laugh again, see if they will not sing and pray again. For, when two of them meet anywhere in the world, see if they will not create a New Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to honor both the victims and the survivors of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Anneg Srabian's life was saved by a branch protruding from a well.

In 1915, 15-year-old Anneg, her family members, and all of the other villagers were forced by Ottoman officials to leave their homes in Havav, a town in the northeastern part of the Ottoman Empire. Some were taken away never to be heard from again. Others were forced to march for hundreds of miles with little food and water to an unknown destination. Many of those who could not keep up with the march were brutally murdered by the Turkish soldiers overseeing the exodus.

Anneg, who just celebrated her 90th birthday, is a resident of the University Nursing Home in Wheaton, MD, and recently recalled in vivid detail the events of that fateful spring 76 years ago. She told of the night the villag-

ers were lined up in front of a well and the Turkish soldiers began beheading their victims and systematically throwing their bodies and heads into the well. When her turn came, the soldiers were tired, and merely pushed her into the well. As she fell, her dress caught on the branch protruding from the side of the well, and there she hung until the slaughter was over.

Then, through one of those strange quirks of fate, one of the Turkish soldiers peered down into the well, saw her hanging there, and took pity on her. He pulled Anneg up out of the well and let her go free, saying that it was "the will of Allah." And so young Anneg's life was spared, although all of her family members perished.

It was through countless episodes of such sheer luck that many other Armenians survived the marches and massacres that killed hundreds of thousands of their countrymen. It is estimated that 1.5 million people of Armenian ancestry were victims of the genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923.

There are more than 30,000 pages of documents deposited in our National Archives, in the Department of State, and in other Government agencies which describe in detail the entire process by which the Armenian people were made the object of systematic murder now known as genocide. Our own U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at that time, Henry Morgenthau, sent home urgent cables providing graphic descriptions of the forcible evacuation of Armenians and the physical abuse of those who were being deported.

In the face of this overwhelming evidence, I was deeply concerned to learn that the National Park Service has removed a photograph depicting the victims of the Armenian genocide from the Ellis Island Centennial Photo Exhibit in New York. There is an old expression which says photographs don't lie, and the caption under this particular photograph stated: Armenians hung during massacre of 1915. By 1921, nearly 100,000 Armenians had come to the United States, fleeing periodic Turkish massacres in which over 1 million Armenians lost their lives.

As the chief sponsor in the Congress of legislation which established the Statue of Liberty Coin Program and raised about \$75 million to repair the Statue of Liberty and to restore Ellis Island, I urge Ann Belkov, the Superintendent of the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island National Park, to reconsider and to restore this photograph to its rightful place in the Centennial Photo Exhibit. Removal of this photo constitutes a deliberate and possibly illegal censorship of the official history of immigration to the United States. Such censorship has no place in America.

For this very reason, so that attempts at historical distortion may be suppressed immediately, it is important that we focus attention each year on this anniversary. It is also important, because as the years pass by, so, too, do the survivors of the Armenian genocide pass away. Fewer and fewer Armenians are alive today who actually suffered through those terrible times, and can relate personally the events of the genocide to succeeding generations, as Mrs. Anneg Srabian has done. Only by continuing to remember the disastrous

events of 1915 can we hope to prevent a tragedy of this magnitude from occurring again.

Mr. Speaker, as we mourn the loss of the Armenian martyrs earlier in this century, so, too, do we now pledge ourselves to continue to remember those martyrs and to continue to fight against abuse of human rights, violence and destruction so that humanity may survive in a world free from the fear of genocide.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commemorating the 76th anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide. This concerted effort to wipe out an entire people and their culture must never be forgotten.

On April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire rounded up hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders. They were sent into exile in remote areas, where they were later murdered. Within a few months, the 250,000 Armenians serving in the Ottoman army were transferred to forced labor units. Virtually all of them were either worked to death or executed.

With no leadership, it was a simple matter to exile the rest of the Armenian nation from their cities and villages. In most cases, the men and older boys were killed, and the women and younger children were marched into the Syrian desert. Thousands of them died there.

At the time, Secretaries of State William Jennings Bryan and Robert Lansing led an international protest of the murders and then organized humanitarian relief for the survivors. Between 1913 and 1930, the American people contributed \$113 million toward this effort and 132,000 orphans became foster children.

The murderers of the Armenian people are now all dead, and the Ottoman Empire no longer exists, but we must never forget the brutal depths to which nations can sink. I find an eerie parallel between the massacre of the Armenian people in 1915, and the plight of the Kurdish people today. The well-known quote from George Santayana that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it" rings all too true.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join those marking the 76th anniversary of the National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–23. We continue to remember and we will never forget the atrocities committed against the people of Armenia and the 1.5 million Armenians who perished.

Although the exact events of this period remain somewhat difficult to definitively ascertain, we are certain of the enormous scope of the suffering faced by all inhabitants of the region. Seventy-six years later, Armenians around the world still have reason to be concerned about the conditions in their homeland. In Soviet Armenia, pollution has become a serious and deadly threat to the well-being of the population. Political unrest and conflict in the region continue, forcing tens of thousands to flee. The result is a refugee crisis in Moscow and other Soviet cities. We cannot forget the tragic earthquake which claimed thousands of lives, effects of which are still readily apparent today.

The lessons of the Armenian genocide must not be lost on the world. Unfortunately, humanity doesn't learn these types of lessons well. The horrors of 1915–23 were perpetrated

again by Nazi Germany against European Jewry, Gypsies, and others, and again by the Khmer Rouge against the Cambodian people. Today, we are witnessing a mass exodus of almost unprecedented scope by an ethnic group attempting to flee extermination by the Iraqi regime. We must remember these brutal occurrences and we must continue to speak out against these atrocities. Respect for the rights of individuals and the groups they comprise—whether ethnic, racial, religious, or national—must be the critical building block of international relations and the relations between a government and its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in this era of unprecedented change, it is more important than ever that the lessons of this tragedy be remembered so that we never again relive the horrors of mass destruction.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today, hundreds of thousands of Kurdish refugees are fleeing their homeland in order to escape slaughter by the forces of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. We sympathize with their plight, having to flee hundreds of miles through frozen, muddy mountain passes in order to reach safety and only to be met with misery. The Kurds are suffering from hunger, exposure, and disease and as many as a thousand are estimated to be dying daily.

Seventy-six years ago this April, another group of people, the Armenians, were also uprooted from their homeland. The Armenians were not only uprooted from their homeland of 3,000 years, but were massacred by the barbaric rulers of the Ottoman Empire, or driven into exile.

Today—April 24—is marked as a day of remembrance for over a million Armenian victims.

At the hands of the Ottomans, the Armenians were systematically murdered, starved, or herded into the Syrian desert, where they died from exposure and starvation.

The Armenian genocide—like the Holocaust—must be remembered, their tragic lessons preserved.

The Armenian genocide carries a universal message. It is that we cannot permit genocide, oppression, and violence to be perpetrated in the name of nationalism, racism, or any other ism.

From the Armenian genocide to the Holocaust to the present day deplorable situation of the Kurds, we must speak out, we must condemn, and we must act. That is our obligation.

The Armenian people were put to death for no reason other than that they were Christians. Prejudice of any kind against anyone, at anytime cannot be tolerated. Silence and apathy are the enemies. They not only tolerate hate and bigotry, they nurture them and permit them to proliferate.

We cannot wipe the slate clean of human experience. Rather, we must learn from it, or condemn ourselves to suffer the fate of the 1 million Armenians and 6 million Jews.

Today, we join the Armenians and all people in remembering—ever vigilant—the more than a million victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow and anger that I join my colleagues in

commemorating the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

On this day we recall the tragic events which began on April 24, 1915, when the government of the Ottoman Empire rounded up the leadership of the Armenian community and executed them in the first step of a premeditated campaign that eventually took 1.5 million lives.

It is not only the horror of this crime that we remember on this dark anniversary, but also the scandal of continued lies and attempts by the State of Turkey to deny the truth of this shameful atrocity.

Earlier this year, under pressure from the Turkish consul in New York, officials of the National Park Service removed a photo of the Armenian genocide from an exhibit at Ellis Island. This photo, which depicts Armenian victims of the genocide, contained a caption explaining the Armenian genocide as a major cause of Armenian immigration to America.

It seems that the Turkish Government has once again chosen to contradict the thousands of documents in the official archives of all major governments, including our own and Turkey's, testifying to this holocaust. We must not allow the Turkish Government to rewrite history, especially when it also impinges on our own history.

The Armenian genocide, as the primary cause of Armenian immigration to the United States during and after World War I, is an integral part of the story of Ellis Island. The removed photograph should be immediately reinstated where it rightfully belongs.

We must never forget this horrible crime against humanity and its many victims. It is a responsibility to our children and to ourselves never to allow the memory of this genocide to fade. Only by looking this awful period in history straight in the eye can we fully comprehend its ugliness and hatred, and ensure that it will never happen again.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, the history of humanity is rife with examples of man's inhumanity to man. From our earliest forebears, who massacred other bands for rights to a watering hole, to today's complex national and religious conflicts, humans unable to dominate their neighbors have all too often turned to the solution of eliminating their neighbors.

Every April 24, people from all over the world pause to recall one particular tragedy, notable not just for its scope and horror, but because all too many of us have never heard of it, and others would choose to forget.

The genocidal deportation and massacre of the peaceful Armenian people between 1915 and 1923, as part of a program to deport the entire Armenian population from the homeland of the Ottoman Empire, led to the death of more than 1.5 million people, either directly at the hand of Ottoman authorities or by starvation.

The remaining survivors of this atrocity still live with horrors that few people in the world can appreciate. Only those persecuted to death by such infamous tyrants as Hitler or Pol Pot in Cambodia can truly understand their agony.

Only a few hundred thousand Armenians escaped death at the hand of the Ottoman Empire, or starvation in the deserts to which the Empire expelled them. Among those are

the many Armenians who have made their home in Michigan. It is they who must continue to suffer the indignity of those past events. And they do continue to suffer.

Only recently, a photograph in an interpretive exhibit at Ellis Island—which explained that thousands of Armenians fled to America to escape certain death at the hands of the Ottomans—this photograph was removed from the exhibit at the request of Turkish authorities.

Other nations have committed atrocities in this century. But the people of these countries have confronted their histories, tried to learn from them, and have made apologies and reparations to those who suffered.

Turkey would rather forget its Ottoman history, rather than learn from it. But the people of the world must never be allowed to forget this, or any other such atrocity. As the sage once said, those who forget their history are doomed to repeat it. And all civilized nations should work together to eliminate such behavior of man toward fellow man from the face of the Earth.

We should all pause on April 24 to offer comfort to those who suffered so terribly in the past, to commiserate with their descendants who suffer the continued indignity, and to recall to all who have forgotten the terrible crimes of the past.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, 2 short days ago, I returned to the United States of America from a heart-wrenching weekend journey into what I call no man's land. I was joined by four of my colleagues as we toured the crude, makeshift refugee camps that have sprung up along the Turkish-Iraqi border, camps where hundreds of thousands of Kurds are taking whatever refuge they can from the forces of Saddam Hussein.

The conditions we saw were nothing short of horrendous: a lack of food and clean water; no sanitary facilities; nonexistent medicine; rampant disease; frigid temperatures, and no shelter. And always the fear that their enemy was just over the next ridge waiting to continue its campaign of murder and terror.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the Kurds are prisoners in no man's land, thrust into this hell on Earth by a systematic campaign of terror by Saddam Hussein.

We should all be proud that the United States is leading the worldwide humanitarian effort to provide life support for the Kurdish people.

However, we should also be mindful that the ethnic terrorism that transformed these Kurds into pathetic refugees is not a new phenomenon. Just as we must stop Saddam's attack on the Kurds and just as we must never forget Hitler's genocide of the Jews, we must also remember the unspeakable tragedy that befell the Armenian people 70 years ago.

From 1915 to 1923, 1.5 million Armenians living in Turkey under the Ottoman Empire were systematically and purposely massacred. Hundreds of thousands of Armenians were uprooted from their homes and either killed outright, worked to death in a labor camp, or sent into exile.

There should be no doubt about the extent and terrible nature of the crimes that were committed against the Armenian people during the rule of the Ottoman Empire. The historical

record is full of appalling details of the cruel genocide that was waged against Armenians. In fact, the cables of our own diplomats who were there bear grim testimony to the tragedy.

As the scale of the suffering became known, the American people responded with genuine sympathy and support for the Armenian people. We made every effort to stop the killing and opened our country as a refuge from persecution. Thousands of Armenians came to the United States in search of a new life. They and their children are now successful, contributing members of our society.

I am pleased that my congressional district in northern New Jersey is home to one of the largest Armenian communities in America. I am honored to represent them. They exemplify the highest standards of family life, educational performance and American patriotism.

Indeed, America in 1991 owes a great deal to the contributions of the Armenian people. But, what the Armenians want most of all is that America and the world never forget the tragedy that befell them over 70 years ago. Only then can we be certain that history will never repeat itself and efforts at historical revisionism will fail.

I thank the gentleman from California. By reminding the House and the Nation of the Armenian genocide, you promote respect for human rights of all peoples.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, the 76th anniversary of the tragic Armenian genocide, to pay tribute to the millions of Armenians who were persecuted during the 8 years of genocide.

On April 24, 1915, a genocide began in Turkey that took the lives of 1.5 million Armenians. On that day alone, about 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were either arrested, exiled or murdered. For 8 long years, from 1915 to 1923, Armenians lived in fear of torture and death. Some were fortunate enough to flee the mass executions, but all Armenians suffered. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from their homes, and many witnessed the death and imprisonment of loved ones. The memories of such atrocities can never be forgotten by the Armenian people, and are passed on from generation to generation. The rest of the world must also reflect on the inhumanity of what happened 76 years ago with passionate intolerance.

Remembrance of the Armenian genocide is imperative to preclude men from successfully repeating Hitler's statement "Who today remembers the Armenian extermination?" Perhaps the executions of the Stalin era and the Cambodian killing fields could have been preempted had global recognition of the Armenian genocide evolved earlier.

Like many of my colleagues, I am the offspring of southeastern European immigrants. As a Greek descendent I share a feeling of national tragedy with the people of Armenia. For this reason, I have always felt a certain empathy for Americans of Armenian descent. Unfortunately, many people today would rather forget the grim reality of what happened 76 years ago today.

On this, the anniversary of the Armenian genocide, I urge my fellow colleagues along with members of the international community, to join me in taking a moment to remember

the horrible tragedy that occurred in Armenia so that it will not be repeated again.

BNL SUBPOENA RENEWAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. ESPY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House of Representatives about the quest of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs for certain subpoenaed documents. As the House is aware, the Banking Committee has been vigorously investigating, in the last Congress and in this one, the secret and unauthorized loans to Iraq by an Italian bank, Banca Nazionale del Lavoro, known as BNL, through its offices in the United States.

Loans now estimated at over \$4 billion went from that bank to assist Saddam Hussein. A substantial portion may have gone into Iraq's secret network of companies and individuals for obtaining Western technology. The subject of BNL, and the examination system for BNL, continues to be of the greatest interest as we watch the consequences of the conflict with Iraq, and draw lessons from the circumstances leading up to that conflict, which included those loans to Iraq and Iraq's use of them. No one should doubt the Banking Committee's strong and unflagging determination to investigate fully this matter of the highest oversight and legislative importance.

In November 1990, the Banking Committee voted to subpoena the Federal Reserve System for the reports of State-prepared examinations of BNL in its files. The Federal Reserve System explains that it regularly uses these examination reports in its umbrella review system for foreign banks like BNL. For four of BNL's five offices—those in Georgia, Florida, New York, and California—the Federal Reserve was able and willing, upon receipt of the subpoena, to provide the reports. However, the banking agency for the fifth State, Illinois, filed suit to enjoin our obtaining the reports of BNL examinations it conducted. The State agency argued in part that a standard form confidentiality agreement between Federal and State banking agencies barred our obtaining those reports from the Federal Reserve. Rejecting the Banking Committee's motion to dismiss the case, a Federal judge in Chicago granted the State agency the injunction which it sought, and the case is now on appeal.

The committee issued the subpoena for BNL's examination reports last year during the 101st Congress. That subpoena expired with the beginning of the current 102d Congress in January. Accordingly, as part of the committee's continuing BNL investigation, the committee met on April 11 regarding a renewal of the subpoena in this 102d Congress to avoid delays or side-disputes about the expiration of the last Congress. Additional subpoenas, not

involved in the court case, were authorized as a result of the widening of the investigation.

The committee can now report to the House that it voted—by a unanimous vote of 40 to 0—to renew that subpoena, on the same basis as in the last Congress. As in that Congress, the committee will defer the subpoena, as to the Illinois reports, in light of the pending proceeding, and will give the Federal Reserve formal notice when it sets a return date. This vote should send a strong signal to those who would file lawsuits to frustrate congressional investigations. A congressional committee will not be distracted or intimidated by such lawsuits.

The chief problem faced by the committee regarding this lawsuit has been that the State agency, by invoking the slow workings of the judicial system, threatens by delay to frustrate the investigation of the loans to Saddam Hussein, and the consideration of legislative reform. Through the House counsel which represents the Banking Committee in this case, the committee has asked the court of appeals to do what it can, in a proper way, to prevent the decision regarding dismissal of the case from being delayed through remands or other extended proceedings. In February, the investigation made the same request of the court of appeals to avoid such delaying proceedings in a formal report.

Now, again, this committee vote of 40 to 0 asks the court of appeals to prevent delays from remands or other extended proceedings. As the BNL report said in February, there may be court cases in which more rounds of district court proceedings help through allowing more study or more settlement talks, but this is not one of them. With further delays, this would truly become a case, as the Supreme Court once said, where "protracted delay has frustrated a valid congressional inquiry." The committee's hearings and reports all emphasize the timeliness of the Iraq loan investigation. Further delays in this matter would be a serious interference with the Banking Committee's forceful determination to press vigorously with this investigation.

I want to take this opportunity to mention some of my own efforts, and the staff's, on the issue of these particular State examination reports. In November 1990, after the committee issued its subpoena to Chairman Greenspan of the Federal Reserve, I personally discussed the subpoena issues with him on November 28 in what proved to be a successful effort at working them out. This was a serious discussion between the principals, of the kind which, instead of lawsuits, should resolve such matters. Immediately thereafter, on December 4, Chairman Greenspan carried out his side of our discussion, writing me that he would provide those State-prepared reports, as he did for the four BNL States that did not attempt to delay us by lawsuit.

Out of an abundance of care for all interest involved, the committee has had its staff and House counsel go back to inquire into the official records that would shed light on the standard form confidentiality agreement relied upon by the State. It has appeared from these inquiries that under the umbrella system established pursuant to the International Banking Act of 1978, the Federal Reserve has received the State-prepared reports of examinations of

foreign banks, long before there was any such agreement. The Federal Reserve's general counsel described to my committee counsel on April 4 what the official records for BNL reflect. BNL opened its Chicago office in 1982. The first Illinois State-prepared examination report of BNL was completed on June 10, 1983. That report was transmitted to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago by cover letter dated August 23, 1983. Not until 1987, years later, did this agreement come into existence, resulting from a history entirely separate from the umbrella supervision system.

Apparently, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, or FFIEC, drafted the standard form agreement. By act of Congress, the FFIEC promotes vigilance and uniformity in the examination reports relied upon by Federal financial regulators, including both the Federal Reserve and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board which supervised savings and loans until succeeded by the Office of Thrift Supervision. The statute creating the FFIEC also empowers a State liaison committee [SLC] to work with the council, recognizing that Federal supervision has relied in the past upon State examinations of even quality.

According to public reports and records, in the mid-1980's, the FFIEC and its SLC worked toward a policy for sharing of examination reports for domestic banks between Federal and State regulators. There was already sharing of examination reports for foreign bank offices pursuant to the International Banking Act of 1978—as reflected by Illinois providing its BNL examinations to the Federal Reserve from the inception in 1983 of its examinations of BNL—and the problem at issue was thus with State-chartered domestic banks, particularly those which are part of an interstate bank holding company. The timing, sequence, and drafting clearly shows that the agreement is tied to examination reports of domestic banks, which sometimes were not being shared, rather than those for foreign banks, which were under the umbrella system pursuant to the International Banking Act.

Although the agreement thus was not aimed at examination reports like BNL's, our inquiries have continued because we wished to know what the agreement means when it does apply. It appears that the policy leading to the standard form confidentiality agreement was approved at the FFIEC meeting on March 14, 1986. Of particular interest, the official minutes of that meeting describe the explanation of Edwin J. Gray, then chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board which supervised savings and loans, who was at that time also chairman of the FFIEC itself. These minutes record that:

Chairman Gray said that he wasn't sure how the various state legislatures worked but that he was not sure how the state agencies could protect the confidentiality of the information in all circumstances. He noted that not even the federal agencies could make such a representation.

The committee has been quite familiar with Chairman Gray, and can very safely say that he knew as well or better than any Federal regulator that Federal agencies cannot withhold from the Banking Committee documents that are needed for oversight of how bank supervision is working. Chairman Gray's state-

ment that "not even the Federal agencies could make such a representation" as to what would happen with "the information in all circumstances" reflects the universal understandings that Federal banking agencies must, as part of their duties, provide evidence to Congress and the Federal courts for them to perform their constitutional functions, and that no policies or agreements would curtail that duty. Other FFIEC discussions make plain, as those familiar with this context will recognize, that confidentiality policies and agreements have a much more mundane focus, namely the noninvestigative access accorded by State freedom of information acts, requests by regulated banks for parts of exports normally withheld from them, and the like.

Pursuant to the policy approved in April 1986, the FFIEC and its SLC devised their model agreement for confidentiality between Federal and State regulators, which was promulgated in January 1987. The Federal Reserve adapted that agreement to incorporate its regulations on release of examination reports in response to subpoenas, and also adapted the agreement explicitly to apply to examination reports of domestic banks, not foreign banks. Illinois has noted that it began providing the pertinent domestic bank examination reports to the Federal Reserve starting in January 1987, and it signed the model agreement with the Federal Reserve in March 1987. Plainly, the Illinois agreement was bound up with providing those domestic reports, not with the foreign bank reports which it had been providing for years pursuant to the umbrella supervision system.

As for the other four BNL States, identical agreements were signed by Florida, Georgia, and New York, while California has a parallel arrangement. The Illinois State banking agency has complained that States would be injured or rendered uncooperative by the Federal Reserve's compliance with the committee's subpoena. Unlikely as that seems, those four States have been checked with by the House counsel's office, to see whether as a result of the committee's demand in its Iraq loan investigation, and the Federal Reserve's providing of the BNL report they prepared, they ceased sharing examination reports with the Federal Reserve. As one would expect, all of the four BNL States of Florida, Georgia, California, and New York have confirmed that they have continued to share examination reports with the Federal Reserve.

What all this shows only too clearly are the consequences if congressional oversight were to be frustrated by lawsuits like this one. The standard form agreement is on interagency scope and nationwide application, used by a number of Federal agencies in dealings with the 50 States. Thus, the agreement covers large parts of the national financial regulatory system, and even larger parts if it were construed, through "oral modifications" or otherwise, to cover parts of the system, like foreign banks, which its terms do not cover. It is not all that different from agreements or understandings that Federal regulators have with regulated businesses which number in the thousands.

The February report noted how quickly the notion spread of withholding documents from the committee on the argument that the com-

mittee should obtain them, not from the files of the Federal Reserve which had them and used them in the umbrella system the committee sought to oversee, but with the permission, and pursuant to the conditions, of the multifarious original preparers. As the committee sees how vast are the subject areas covered by such agreements or understandings, it stands more resolutely than ever, by its unanimous vote renewing the subpoena, on its right not to have lawsuits bring disputes over how it conducts its investigations into Federal court. If the Federal courts were to judicialize this third-party complaint about Congress obtaining agency files, they would do so for other examples of that aspect of congressional investigations. If the Federal courts were to judicialize this aspect of congressional investigations, they would do so for the other aspects. Those considering the route of delaying congressional investigations will have a complete roadmap, a gold-plated invitation and a guarantee of hospitality.

Every Member of this House is familiar with the enormous bills to the taxpayer for the savings and loan scandal and the necessity for vigorous oversight of the banking supervision system. Yet, if the committee's Iraq loan investigation can be interfered with by lawsuit, the same arguments about the same standard form agreement would be raised against oversight for savings and loans, and in fact for much of the banking system. Similar arguments would be raised throughout Congressional oversight of departments and agencies. The Banking Committee has resolutely refused to let oversight be frustrated in that fashion.

I will briefly note another development in the BNL matter. On February 28, it was announced that a grand jury indicted 10 defendants on 347 counts of fraud and related charges concerning more than \$4 billion loans and credit extension to Iraq. Together with the connections between BNL and the network of Iraq's front companies, this will be illuminated in the committee's hearings. At this time, that is noted just for its confirmation of the vital need for the Banking Committee's BNL inquiry, which is the only way that major questions about systemic matters and needs for legislation will be answered to which such a huge fraud points, but which will not be answered in a trial narrowly focused on the allegations about the defendants. Thus, the House of Representatives understands why the Banking Committee declares, as it strongly believes, that the injunction blocking its BNL inquiry is against the national interest.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
EXAMINATION COUNCIL

To: Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council.

Subject: Minutes of the March 14, 1986 FFIEC Meeting.

Chairman Gray convened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. in the conference room of the Comptroller of the Currency on Friday, March 14, 1986. Representing their agencies were:

Robert L. Clarke, Comptroller of the Currency.

Edwin J. Gray, Chairman, FHLBB.

Roger W. Jepsen, Chairman, NCUA.

Preston Martin, Board Member, FRB.

L. William Seidman, Chairman, FDIC.

Representing the State Liaison Committee were:

Sidney A. Bailey, Commissioner of Financial Institutions, Virginia.

Charles W. Burge, Deputy Commissioner of Thrift Institutions, Georgia.

Tom D. McEldowney, Director, Department of Finance, Idaho.

PROPOSED POLICY ON THE EXCHANGE OF SUPERVISORY INFORMATION AMONG THE FEDERAL AND STATE SUPERVISORY AGENCIES

James Houpt, FRB, stated that this policy was being proposed to the Council because of the growth in interstate banking activities and the growing need for federal and state agencies to cooperate in their supervisory efforts. Mr. Houpt summarized the proposed policy for the Council. Mr. Bailey, SLC Chairman, said that the policy as drafted seemed to focus on examination data but that information pertaining to applications was also important and that it should be made clear that such information was also covered by the proposed policy. He said that the primary concern is with safety and soundness and that the purpose of the policy should be to provide for the soundness and that the purpose of the policy should be to provide for the routine sharing of information. Mr. Bailey questioned the definition of "legally able" used in term #2. Mr. Houpt stated that this wording was only intended to protect the confidentiality of information obtained from the federal agencies from disclosure under state freedom of information laws and was not intended to imply that states would have to have specific laws providing an absolute guarantee that such information could never be disclosed. Chairman Gray said that he wasn't sure how the various state legislatures worked but that he was not sure how the state agencies could protect the confidentiality of the information in all circumstances. He noted that not even the federal agencies could make such a representation. (Council Member Martin, FRB, entered the meeting at this point, 9:30 a.m.) Mr. Bailey suggested that if expanded access to the FDIC's existing data base could be arranged on a need-to-know basis that it would provide most of the data that are needed by the states. About 30 states are already linked into this data base for information on state chartered banks in their own states. Mr. Houpt said the FDIC applies its own examination ratings to state member and national banks and might have examination ratings different from those of the principal agency. Mr. Bailey said the FDIC rating is not what the states are interested in: the states want the information on which the rating is based. Mr. Selby, OCC, said the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency would want to release its own information and not have it released from the FDIC. (Mr. Clarke left the meeting at 9:50 a.m.)

Council Member Martin made a motion to approve the policy, with the suggested changes by Mr. Bailey and Council Member Jepsen. The motion was seconded by Mr. Selby (acting for Council Member Clarke) and unanimously approved.

PRESS RELEASE

The Examination Council announced today its approval of a Model Agreement on Sharing of Confidential Supervisory Information. The Model Agreement was developed because of the increased importance of interstate banking and thrift operations and the growing need for federal and state agencies to cooperate in their supervisory efforts.

The Model Agreement was developed in cooperation with the Examination Council's

State Liaison Committee, a group of five state supervisors of depository institutions that advises the Council on matters affecting the supervision of state-chartered depository institutions. The Model Agreement is an extension of the General Policy Statement on the Exchange of Supervisory Information Among the Federal and State Supervisory Agencies that was adopted by the Council on March 14, 1986.

The Council is recommending to the Federal Reserve Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, National Credit Union Administration, and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency that they consider this Model Agreement when they develop their own agreements for the exchange of confidential supervisory information with state supervisory agencies. Also, the Council's State Liaison Committee plans to recommend to the states that they give consideration to the Model Agreement in developing agreements with the federal supervisory agencies and the supervisory agencies of other states.

A copy of the Model Agreement is attached.

AGREEMENT ON SHARING OF CONFIDENTIAL SUPERVISORY INFORMATION

The _____ ("Requesting Agency") and the _____ ("Responding Agency") hereby agree ("Agreement") to exchange confidential supervisory information including reports of examination relating to depository institutions which are related to an organization for which the Requesting Agency has supervisory jurisdiction or which have submitted an application to the Requesting Agency. Under this Agreement, either the Federal or the State Agency may request information as the Requesting Agency subject to the conditions, obligations, responsibilities of this Agreement. In submitting a request, the Requesting Agency shall provide a specific description of the information desired and its need for the information. The Responding Agency will make all reasonable efforts to reply to the request within twenty (20) working days of its receipt.

The Requesting Agency specifically agrees to be bound by the same standards of confidentiality and other limitations and conditions respecting the use of any such data received from the Responding Agency as specified in the Joint Statement of Policy on Interagency Exchange of Supervisory Information and dated August 23, 1984, adopted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Office of Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The Requesting Agency expressly agrees further to limit its use of any such information it receives under this Agreement to functions related to the exercise of its appropriate supervisory authority.

The Requesting Agency acknowledges that all confidential supervisory information, in whatever form, furnished by the Responding Agency remains the property of the Responding Agency and agrees that no further disclosure of any information obtained from the Responding Agency under this Agreement shall be made to any other state, local, or federal agency, court or legislative body, or any other agency, instrumentality, entity, or person without the express written permission of the Responding Agency.

By this Agreement, the Requesting Agency gives express assurance that under the applicable laws, regulations, and judicial rulings it has the authority to comply fully with the

use and disclosure limitations and conditions of this Agreement; that it will provide written notification to the Responding Agency within ten days of any material change to this authority or any violation of this Agreement; and that any such change or violation shall automatically terminate this Agreement unless the Responding Agency waives termination in writing within thirty days of learning of the event constituting the change or violation.

In event of termination of this Agreement, all information received hereunder by the Requesting Agency shall be immediately returned to the Responding Agency with the express agreement that no copies or derivative information will be retained by the Requesting Agency. In addition, and without terminating the Agreement, the Responding Agency may, in its sole discretion, require the return of all documents and derivative information previously supplied on a particular depository institution.

This Agreement shall in no way limit the discretion of the Responding Agency to deny future requests for confidential supervisory information, in whole or part, for any reason consistent with the Council's General Policy for sharing such information, adopted at its meeting March 14, 1986, and with Responding Agency's own supervisory interests and obligations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLOMON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes each day, on April 30, May 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 16.

Mr. GILCREST, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, on April 25.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MANTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DONNELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DARDEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THORNTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ESPY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes, on May 8.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLOMON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOOLITTLE.

Mr. COX of California.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. GEKAS in four instances.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in five instances.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. PURSELL.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. WYLIE.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MANTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. STARK, in three instances.

Mr. DONNELLY, in three instances.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. REED, in two instances.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. VENTO, in two instances.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. ROEMER.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the speaker:

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 21, 1991, and the week beginning April 19, 1992, each as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 218. An act to designate the week beginning April 21, 1991, and the week beginning April 19, 1992, each as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 25, 1991, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1139. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the twelfth report on applications for delays of notice and customer challenges under provisions of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3421; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1140. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 92-20), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1141. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting certification that the furnishing of assistance as requested in the proposed International Cooperation Act of 1991 for Greece and Turkey will be consistent with the principles set forth in section 620C(b) of that Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1142. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting a copy of the decision granting defector status in the case of a certain alien who has been found admissible to the United States under law, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(28)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1143. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the annual report on applications for court orders made to Federal and state courts to permit the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications during calendar year 1990, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1144. A letter from the Acting Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's sixty-fifth quarterly report on trade between the United States and the nonmarket economy countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2441(c); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 1. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore and strengthen civil rights laws that ban discrimination in employment, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Report No. 102-40, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of April 17, 1991]

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. WELDON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ROE, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 1918. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a service pension of \$100 per month for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

[Submitted April 24, 1991]

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 2037. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to enhance air carrier competition and improve air carrier passenger services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCURDY:

H.R. 2038. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1992 for intelligence activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2039. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Legal Service Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H.R. 2040. A bill to establish certain programs regarding adoption, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2041. A bill to direct the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to conduct a study to develop methods and devices to protect manatees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. THORNTON, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GILCREST):

H.R. 2042. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 2043. A bill to amend the copyright laws to provide compulsory licenses only to those cable service providers who provide

adequate carriage of local broadcast signals, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2044. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on m-Toluic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2045. A bill to safeguard individual privacy of genetic information from the misuse of records maintained by agencies or their contractors or grantees for the purpose of research, diagnosis, treatment, or identification of genetic disorders, and to provide to individuals access to records concerning their genome which are maintained by agencies for any purpose; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DARDEN (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 2046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain expenses of State legislators; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 2047. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the abatement or waiver of interest on certain tax deficiencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 2048. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to clarify the employment tax status of certain fishermen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SUNQUIST, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 2049. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the exclusion of immigrants infected with the HIV virus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWYER of New Jersey:

H.R. 2050. A bill to suspend for a 3-year period the duty on ofloxacin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ECKART (for himself, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. SAWYER):

H.R. 2051. A bill to ensure that tourism activities in Antarctica do not have an adverse impact on the Antarctic environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FAZIO:

H.R. 2052. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, upon payment of a specified sum, to transfer title to certain water supply facilities of the Solano Project to an organization composed of the users of water from the Solano Project, to enhance Putah Creek, to authorize use of the proceeds of the sale to fund selected environmental enhancement measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. EARLY, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 2053. A bill to authorize the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority to use a facility for the treatment of residual waste located outside of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FUSTER:

H.R. 2054. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from prescribing or collecting fees to cover the cost of providing certain agricultural quarantine and inspection services at a site within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. HUGHES):

H.R. 2055. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for international parental kidnaping of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 2056. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require that subsidy information regarding vessels be provided upon entry within customs collection districts and to provide effective trade remedies under the countervailing and antidumping duty laws against foreign-built ships that are subsidized or dumped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANDY:

H.R. 2057. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on zinc powder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 2058. A bill to amend the Import Milk Act to require that dairy products offered for importation into the United States meet the same standards applied to dairy products produced in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2059. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot project using foreclosed properties to provide shelter for homeless veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 2060. A bill to suspend temporarily the duties on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2061. A bill to suspend temporarily the duties on certain instant print cameras; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL of California):

H.R. 2062. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Mateo County, CA; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SABO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 2063. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the use of child safety restraint systems approved by the Secretary of Transportation on commer-

cial aircraft; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a strategic urbanized program for providing additional assistance for the Federal-aid highway systems and for mass transit projects in urbanized areas with populations of 50,000 or more, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. LOWEY of New York:

H.R. 2065. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose foreign gifts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

H.R. 2066. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on imported baseball and softball gloves and mitts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2067. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain radio-tape player combinations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGRATH (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2068. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on digital processing units for automatic data processing machines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2069. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff of the United States regarding certain parts for automatic data processing machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself and Mr. STUMP):

H.R. 2070. A bill to grant a Federal charter to the Fleet Reserve Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 2071. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to increase border patrol personnel to 6,600 by the end of fiscal year 1994 and to make available amounts in the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund for the additional border patrol personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY):

H.R. 2072. A bill to authorize States to regulate certain solid waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL of North Carolina:

H.R. 2073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to index the basis of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss and to exclude from gross income all dividends from domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. CLINGER):

H.R. 2074. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for the purpose of enhancing competition among air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2075. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit discrimination in the provision of home and community-based services under a waiver based on whether an individual has received institutional services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PEASE (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 2076. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to reform the provisions relating to child labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 2077. A bill to encourage the reporting of sexual assaults by protecting the privacy rights of victims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2078. A bill to include photoreceptors and assemblies containing photoreceptors within the temporary suspension of duty on parts of certain electrostatic copying machines, and to extend the suspension of duty until January 1, 1995; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 2079. A bill to allow the Resolution Trust Corporation to acquire property for its own use from an institution for which it has been appointed conservator or receiver only if the property has been offered for sale or lease to the public; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. KYL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 2080. A bill to provide for the designation and conservation of certain lands in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize Federal support of State defense forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 2082. A bill to conserve the diversity of fish, wildlife, and biological systems of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SYNAR (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. PENNY, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 2083. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve the safety of exported pesticides, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALLON:

H.R. 2084. A bill to establish a minimum requirement for the water quality criteria for dioxin published pursuant to section 304(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, to require each State to adopt a water quality standard for dioxin which is at least as stringent as that criteria, and to direct the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in consultation with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct a study on the effects of dioxin on wildlife,

and the entire aquatic environment; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming:

H.R. 2085. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake interpretive and other programs on public lands and lands withdrawn from the public domain under their jurisdiction, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, Agriculture, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 2086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for that portion of a governmental pension received by an individual which does not exceed the maximum benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act which could have been excluded from income for the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLKMER (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri):

H.R. 2087. A bill to authorize funds for the construction of highways and to authorize activities under chapters 1 and 2 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 2088. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania shall be held at Lancaster, PA, in addition to those other places currently provided by law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 2089. A bill to require hearing loss testing for all newborns in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WASHINGTON:

H.R. 2090. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide the penalty of life in prison for bankers laundering drug money; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2091. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal recent increases in Social Security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 2092. A bill to carry out obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter and other international agreements pertaining to the protection of human rights by establishing a civil action for recovery of damages from an individual who engages in torture or extrajudicial killing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida):

H.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution designating the week beginning May 5, 1991, as "National Correctional Officers Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO (for himself, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.J. Res. 233. Joint resolution designating September 20, 1991, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day," and authorizing display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution commending Solidarity for bringing democracy to Poland and proclaiming Lech Walesa as an honorary citizen of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSO (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WILSON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. ROE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LENT, and Mr. APPELGATE):

H.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution designating May 15, 1991, as "Joe DiMaggio Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Resolution Trust Corporation should follow asset disposition procedures which provide incentives for the prompt and efficient disposition of assets; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 132. Resolution electing Congressman LEVIN of Michigan to the Committee on the District of Columbia; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. RITTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SHARP, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. VALENTINE):

H. Res. 133. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives regarding agreements between the United States and Japan with respect to trade in semiconductors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHARP (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LEHMAN

of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. WILSON):

H. Res. 134. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States implement promptly the recommendations the National Academy of Sciences issued in its report "Policy Implications of Greenhouse Warming"; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, Agriculture, and Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

90. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a constitutional amendment to protect the American flag from desecration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of April 23, 1991]

By Mr. McCOLLUM:

H.R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Maj. Ralph Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

[Submitted April 24, 1991]

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT:

H.R. 2093. A bill for the relief of Trevor Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 32: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 43: Mr. CAMP, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 62: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 77: Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 78: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 118: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 134: Mr. GRANDY and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 150: Mr. CARDIN and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 187: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 252: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 256: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 303: Mr. KASICH and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 304: Mr. GOSS and Mr. DICKINSON.

H.R. 330: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FISH, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 351: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 352: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 386: Mr. YATES, Mr. ROSE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Ms. SLAUGH-

TER of New York, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 413: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 418: Mr. FIELDS and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 467: Mr. JAMES, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 479: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 504: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 525: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 550: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 565: Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 583: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 592: Mr. LAROCO, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FISH, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 652: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FOGLETTA, and Mr. APPELGATE.

H.R. 656: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 670: Mr. HERTEL and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 702: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 710: Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. McCRERY.

H.R. 713: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 744: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 745: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 747: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. OAKAR, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BUNNING, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 763: Mr. WEISS and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 776: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. NOWAK.

H.R. 784: Mr. MILLER of Washington and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 793: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SWETT, Mr. JONTZ, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 809: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 842: Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 865: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 866: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 916: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 919: Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H.R. 939: Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 972: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 993: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WEISS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1076: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 1079: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1081: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1113: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1114: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1118: Mr. GORDON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 1124: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WISE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1130: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1141: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1145: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. PRICE, and Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 1147: Mr. CAMP, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GUARINI,

Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HANCOCK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. CARR, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. PURSELL, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1149: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1168: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 1177: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1178: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1184: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1189: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DE LUGO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 1197: Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ECKART, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 1200: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. APPLEGATE, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1239: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CARPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 1245: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. JAMES, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MC MILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1250: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1257: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 1288: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1326: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 1339: Mr. DIXON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1348: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. YATES, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1352: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1361: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 1412: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 1460: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BRUCE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 1469: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1472: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ORTON, and Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 1473: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1497: Mr. HORTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. PICKLE.

H.R. 1504: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1508: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 1516: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. KYL.

H.R. 1527: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. LONG, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SWETT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1528: Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1545: Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1551: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1570: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 1571: Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 1579: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1601: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1611: Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1633: Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WEISS, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. RIGGS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. GEJENSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1635: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1649: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 1663: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1669: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1682: Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 1711: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1723: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 1727: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1738: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1770: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUARINI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1860: Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1920: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1921: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1969: Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. YATES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. CARR, Mr. LENT, and Mr. GREEN of New York.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEACH, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HENRY, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.J. Res. 140: Mr. FISH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. FASCELL.

H.J. Res. 141: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. SWIFT.

H.J. Res. 142: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 154: Mr. VANDER JAGT and Mr. STEARNS.

H.J. Res. 171: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.J. Res. 173: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. YATES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SABO, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.J. Res. 191: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. WALSH, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr.

EMERSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DIXON, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. TALLON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RHODES, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SHARP, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RITTER, Mr. EARLY, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.J. Res. 195: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FAWELL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. BRUCE.

H.J. Res. 198: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. SOLARZ,

Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.J. Res. 219: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. BRYANT.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. LEVINE, of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RHODES, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BRUCE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr.

WILSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. PETERSON, of Florida, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. HORTON, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. MACHTLEY

H. Res. 33: Mr. GRANDY.

H. Res. 101: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. SPRATT.

H. Res. 121: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 524: Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 1344: Ms. PELOSI.