

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 20, 1992

The House met at 11 a.m.

Rev. Tom Hargesheimer, St. Pius X, Rochester, MN, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we ask You bless our Nation and its people. May our ties of fellowship and citizenship be strengthened. Protect us from all catastrophes and disasters. Unite us in peaceful struggle toward true progress and prosperity; may it become reality through the productive work of all.

Send Your blessing upon all those responsible for the destiny of this Nation. Grant the representatives of the people the strength and courage to make decisions for the well-being of all. Help them to preserve the climate of freedom, justice, and opportunity for all in this great Nation.

Protect all citizens; encourage them in their efforts during these difficult times in the cities and rural areas, along the borders and on the world scene, and thus help build a happy and beneficial future for all our citizens. 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. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] to lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOOLITTLE 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 bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 353. An act to require the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to conduct a study of the prevalence and issues related to contamination of workers' homes with hazardous chemicals and substances transported from their workplace and to issue or report on regulations to prevent or mitigate the future contamination of workers' homes, and for other purposes.

WELCOMING REMARKS FOR FATHER TOM HARGESHEIMER

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

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to welcome to the House today our guest chaplain, Father Tom Hargesheimer. Father Hargesheimer is pastor of St. Pius X Catholic Church in Rochester, MN, where he has served for the past 6 years. Prior to his assignment to St. Pius, Father Tom served in several other parishes of the Winona Diocese. I am especially grateful that he is able to be with us today since his own father died this past week. I know my colleagues join me in extending our condolences to the Hargesheimer family.

Father Tom is here today at the suggestion of one of my former employees, Michael Cronin, who served under Father Tom's tutelage this past summer.

Father Tom fulfills, in an exemplary way, the many roles we ask of our clergy. He is a pastor, a spiritual guide, a moral leader, a community leader, a mentor, and a friend. In addition, he is well known for his keen sense of humor and his good cooking. We are grateful for his inspirational leadership to his parish and his years of faithful service in southeastern Minnesota.

Father Tom is representative of the many other dedicated clergy who serve in our area, and I am pleased to welcome him to Washington today. So thank you, Father Tom.

Since this is also a special day for you in another sense, I want to wish you a happy 50th birthday.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1992

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

A FORMULA TO STIMULATE GROWTH, FIGHT RECESSION

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, an increasing Federal deficit and record domestic spending has only proven to the American people that the Democrat-controlled Congress does not care that unemployment is up, investment is down, and families must bear the burden of financing the whims of Members and their precious special interest groups.

The liberals in this body have got to get it into their heads that in order to provide ample tax cuts for the people, they have to decrease congressional spending. And, on top of that, they cannot continue to levy taxes that end up hurting American workers like the botched-up 1990 budget deal. All that did was backfire and force struggling manufacturers to lay off thousands of middle-class workers.

There are 29 days until the March 20 Presidential deadline. As the Republicans have known all along, the only way to help our recession-stricken Nation is to stop wasteful spending, implement tax cuts to stimulate growth and increase savings and investment.

DELIVERING A MESSAGE

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the area I represent in central California is about the same size as New Hampshire, and the recession is about the same, too.

In good times, central California agriculture spreads riches throughout the region's entire economy.

Unfortunately, the area is reeling from recession, drought, and a devastating crop freeze that hit more than a year ago. The unemployment rate is stuck at about 15 percent.

This past year, central Californians waited patiently for months and months while the White House delayed a decision on emergency assistance for freeze victims. They stood by as a much-needed extension of jobless benefits was delayed for months by the White House. They wondered what it would take for their President to pay

□ 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.

attention to serious problems here at home.

On Tuesday, the voters of New Hampshire may have provided the answer. Central Californians don't have much in common with New Hampshire, but their message is the same.

**"ZERO BY 2000," A PLAN TO
ELIMINATE THE DEFICIT**

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

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, Congress is fiddling around while the economy is being burned up by the tinkering that is going on in these very halls. The sure-fire answer to the problems facing us in the present for the short term and the long term is the deficit of the U.S. Government. Once we begin to reduce the deficit and eventually bring it down to zero, you will see an expansion of activity, productivity, enterprise, recapitalization, and a road to prosperity like we have never known before. But we must start now.

These measures that are coming before us in a political year will not do the job. That is why I am proposing today and will introduce legislation to implement "Zero by 2000," a plan something like Gramm-Rudman, which will reduce the deficit of the United States piece by piece until the year 2000 when we will have come down to zero.

What that will mean is we will be freeing up billions of dollars for all those necessities that everyone craves for on this floor, while at the same time making sure that our economy will be reignited for that prosperity for which we all yearn. Zero by 2000. That should be our calling card.

**PRESIDENT'S POLICIES
REGRESSIVE TOWARD WOMEN**

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, as we all know from looking at the polls in New Hampshire, it was Republican women who saved George Bush's career. There was a terrific gender gap, because the women figured out that the only thing worse for them than George Bush would have been Pat Buchanan.

Yet we now see the administration going pell-mell toward issuing regulations on the gag rule. That would be the most regressive thing you could do to women. In other words, in any clinic getting Federal funds, doctors cannot speak openly to women. They must only say what the Federal Government tells them to say.

Women do not want that kind of protectionism. I would hope that the

President would at least talk to the Republican Congresswomen, if he does not want to talk to the Democratic Congresswomen. He should at least talk to them before this regulation comes out, because I think it is a very, very serious mistake. He might find the next time around the women are not going to vote for him if they are given another choice.

**SUPPORT URGED FOR A CONTINUED
STRONG IMPACT AID PROGRAM**

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

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to alert my colleagues that one of our oldest Federal educational assistance programs may be drastically cut, if not eliminated entirely. At a time when we constantly are hearing calls for increased Federal involvement in education, it is hard to believe that this program should be under attack.

I am speaking of the Federal Impact Aid Program which supports the Education of children of our military families.

For decades we have recognized that we had the responsibility to assist school districts in areas highly impacted by Federal military and civilian employment. This was not done simply to assist local school districts with their budgets—it was done to assure quality education for the sons and daughters of people who were making a vital contribution to all of our national interests.

Now, apparently because we are making significant cutbacks in military bases and personnel, there are those who say that this program no longer is needed. I urge my colleagues to join me in expressing support for the continuation of a strong impact aid program.

□ 1110

**CREATE JOBS WITH VALUE-ADDED
FARM COMMODITIES**

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Madam Speaker, farmers and agricultural economists have realized for a long time that the key to prosperity in agriculture is to increase the U.S. share of the world market in value-added farm goods. It's time that America woke up to this reality. We have simply failed to utilize our existing export programs to aggressively promote the sale of value-added commodities, and U.S. farmers have lost markets as a result.

While our competitors, principally the European Community, have nearly doubled their value-added exports, our

own trade in such products actually has declined during the last decade. And, this has come during a time when value-added exports, worldwide, have increased by more than 50 percent.

That is why I am today introducing legislation to require that 35 percent of our export credit programs and 25 percent of the Export Enhancement Program [EEP] be used to expand and open markets for U.S. processed agricultural commodities.

Madam Speaker, as much as this is a farm issue, it is a job issue as well. The fact is that if we use our credit guarantee programs aggressively, we can create jobs for American workers now and increase markets for American farmers into the future.

USDA's Economic Research Service studies back up my argument: ERS says increasing our share of the world market for high-value products to 15 percent could create 1½ million new jobs and increase our gross national product by \$52 to \$104 billion. And, this could be done without harming our traditional markets for raw, bulk commodities, where we lead the world.

Madam Speaker, I believe it is time that U.S. policies promote what we can do better than anyone else in the world: Provide food and fiber that are processed, packaged, shipped, and marketed at reasonable prices throughout the globe.

I would hope that we can move forward quickly with this legislation. It is good for farmers, for workers, for basic manufacturers, for processors, for wholesalers, for shippers. It is good for the economy, Madam Speaker.

TAX CUTS SPELL RELIEF

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Madam Speaker, all the evidence is in. As conservatives predicted, the 1990 budget agreement with its \$137 billion tax increase has forced American families and businesses to tighten their belts to the point of strangulation.

Despite the fact that the Democrats finally are beginning to realize that tax cuts spell economic relief, many are still holding fast to the ill-fated budget deal. The big government types refuse to see that the tax increases have resulted in less growth and a bigger deficit.

Congress can ease the financial burden of working families by repealing some of the flawed economic models in last year's agreement and enacting comprehensive tax cut legislation that would put money back into pockets of Americans; where it belongs.

I challenge Members of the House to do just that. We now have 29 days to enact the President's budget proposal. In doing so, let's give the American

people their money back in the form of tax cuts, and let's pay for it by trimming the fat around the enormous belly of the Federal Government. Let the people decide when, where, and how to spend their hard-earned money.

CRISIS IN ALGERIA

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, I would like to welcome Fedrick Chiluba from Zambia to Washington, DC. He is President of Africa's newest democracy and part of a movement toward democracy which for the first time includes African and Islamic countries.

The movement toward democracy was alive and well, for example, in Algeria a few short weeks ago, when the Algeria people decided that they would elect a fundamentalist Islamic group of people to power to replace the pro-Marxist dictatorship that had ruled them for two decades.

Unfortunately, democracy has been thwarted in Algeria in the name of thwarting the Islamic fundamentalism.

This is wrongheaded, Madam Speaker. The United States should be on the side of democracy, and we have nothing to fear from Islamic fundamentalism any more than we have to fear from Christian fundamentalism.

What we are opposed to is dictatorship, is fanaticism, is repression. The Islamic fundamentalists of the world who devoutly believe in their Islamic religion are not a threat to the Western democracies. We should be on the side of democracy in Algeria and elsewhere, whether the religious people are devoutly Moslem or Christian or any other religion.

It is sad that the people of Algeria now believe that the United States is not on the side of democracy and the other democratic powers are not on the side of democracy, if indeed it is contrary to the Christian religion.

I believe that in Iran, Islamic fundamentalism has certainly been a negative force, but that need not mean that we oppose Islamic fundamentalism all over the world and should seek to make it a force for democracy and freedom and tolerance.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 330

Mr. FISH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill H.R. 330, the Refuge Wildlife Protection Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SLAUGHTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, if we needed further evidence of the struggle of middle-class working Americans, the U.S. Census Bureau provided it today. According to a census bureau report, there are fewer middle-class Americans today than there were 20 years ago. Something is wrong.

The most telling part of this story is that the lower income levels are growing faster than the higher brackets. The American dream is fading.

The American dream is about opportunity. This report tells a story I've heard confirmed all too often at the supermarkets and lunchrooms in Connecticut. Working middle-class Americans are afraid. They are afraid that they will no longer have the ability to care for their families, send their children to college, or pay the high costs of things that shouldn't be considered extravagant—like health care.

We can fix what's wrong. We can provide assistance to our middle class by passing a significant middle-class tax relief proposal, one that provides real relief to a substantial portion of the American middle class. We can address the soaring costs of health care. We can help restore the confidence of the American middle class in the dream that guides each of us.

GOVERNMENT WASTE

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, we are all trying to reduce waste, and we are always trying to figure out ways to conserve paper and use recycled paper and so forth.

I want to show my colleagues an example of what one of my constituents brought in to me last week in the way to reduce waste and how our U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is handling it. I do not want to give his name, because we do not want to get him nuked, but at any rate, this person got this big envelope, 39 cents mailing. And lo and behold what was in there was this little notice. That was it, in a 39-cent envelope this big.

This is not a big deal, but if we are going to try to reduce Government spending, all these little things matter. If we want to conserve, if we want to reduce waste, the best way to do it is have a simple envelope, a small envelope, save 14 cents.

Who knows how many thousands of these little sheets of paper went out to each and every person who might be on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's list?

I think that my colleagues, Madam Speaker, should be on the lookout for

this. And whenever we see waste in Government, no matter how small or how large, be on the lookout for it. Point it out and get these Government agencies, whether it is the Department of State, whether it is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or whichever one it is, point it out. Let them know that we think this is unacceptable.

Let us work together to end some of this frivolous expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

LINDY BOGGS ON THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND THE RIGHT TO VOTE

(Mr. JEFFERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JEFFERSON. Madam Speaker, on December 13, 1991, my friend and predecessor, Lindy Boggs of New Orleans, LA, spoke at Independence Hall in Philadelphia as part of the final events marking the 200th anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. In her remarks, Mrs. Boggs spoke of the roles of the 15th, 19th, 23d, 24th, and 26th amendments in fulfilling the promise of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution by expanding the franchise to ever larger segments of our citizenry. "Taken together," Mrs. Boggs said, these five amendments—which were needed in order to eliminate impediments to franchise of African-Americans, women, young people over the age of 18, and residents of the District of Columbia in Presidential elections—"represent a century in the political and constitutional development of the United States."

Mrs. Boggs noted that "precious constitutional rights don't always come easily or quickly" and that "the struggle for liberty and justice for all is not over, nor will it ever be."

I would like to share her comments with my colleagues because her observations, based on her years in the political arena and her efforts on behalf of full participation for all our citizens, are most insightful.

EXPANDING THE FRANCHISE

(Remarks by Hon. Lindy Boggs)

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

I saw in the paper recently that a fellow in Washington, DC, who owns 44 Dominos Pizza stores, wants to buy the entire company and take over all 5,200 Dominos stores all over the country. I suppose you could say he wants to "expand the franchise." But that is not the kind of franchise I want to talk about today. The first definition of the word franchise is: "A privilege or right officially granted a person or a group by a government, especially: the constitutional or statutory right to vote." The other definitions of "franchise" deal with the establishment of corporations and finally a definition which covers the licensing of a product or service, such as the right to sell Dominos Pizza in a certain locale. I hope any prospective

Dominos dealers in the audience will not be disappointed or feel that they were lured into Congress Hall to hear a talk on how to get rich quick selling pizzas.

I am pleased to be a part of this series of lectures in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights. In some ways I feel I have come full circle with my involvement with the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the subsequent amendments to the Constitution. When I first became involved with the Constitution and political life more than fifty years ago, it was by helping citizens of the State of Louisiana register to vote. When my husband Hale Boggs was elected to Congress in 1940, I accompanied him to Washington and played an active part in the running of his Congressional office. In 1972 when Hale, then Majority Leader of the House, was lost in an airplane crash in Alaska, I was elected to his seat in 1973 and held that position until I retired at the end of the 101st Congress in January of this year.

From my earliest days in office, I became an active participant in the celebrations and commemorations of the bicentennials of the founding of this nation, as Frank Roberts has mentioned. I always enjoy the opportunity to return to Independence National Historical Park because this is where the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution began. Two years ago on this very spot the Congress celebrated its own bicentennial with a ceremonial meeting here in Congress Hall that had all of us singing the Preamble of the Constitution from Frank Robert's musical "Four Little Pages." In each of these special anniversaries Philadelphia was the touchstone—the place where so many of the events had their origin and their inspiration.

Today I come before you as a private citizen, doing very much what I was doing a half century ago: talking about the importance of voting and the importance of the franchise. The particular Constitutional Amendments I will discuss today are not a part of the Bill of Rights. My topic, the "expansion of the franchise," involves subsequent amendments that appear to be scattered at random through the Constitution. They are the 15th, 19th, 23rd, 24th, and 26th Amendments.

The first was a Product of Reconstruction the Civil War, adopted in 1870, the last was a product of the Vietnam War era, adopted in 1971. Taken together they represent a century in the political evolution and Constitutional development of the United States. Each of these amendments has its own story. And, I should say right off, that I am not going to try to cover the entire history of the right to vote in America. Much of that story can only be told from the state and local level throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. I will confine myself to the Constitutional aspects of expanding the franchise.

All of us are the beneficiaries of this constitutional legacy, and each of these struggles to amend the Constitution and expand the franchise should remind us that every generation of Americans has the responsibility to preserve these rights and find ways to continue to extend constitutional guarantees for those Americans not yet enfranchised. Sometimes this is a matter of making sure that people are registered to vote and know how to vote, other times it means extending the privilege and responsibility to those who do not have the right to vote or whose rights are abridged. Some of us, unfortunately, disenfranchise ourselves simply by not participating in the electoral process. To enfranchise this group is a matter of education and motivation, not Constitutional change.

The truly revolutionary thing about the founding of the United States was the fact that political thinking in Europe and in the American colonies evolved by the mid-eighteenth century to the point where the highest ideal of government was a republic not a monarchy. In a republic the people are the ultimate political authority, not a king.

When the United States adopted its Constitution here in Philadelphia a little more than 200 years ago, Britain and France had monarchs, Rome had an emperor, an autocrat ruled St. Petersburg, there was a caliph in Constantinople, a divine emperor in Peking, and a shogun in Japan. We chose a republic and were the first to establish a nation based on the power of the people to determine their own fate through procedures established and guaranteed in a written Constitution and Bill of Rights.

To assume that this marvelous and revolutionary new political invention called the United States was Perfection itself is to miss the point. It was not perfect then. It is not perfect now. But the promise and the opportunity for improvement is what made it exciting then, and it is still the thing that challenges us today.

In the early days of the republic voting was for white males who were property holders. While voting requirements varied from place to place in the United States, it is safe to say that in almost all cases women didn't have the right to vote, free blacks didn't have the right to vote, poor people, whatever their color, could not vote, young adults, less than age 21 could not vote, certainly slaves could not vote, in fact they were not even considered citizens. Under the law they were property, not persons. Government was then, and was throughout much of American history the province of wealthy citizens who sought and maintained control of government and the political process.

But this situation too, began to change. Beginning with the election of Thomas Jefferson in 1800 and continuing through the Jackson presidency in the 1830s and right up to the Civil War, the idea of a mass democracy, where there was political power for ever widening segments of the population, continued to grow and take hold in American political culture.

When Andrew Jackson left office in 1837 the Constitution was fifty years old. Jackson was a frail old man who looked back on the political struggles of his age and said in his farewell to the American people that he was pleased to see that the Constitution had survived and was a solid, working basis for government.

But despite his optimism about the success of the Constitution he issued a warning: ". . . the Constitution cannot be maintained nor the Union preserved in opposition to public feeling by the mere exertion of the coercive powers confided to the General Government. The foundations must be laid in the affections of the people; in the security it gives to life, liberty, character, and property, in every quarter of the country. . . ." Jackson's views of the success of the Constitution rested on a belief what we needed to remember was the powerful ideas on which the Constitution was built, which were to be found in the Declaration of Independence.

About this same time the great historian of the Jacksonian era, George Bancroft, was praising the political wisdom of ordinary people when he wrote: ". . . the best government rests on the people and not on the few, on persons and not on property, on the free development of public opinion and not on authority."

Other ideas in the marketplace of American political values were challenged during the 19th century. Foremost among these was the stark juxtaposition of the noble ideal of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" and the harsh reality that slavery was legal in the United States. This was something that bothered many of the Founders themselves but they sidestepped the issue in 1787. By the mid-nineteenth century, however, the compelling and logical extension of the ideas of Declaration of Independence and its application to an ever widening body of citizens still stopped abruptly at slavery's door.

During the Lincoln-Douglas debates in 1858, Abraham Lincoln, then running for a seat in the U.S. Senate, which he lost, was compelled to explain how he really felt about slavery. He said he hated it as much as any abolitionist but he thought it would eventually die out because he assumed most reasonable people like him also hated it. But it wasn't going away. He said we needed to apply the principles of the Declaration of Independence to all men.

Lincoln reminded his listeners that citizens of this country came from all parts of Europe. They were not here when the Founders drafted the Declaration of Independence, they were not of English ancestry like the Founders, yet they felt as though they were connected to that document and those Founders. They felt as if they were "blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh," with the Founders and their ideas. "That," Lincoln said, "is the electric cord in that Declaration that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together, that will link those patriotic hearts as long as the love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world."

The 19th century thinkers who contributed to the dialog on the American political system and who would be able to fully participate in it, excluded women. When Abigail Adams wrote to her husband John not to forget the ladies when the Massachusetts Constitution was being drafted in 1776, the very year of the Declaration of Independence, he apparently failed to take her seriously. Later when such eloquent champions for the concept of "all men are created equal" as George Bancroft or Abraham Lincoln spoke they talked about men and mankind. Their words included women, but only in the abstract. But there were other voices, equally eloquent, who were heard in those years leading up to the Civil War.

These voices turned also to the Declaration of Independence more so than the Constitution itself for their inspiration. While the abolitionist crusade sought the end of slavery, a growing parallel movement among women began in the decades before the Civil War. Ironically it was the abolitionists who insulted pioneer feminists Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott by barring them from a world antislavery convention in 1840.

In 1848 at the famous meeting in Seneca Falls, New York, these women ushered in the woman's movement in America. Their "Declaration of Sentiments" was based on the Declaration of Independence. It called for equal treatment of women. It said women should have the right to pursue any career, any education, and any avenue of life open to men. The most controversial provision adopted at the convention at the insistence of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, called for women to receive "their sacred right to the elective franchise."

Even Stanton's friend, the Quaker Lucretia Mott worried about this demand for

the franchise saying: "Why, Lizzie, thee will make us ridiculous." This was the same year the Philadelphia Ledger said: "A woman is nobody. A wife is everything."

The first of the Constitutional Amendments that expanded the franchise was the 15th Amendment, which, as I said earlier, was adopted in 1870. It is part of a remarkable trio of post-Civil War amendments that transformed the Constitution. Most scholars see the Reconstruction amendments as a watershed in American Constitutional History. Others in this series of lectures have discussed the 13th Amendment which abolished slavery and was ratified in 1865. The 14th Amendment, ratified in 1868, guaranteed all persons born or naturalized in the United States were citizens whose rights as citizens should not be abridged. It promised "equal protection" under the laws of the country.

The 15th amendment, just two sentences long, stated: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The second sentence simply gave Congress the power to pass laws to enforce the article.

The defeated Confederate States had to agree to the provisions of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments before they could be reconstructed into the Union.

Under the direction of Federal troops in the South, blacks, many of them newly freed slaves, exercised the franchise for the first time and cast ballots which sent members of their own race to state legislatures and to Congress for the first time in history. Twenty black men served in the House of Representatives in the 19th century and two served in the Senate.

But the victory for black voters and black office holders was short-lived. With the removal of federal troops from the South following the disputed presidential election of 1876, the Southern states lost little time drafting new state Constitutions which disenfranchised blacks once more. Other provisions of state law such as literacy tests, poll taxes, white primaries, and the infamous grandfather clause, kept the franchise from many black citizens for decades to come.

The Grandfather clause, first used in South Carolina in 1895, and three years later in my own state of Louisiana, was an insidious device that simply stated that if your grandfather or father was a voter as of January 1, 1867, then you could vote. Since most black fathers and grandfathers in 1867 were newly freed slaves who were not yet protected by the 15th Amendment, their descendants were disqualified from voting. At the same time this device gave the franchise to thousands of poor and illiterate whites who could claim the grandfather clause and avoid literacy tests and poll taxes. The Supreme Court eventually struck down the grandfather clause in 1915 in an Oklahoma case brought by a fledgling organization called the NAACP. The Court said the grandfather clause violated the intent of the 15th Amendment.

The women who worked so hard and long for the franchise, beginning in 1848, finally saw the passage of the 19th Amendment in 1920. The 72-year struggle from the Seneca Falls convention through the creation of two national suffrage organizations in 1869, which merged in 1890, and the subsequent protests, parades, petitions, and arrests, eventually led to the amendment which said: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of

sex." Women had come a long way from the day in 1872 when Susan B. Anthony was arrested for trying to vote in a presidential election.

Several states actually adopted women's suffrage before 1920. In 1896 Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho granted women the right to vote. Subsequently, in 1914, Montana followed suit allowing Jeanette Rankin to run for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, becoming the first woman elected to that body in 1916.

The story of the 19th Amendment, like that of the 15th, is not one of steady progress and constant victory. While these vital Constitutional Amendments are clearly the results of the political ferment in the country and were designed to address new expectations in the electorate, they did not necessarily lead directly to the promised land. The modern women's movement, since the passage of the 19th Amendment, is ample testimony that enfranchisement was only the first step toward full participation in American political life.

When I was first elected to Congress in 1973, only 77 women had served in the House before me. I am pleased to report that the numbers are going up, and now 120 women have served in the House and 16 in the Senate, (two of which served first in the House) since Jeanette Rankin. But the percentage of women and blacks who have served in the national legislature is still only a tiny fraction of their percentage of the population as a whole, or when seen against the figures of more than 11,000 men who have served in the House and Senate in the past two centuries.

The 23rd Amendment, ratified just thirty years ago in 1961, gave the right to vote in Presidential elections to the citizens of the District of Columbia. This amendment redressed a long standing problem in the Federal District, but it did not solve all the problems related to the full enfranchisement of citizens of the District. Many residents of the District feel they will not be fully enfranchised until the District of Columbia achieves statehood.

In the meantime, the elected delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives is not fully enfranchised within the House. While she may speak for the District and on all issues before the House, she can only vote in the committees she serves on and not on the floor of the House. This is true also of the delegates or resident commissioners representing the American territories of Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

The 24th Amendment, ratified in 1964, expanded the franchise further, especially in the South, by eliminating one of the long standing obstructions to voting, the poll tax. This amendment was adopted during a decade of major gains in civil rights beginning with the school desegregation cases of the 1950s, and passage in the 1960s of the most important civil rights legislation since the days of Reconstruction. Every Congress, beginning in 1939, sought to eliminate the poll tax either by statute or constitutional amendment.

Still, as late as 1962, five states retained a poll tax as a qualification for voting. In the year after the passage of the 24th Amendment the State of Virginia tested the Amendment by trying to retain a poll tax for state elections only. The Supreme Court struck down the Virginia plan citing the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, bringing to an end the practice of paying a tax for the privilege of voting.

Finally, the last major expansion of the franchise in this country came with the rati-

fication of the 26th Amendment in 1971, which gave the vote to persons 18 years of age or older. The compelling argument for doing this was a simple one. Young people were fighting and dying in Vietnam. They could fight for their country but they were not considered old enough to vote. The Senate proposed this amendment in March 10, 1971 and the House approved it less than two weeks later. Ratification followed in record speed with five states ratifying on the same day the House passed the resolution. In less than five months 45 states had given their approval and the remaining five ratified before the year was out.

The 26th is the last Amendment which has been ratified. There have been no amendments to the Constitution in twenty years. Two amendments have been proposed and sent to the states for ratification since 1971, only to fail to achieve the necessary number of states for ratification. The first was the Equal Rights Amendment which said: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

The other proposed amendment would have provided the District of Columbia with the same voting rights for congressional and presidential elections as if it was a state. This would have given full voting rights to the House member or members from the District, and provided the District with Senate representation as if it was a State.

What do I conclude from this brief recitation of the Constitutional Amendments which have expanded the franchise? I think there are several lessons. The most obvious is that precious constitutional rights don't always come easily or quickly. Our Constitution and its amendments is a most remarkable document. Our Constitutional system is, after 200 years, a resilient and practical blueprint for how a free people should govern themselves. Yet there is often a gulf between the words of the document and the realities of history.

The struggle for liberty and justice for all is not over, nor will it ever be. In an ever-changing world we will constantly face new challenges to the Constitution. We will always be testing it, drawing on its strengths while we seek to have it meet new demands. When we think of Constitutional change and the preservation and expansion of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, we should remember the words of Abraham Lincoln that it is the ideas of the Declaration of Independence that is the "electric cord" that ties us all together. Sometimes in our commemoration of historical events we focus on one event to the exclusion of others that are related. I think Lincoln was right, the Declaration of Independence inspires us, while the Constitution sustains us. The two should be forever linked in our memory by Lincoln's apt metaphor of an electric cord.

To say that blacks and women have achieved full equality because of the expansion of the franchise in the Constitution is to miss the lessons of history. To suggest that major advances have not been made in these areas is also to misread history.

What can reach of us do to make our Constitution system work better? There are many answers to this question, but I will suggest only one that fits the theme of today's topic: Vote. Use the franchise that our forebears struggled so hard to achieve. Right now there is a great deal of unrest in the country. Some of it is bought on by the hard economic times, some of it by the perceived failure of government to act on important issues, or, to some, the failure of the political system itself.

In several states we have seen movements to reform Congress by suggesting terms limitations for members of the House and Senate. The term limitation advocates say that the best way to reform Congress is to bring in new faces on a regular basis. The way to do this is to require by law or Constitutional amendment that the electoral process put a limit on terms of service. Those who oppose term limitations counter with the argument that the citizens of this country already have the power to determine how many terms a member of the House or Senate serve. All one has to do is vote. Vote for the person you want in office. Vote against the person you want out of office or that you want to keep from office.

In my own State of Louisiana the recent election for governor received national and international attention because one of the candidates was a former member of the Ku Klux Klan who preached a thinly disguised message of racial bigotry. He was soundly defeated by a remarkably large voter turnout. The crucial votes in the defeat of this candidate came primarily from the newly enfranchised blacks, women, and young people of Louisiana, those who have benefited from the provisions of the 15th, 19th, and 26th Amendments. While much of the world still has to resort to bullets to determine political power, we have the golden opportunity and the rare privilege to use ballots.

Two-hundred and four years ago, on the walkway just outside this room, after the Framers of the Constitution had finished their work drafting the Constitution in the building next door, a woman asked Benjamin Franklin what kind of government they had given us. His answer is a familiar one, especially here in Philadelphia. He said: "A Republic, if you can keep it." You see, he wasn't too sure that the new government would work. It was all so new, so experimental.

I suspect he would be pleased to come back to this familiar setting, to see the old buildings he knew then, and to marvel at the city that has grown up around this small section of real estate that is frozen in time. He was worried that a nation of about 4 million persons might have difficulty keeping the republic in 1787. What would he think about 250 million Americans of diverse ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds trying to do the same thing in 1991?

What Franklin said in 1787 is every bit as important to us today. We are still trying to keep the Republic. We are still trying to make this experiment in democracy work. The single best way to insure the survival of the Republic is to participate in the democratic process by voting. On we go.

□ 1120

JOE DOHERTY DEPORTATION

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

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, Joe Doherty was returned today to the Crumlin Road jail, from which he escaped 11 years ago. This marks the end of a bitter legal fight in the United States which lasted over 8 years and involved the unprecedented decisions of three Attorneys General to overturn the actions of the courts and administrative agencies.

Following numerous decisions of the Federal court and administrative agency in Mr. Doherty's favor, Attorney General Thornburgh made an extraordinary decision to reverse the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals that Joseph Doherty has the right to apply for asylum and withhold any impending deportation.

On January 15, 1992, the Supreme Court ruled that Attorney General Richard Thornburgh did not abuse his discretion in denying Joe Doherty a hearing on his claims for asylum and withholding of deportation.

In a last ditch effort, Representatives FISH, MANTON, ACKERMAN, HYDE, and I met with Attorney General Barr to request that he exercise his discretion and grant Joe Doherty a fair hearing. While we did meet with the Attorney General, our request was ignored and we never received any response whatsoever from his office.

One only has to turn to the current situation in the Crumlin Road jail to see that the prison is out of control, and our Nation has returned Joe Doherty to a life-threatening situation. On November 24, 1991, a bomb planted by the IRA killed two loyalist prisoners and wounded seven others. Furthermore, there have been numerous fights between prisoners from both sides of the conflict in the visiting areas.

We all continue to anguish over the allegations of human rights abuses by the British military presence in northern Ireland. However, it has become clear that we must make certain that our own system of justice is fair. I am concerned that the past decisions of Attorneys General Meese and Thornburgh have ignored the facts in this case. These actions in the Doherty case do not reflect the beliefs and values upon which our country was founded.

GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO BE ACCESSIBLE TO CITIZENS

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

Mr. MINETA. Madam Speaker, this morning I would like to speak with you and with my colleagues about a responsibility charged to each of us as Members of Congress, one that does not get discussed very often in this Chamber.

This responsibility is casework for our constituents.

Members of Congress are often the last, and in some cases the only, opportunity for constituents to get help from a Federal Government department or agency.

For the past several years, I have watched agency staffs grow shorter and lines of constituents needing help grow longer.

Telephone calls and letters to my office are increasing in number, and in desperation.

Madam Speaker, we need to look at these agencies and make sure that our Government is accessible and accountable to its citizens.

In the next few weeks, I plan to stand here in the well of the House and take the time to remind this Chamber, in human terms, the cost of this Government's failure to provide adequate services to its citizens.

ALEX HALEY, A WRITER WHO MADE THE WORLD A BETTER PLACE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, as everyone knows, the great American writer Alex Haley passed away a few days ago. While Mr. Haley did not live in my district, his home in Norris, TN was close by. He was a good friend, both to my late father and to me.

Alex Haley was a man who, as Kipling said, walked with kings and princes but never lost the common touch. Mr. Haley met often with the wealthiest and most powerful, but he was probably most at home with some of the poorest and least powerful.

If anyone went to events at his home, as I did on several occasions, they would find leaders of corporate America eating and having fellowship with laborers and other working people.

Alex Haley was one of the kindest men I have ever met. He treated everyone the same, rich or poor, black or white, young or old. He received all of the material blessings one could receive in this life. He knew life had been good to him, and he tried to give back to others. He touched many lives, and because he did walk among us, this world is a better place today.

I am proud to rise at this point in brief tribute to not only a great man, but more importantly, a good man, my friend, Alex Haley.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE JOE FISHER

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, yesterday morning a good friend and former Member of the House of Representatives, Joe Fisher, passed away.

Joe was one of the elder statesmen of northern Virginia politics and government. A former chairman of the Arlington County Board and member of the cabinet of Virginia Gov. CHUCK ROBB, he was a consistent source of leadership, humility, and understanding to all who had the opportunity to work with him.

Joe Fisher was truly one of the finest and most accomplished individuals produced by our region. A Ph.D. graduate

of Harvard University, Joe served in the U.S. Army during World War II and got his start in government a long time ago—working in the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as an economist with the State Department and later in the Truman administration as a staff member of the Council for Economic Advisers. He remained with the Council until 1953, serving as executive officer and chief economist.

When Joe left the Federal Government he began a long and very accomplished career working on behalf of the environment. From 1953 to 1974 he worked for Resources for the Future, a prestigious Washington research center dedicated to providing impartial and independent research and policy analysis about natural resources and the environment. He served as its president from 1959 to 1974.

Joe began his career in politics and public service in 1963, when he was elected to a seat on the Arlington County Board. In his 12 years on the county board Joe served as chairman for 3 years and served as a chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

Encouraged on by his many supporters, Joe decided to run for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives and was elected to Congress in 1974. Joe served for 6 years in this body and also served as a member of the Ways and Means Committee. After Joe left Congress in 1980, he served as Virginia Secretary of Human Resources in the cabinet of Gov. CHUCK ROBB.

Joe didn't depart public service after his work in Richmond, but he did return to northern Virginia where he served as a professor of public policy at George Mason University and later as assistant to the president of the university where he oversaw expansion of the Arlington metro campus.

If his life was not full enough, Joe was a civic activist and ardent athlete. He was a leader of the Arlingtonians for a Better County and for 12 years served as the worldwide head of the Unitarian Universalist Association, the international administrative body of the Unitarian Church. An athlete, he boxed as a young man and was known to have a polished tennis game. Always an outdoorsman, he enjoyed hiking.

Many, many people throughout this area—and throughout the State of Virginia—lost a friend in Joe Fisher. I extend my condolences to his wife, Peggy, and his seven children. Last week when I visited him at his Arlington home, he was a tremendous source of advice, wisdom, and support. His life was dedicated to public service and many of us are better for it.

NO GOOSE, NO GOLDEN EGG

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

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, Democrat frontrunner Paul Tsongas has seen the light. He, believe it or not, is in favor of a capital-gains tax cut. Now, that's a novel idea.

In his own words, Tsongas is a probusiness Democrat. He understands that you can't create jobs by stifling job creators.

As Tsongas put it, no goose, no golden egg.

Unfortunately for Tsongas and the country, the Democrat Party is committed to cooking the goose and then serving it to the people as a political favor.

The Democrat's prime directive has been to kill business through regulation, stifle business through high taxes, and destroy business with labor union legislation.

Tsongas understands the Democrat Party has done no favors for the American people with shortsighted political legislation that has hurt American competitiveness.

Of course, the Republican Party has said that all along.

Tsongas undoubtedly will get his goose cooked for exposing the Democrat Party for what it is becoming: a shortsighted, irresponsible anti-business political party. But I commend him for his efforts, anyway.

A DECLARATION OF CREDIBILITY FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to talk a little bit about the direction this Congress goes as an institution. I want to talk a little bit about a declaration of credibility that I think ought to be applied to the operations of this Congress. I have not been here long. This will soon be 3 years.

□ 1130

But I did serve in the legislature prior to coming here, and it seems to me that we have legislative bodies that operate under different rules that are consistently more effective, more responsive to public need than is the Congress of the United States.

There is clearly an ugly mood in the country that holds the Congress accountable for perhaps more of the ills of the world than it deserves, but nevertheless holds the Congress accountable, and I think for good reason. Obviously when the economy in the country is not good, the mood is worse. When the economy falters, people are uncertain about their jobs, about the quality of life, about their ability to send their kids to college, about their ability to pay for their parents and health care, and they lack confidence in their leaders.

In terms of the operations of this place, the Democrats have controlled this House of Representatives for longer than Castro has controlled Cuba, and I think during this time, this institution has slipped into a state of disrepair and, frankly, of shame. There are some things that we ought to do to restore the confidence of the American people in government, and at a minimum, I believe every Member should subscribe to a declaration containing some basic points.

Let us give the folks at home some reason to have a look at their leaders as problem-solvers. This idea of talking constantly about issues is not the question. What we need to do is to come with some solutions and solve problems.

I have put together a number of ideas, and they come from other people as well, that I call a declaration of credibility for Congress, and that includes a number of things. One is we ought to move more quickly to solve the problems that are immediate such as the economic issue that we have before us now. The second is budget reform. The third is campaign reform. The fourth, I think we should do something about our work schedule as evidenced by today, as a matter of fact. Congressional reorganization ought to take place, and we ought to do something about requiring the Congress to operate under the same laws that it imposes on the rest of the country.

Let me walk through a couple of those. We need to move on a jobs and economic policy. We talked about this last fall. It was clear that we needed to do something. It is fairly clear what we need to do. This country has done well over the years, because we have had incentives to put money into the investment, into the industrial sector to create jobs, and you do that basically with tax policies.

There is no question but what things have changed since 1986.

We need to reduce excessive regulation. I was in Wyoming last week, and everyone I met with said, "We are being regulated out of business. There is too much government at all levels. We need to do something about regulation. We need to reduce individual tax burdens. The money that we make ought to stay for the large part in the pockets of Americans who decide how to spend it."

Budget reform: Clearly the evidence is that the Congress does not have the discipline to balance the budget and, indeed, we need some procedural changes. One is a line-item veto. Forty-three Governors have it. They have it in Wyoming. It works. You vote for bills like a highway bill, and you want it to pass, and it is a good bill, but in it is a bunch of pork barrel. There is nothing you can do about it as a Member. The only person in this country who has a broad enough political base

to do something is the President, who can reach into the bundle package and pull out that stuff that really should not pass, and it happens all the time.

A balanced-budget amendment: I think we ought to have a chance as citizens to vote on the cost versus the benefit, and if it is worth it, we vote for it, and if it is not, we do not. That is what balanced budgets are all about.

Limit the growth of government. The President in his message said let us limit the number, and I have a bill in the Congress that limits the number of Federal employees. Why not? We can shift them around. We need less government, not more.

Campaign reform: Frankly, it was difficult for me intellectually, but I think we ought to favor term limitations, at least term limitations for chairmen in this place so that we get some different ideas and some changes.

Full disclosure of contributions: We should have that and insist on it. At least 50 percent of your contributions ought to come from the district from which you are elected, and we ought to continue to move against honoraria. That is wrong.

Work schedules: We ought to be doing what needs to be done, not predicting work schedules on holidays, on somebody going to Europe, the leader going somewhere. We ought to be here working. We ought to be here working today, as a matter of fact, but we are not.

Congressional reorganization: Clearly, when we have 30 committees dealing with the same issue, you cannot expect an efficient operation to be going on.

Finally, the Congress has exempted itself from many of the laws, Social Security, minimum wage, Equal Pay Act, Civil Rights Act, Privacy Act, Age Discrimination Act, Americans with disabilities. We eliminate ourselves from jurisdiction in those areas.

This is an institution that has served this country well, can continue to serve the country well, but I think we have to have some procedural change. I think a declaration of credibility is something that would move us forward, allow us to do some things, and, indeed, make us more responsible to the people of the United States.

AZERBAIJANI AGGRESSION

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak out against yesterday's extensive Azerbaijani missile attacks against Stepanakert and other Armenian population centers throughout Nagorno Karabagh. The attacks, which began Wednesday morning and continued through nightfall, included heavy use of GRAD missiles. Over 240 of these missiles hit Stepanakert, the capital city of the Re-

public of Nagorno Karabagh, causing at least 20 deaths and destroying, among others, the Parliament and city hall buildings.

Azerbaijan has significantly escalated the level of violence in Karabagh with the introduction of GRAD multiple missile launch systems. The GRAD launchers are capable of firing up to 40 missiles up to 17 kilometers with great accuracy. The Azerbaijani National Army, which acquired these weapons from the retreating forces of the former Soviet Union, has positioned them in the highlands surrounding Stepanakert and outside of Armenian towns and villages throughout Karabagh.

With the formation of the Azerbaijani National Army, and with the introduction of this new weapon of mass destruction, it is clear that the Azerbaijani leadership is committed to emptying Karabagh of its ancient Armenian population. Recognizing this increasing militarism and absence of democracy in Azerbaijan, Secretary of State James Baker, in his speech at Princeton on December 12, 1991, specifically singled out that nation as not having satisfied United States standards for the establishment of diplomatic relations. President George Bush reaffirmed this sound principle when, on Christmas Day 1991, he did not include Azerbaijan among those republics with which the United States would establish relations.

Instead of requiring that Azerbaijan demonstrate a respect for human rights and the willingness to establish democratic institutions, the Secretary of State visited Azerbaijan last week and indicated that the United States would soon establish full diplomatic relations. This move was made prior to any efforts on the part of the Azerbaijani Government to meet these standards. Secretary Baker simply accepted the assurances of Azerbaijani President, and former Communist Party leader, Ayaz Muttalibov, that Azerbaijan would adhere to the principles of democracy, protection of human rights, and free market economy.

Since Secretary Baker's visit to Azerbaijan on February 12, the Azerbaijani Government has not only failed to take any steps toward reform, but in fact has launched a major military offensive against the civilian population of Karabagh. By abandoning any standards or expectations for United States recognition, the administration has given the green light to Azerbaijan to unleash this most recent, and most destructive, wave of aggression against the population of Karabagh.

I refer my colleagues to the editorial on this subject in the New York Times of February 14, 1992. As the New York Times so justly stated, "America disarms itself by not standing up for what is right." I urge the administration to reconsider and change its course. A lasting peace can never be built by ignoring the rule of law and by violating basic human rights, as the Azerbaijani leadership is now doing.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1992]

WINKING AT AGGRESSION IN BAKU

So much for principle. Last fall Secretary of State Baker articulated sound standards for establishing diplomatic ties to the former Soviet republics, based on their adherence to the rule of law and respect for human rights. Azerbaijan has flagrantly violated these standards by its brutal aggression against Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh. Yet Mr. Baker looked the other

way in Baku Wednesday; he suggested that mere lip service to these principles by the Communist-run republic warrants early recognition.

Mr. Baker seems excessively anxious to keep Azerbaijan and other Muslim republics in Central Asia out of Iran's orbit. He's right to establish diplomatic relations with Azerbaijan, but why rush before appropriate conditions are met?

Last September Mr. Baker called on the former Soviet republics to embrace democratic practices, respect existing borders, support the rule of law, and safeguard human rights. But Azerbaijan has shown utter contempt for the principles by tightening its blockade of Nagorno-Karabakh and escalating attacks on Armenian villagers.

Azerbaijan's President, Ayaz Muttalibov, is an unreconstructed Communist who faces internal opposition and is stirring ethnic passions to maintain power. With food and medicine scarce, serious wounds mean almost certain death. Armenians and Azerbaijanis, caught in the crossfire, are dying by the scores.

Refusal to recognize Azerbaijan would register America's opposition to aggression. Washington could also encourage the Red Cross, Red Crescent and other international voluntary agencies to provide humanitarian relief. Their presence could help stay Azerbaijan's hand. Instead, Washington is rushing to unprincipled recognition.

In the 19th century, major powers used military force in the struggle for influence over Central Asia. Now the contest is very different—a struggle over basic values. America disarms itself by not standing up for what is right.

AMERICAN VETERANS' HEALTH CARE REFORM ACT OF 1992

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans, today I am introducing H.R. 4278, a bill that would guarantee comprehensive health services to veterans and their families. There follows a section-by-section analysis of the bill prepared by the organization:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMERICAN VETERANS' HEALTH CARE REFORM ACT OF 1992

Purpose: This is a bill to guarantee comprehensive health care services to veterans and their families by ensuring entitlement and eligibility to a wide array of health care services, to make greater resources and funding available for the delivery of such services, and for other purposes.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE TO ACT

Establishes that the legislation will be referred to as the "American Veterans' Health Care Reform Act of 1992." The bill would primarily amend Chapter 17 of Title 38 of the United States Code.

SECTION 2. FINDINGS

Recognizes eight basic findings relative to veterans' health care on which the Act is premised and/or which it is intended to remedy. These findings essentially focus on three areas of consideration:

1. Veterans should be afforded health care services by the VA because of their service to the Nation and the concomitant implicit guarantee that they will be able to access and receive that health care.

2. Notwithstanding that promise, the veterans' health care system is inadequate to meet their needs. Services are restricted without appropriate consideration of medical need or currency and funding of the system is significantly deficient.

3. There is a need for reforms to the veterans' health care system that will fulfill the Nation's promise to them by providing comprehensive health care services that are attendant to the current and predicted demographic and geographic patterns of veterans. In establishing these reforms the valuable role of the veterans' health care system in national health care reform must be considered.

SECTION 3. ACCESS TO COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE FOR VETERANS AND THEIR SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS

Categories of Veterans

Core-Entitled Veterans—including all service-connected veterans, certain low income veterans, former prisoners of war, and additional limited categories of veterans.

Other Eligible Veterans (Non-Core Entitled Veterans)—including all other veterans not part of the core-entitled category the care of whom is established as discretionary.

Access and Services

Core-entitled veterans shall be entitled to the full continuum of medically-necessary health care provided by/through the VA. This would include, without limitation: inpatient, outpatient, nursing home care (including adult day care), domiciliary care, home health services, respite care, collateral health care and dental care services, readjustment counseling, the provision of therapeutic and rehabilitative devices, seeing eye dogs, and the repair of prosthetic and other appliances, alcohol and drug treatment, and necessary medications.

Other non-core entitled veterans would be eligible for all services, at the discretion of the Secretary, without statutorily prescribed limitations, but with the ability to offset the cost of the care received.

Readjustment counseling services would be provided without regard to the period of active duty service.

SECTION 4. PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE

Adds a new section formally establishing that preventive health care services would be among the services available to veterans. These services are essential to a comprehensive health care system and can be expected to substantially reduce the longer range costs of health care to veterans and improve their quality of life. Further, service-connected conditions (e.g., amputations), and life-style and genetic factors particularly prevalent among the veteran population (e.g., smoking rates, hypertension rates) suggest the need for these services to be readily available as an entitlement for the core-entitled veterans and contingent on ability to offset cost for non-core entitled veterans.

The full range of screening, treatment, and educational services would be available and most of these services are delineated in this section, including smoking cessation services, hypertension and colo-rectal and prostate screening, nutritional education, and immunizations.

SECTION 5. HEALTH SERVICES FOR NON-CORE ENTITLED VETERANS AND OTHER ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS

Adds a new section that would require the VA to put into continuing effect a managed care plan for the delivery of health care services to any non-core entitled veteran and to the survivors and dependents of any veteran.

The plan would have to be in effect within 2 years of enactment of the legislation.

Provides that the VA offer various packages reflecting different combinations of services and ranges of premiums that are structured so as to be affordable to potential purchasers. In order to provide an opportunity to constituent groups to consider the degree of the "affordability" the Secretary would determine the premiums by regulation.

SECTION 6. PAYMENT FOR SERVICES

Adds a new section that prescribes the methods of payment that could be used to offset the costs of services to non-core entitled veterans and to survivors and dependents of any veteran.

Methods of payment would include:

- Direct out-of-pocket payment;
- Medicare reimbursement;
- Medicaid reimbursement;
- Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) reimbursement;
- VA Managed Care Plan fund;
- Private health insurance reimbursement;
- Any combination of these.

SECTION 7. APPROPRIATIONS; COST RECOVERY; AND SEQUESTRATION

Establishes that funds for the provision of health care services to core-entitled veterans, inclusive of administrative costs associated with that care, would be appropriated as a non-discretionary entitlement exempt from sequestration, beginning in Fiscal Year 1993.

Further, provides that the mandatory, entitlement appropriation would take into account costs associated with quality management and assurance functions.

Administrative costs related to the non-mandatory services provided by VA to/for other than the core-entitled veterans would be separately appropriated and separately accounted for and stated in the President's budget requests.

Establishes the authority of VA to collect reimbursements from Medicare and Medicaid for the treatment of veterans, survivors, and dependents eligible under those programs.

Provides that the VA would have the authority to use any funds deposited in the Medical Care Cost Recovery Fund to provide health care benefits to eligible persons, to operate the VA health care system, and to enhance the quality of care and the delivery systems providing health care to veterans.

The President's budget requests for the VA would have to be developed without consideration of the collected/reimbursed amounts deposited into the Medical Care Cost Recovery Fund.

SECTION 8. ANNUAL REPORTS.

Requires the VA to report to the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees by January 15 of each fiscal year on the impact of the effected reforms. Specifically, the report would include:

Cost information and cost changes between the reformed system and the system of health care delivery prior to reforms;

Current and former information on the demographics of veterans, and of their access and use of the health care system;

Findings and conclusions as to effectiveness of reforms in terms of access, medical advantages, and cost;

Plans for legislative or regulatory actions necessary to the continued effectuation of the reforms.

Congressionally-chartered veterans' organizations would be given the opportunity to provide comments which the VA would consider and include in the reports.

SECTION 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Provides for implementation of most reforms by the beginning of the first fiscal year occurring after enactment.

IN TRIBUTE OF GEORGE MASON

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, along with my colleague Representative TOM COLEMAN, to authorize the construction of a memorial in Washington, DC, to honor George Mason. I want to make it clear from the outset, this monument will be constructed using private funds, free of taxpayer expense.

Many of us may not be as familiar with George Mason's contributions to our Government as those of Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, or James Madison, but his contributions were essential to ensuring our democratic form of government through the Bill of Rights, whose 200th anniversary we are now commemorating.

Mason drafted Virginia's Declaration of Rights, which was the first document in any of the Colonies to set standards for the rights of citizens and the role of the colonial government. This document then served as a reference for the rights enunciated in our Constitution. Included in Virginia's Declaration of Rights were guarantees of free speech, due process of law, the right to a speedy trial, the right to a jury in civil cases, and prohibitions against unreasonable searches and seizures, and cruel and unusual punishment.

Thomas Jefferson thoroughly examined Virginia's Declaration of Rights shortly after its unanimous adoption. Jefferson took its tenets and wrote them in the Declaration of Independence, "we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These self-evident truths were very clearly based on Mason's Declaration of Rights.

When the members of the second Constitutional Convention did not include a bill of rights or call for an end to the slave trade, Mason refused to sign the document. Mason's strong opposition to the original document came from his fierce belief that basic, fundamental rights must be included in the governing manual for our Nation.

Fortunately, other States agreed with Mason's thinking regarding the inclusion of a bill of rights. They too insisted on ratifying a document that would enunciate those rights.

Finally, in 1789, Congress adopted 10 amendments to the Constitution for ratification by the States. On December 15, 1791, Virginia ratified the

amendments and Mason's Declaration of Rights became part of the U.S. Constitution.

Ultimately, had no bill of rights been added to our Constitution, individual liberties and freedoms would not be guaranteed. Americans, like so many people throughout the world, would be left at the whim of leaders to interpret our Constitution. We still have our basic liberties today and each of us can thank George Mason for that.

I urge each of my colleagues to cosign this important legislation in honor of George Mason. Chairman JOHNSTON of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee has already introduced legislation in the Senate, and today we are introducing legislation in the House. Under the Commemorative Works Act, Congress must pass this legislation by March 15, 1992. Please help to support the person who helped ensure our liberty and freedom—George Mason. Please cosponsor this important legislation.

WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1245

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1245.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SLAUGHTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

A QUIET REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my feelings about the direction this country is heading and the types of reforms that are needed. We have heard an awful lot of talk lately about proposals for reform. I guess I would just like to go on record as saying I think we need to go beyond mere incremental reform. This country needs a quiet revolution of the type Thomas Jefferson discussed back when he was one of the Founding Fathers of this country. He indicated that we ought to have a quiet revolution every 19 years in this country, every generation.

I think Americans are fed up with the state of affairs in this country, Madam Speaker from crime in the streets, and indeed this very city is the murder capital not only of the country, but of the Western Hemisphere.

We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars of hard-earned taxpayer's money, but poverty is probably greater than ever today.

The condition of our central cities is disastrous. The problems facing our schools are monumental and the condi-

tion of the American family is in grave disrepair.

I think instead of the glib 30-second television spots and pictures of politicians smiling and kissing babies, we ought to have some talk about substance in this country. We ought to do something to make a difference.

When I served in the California State Senate, our rules committee commissioned a poll and did as well some focus groups to ascertain public sentiment. The results were very, very interesting. I suspect they are valid today as concerns this institution.

Contrary to a lot of the public banter that we hear, they did not think the politicians were all corrupt or even mostly corrupt. They were upset with their elected leaders because they were not earning their money. They did not believe those leaders were doing anything to make a difference for the people of the State of California or in this case I believe it would apply to us acting for the people of this country.

We have real problems. People are taxed a great deal. People are out of work and their elected officials who are supposed to be doing something meaningful are merely posturing. It is time that we get beyond that. That is why I say this country needs a quiet revolution.

Now, the liberal Democrats that dominate this House are very much interested in the posturing, the glib phrases, without really solving the problems. In fact, you can squarely lay the blame for this economy at their doorstep. Beginning in 1986, with the accommodations forced upon President Reagan in that 1986 Tax Reform Act that created a real estate depression, that brought low the savings and loans of this country, that are now bringing low the insurance industry and the pension funds, and unless and until we dramatically change that law we are going to continue to face severe economic problems.

President Bush has called for a number of reforms, and we as a Congress have failed to enact them. Once again, the liberal Democrats have blocked the way of reform. That is why I have made it my top national priority to focus my efforts as one Member of Congress on President Bush and to get him to do what many of us think he has the power to do already inherently as the Chief Executive, and that is to exercise his power of the line-item veto. This is a power presently possessed by 43 of the 50 State Governors. It allows the chief executive to exercise fiscal restraint over the spending of the States. We certainly need fiscal restraint here in the Government of the United States.

Let me cite three figures that stick in my mind that are illustrative of the problem that we face. For the decade of the 1980's, the annual average increase in the rate of inflation was 4 percent.

The annual average increase in revenues into the Federal Treasury was 7 percent, and the annual average increase in Federal spending out of the Treasury was 11 percent. So year-in, year-out, on the average we were increasing our spending by nearly three times the rate of inflation.

Madam Speaker, that has not changed today. Indeed, if anything, the ratios are even worse. The increases in spending are even greater today than they were in the decade of the 1980's.

What can we do to control this? Can the Congress control it? Yes.

Will the Congress control it? I think the record is clear, they will not, because the Congress is controlled by liberal Democrats who really have no interest in or commitment to balancing this budget, except through higher taxes.

Oh, yes, they will give us higher taxes. They will do the responsible thing as we have done time and time again, hiking the taxes with the promise that spending restraints will occur down the road. Of course, it never does occur, does it, Madam Speaker? It never does occur.

Now, let me tell you about the line-item veto, what I spent my time doing as one Member of Congress. I had a conversation, I had a chance to visit with President Bush last summer, last July, in the White House. Of course, every now and then as Members of Congress, we occasionally get that opportunity of interacting one on one with the President, so when my time came, I took my best shot. I said:

Mr. President, I think the most important thing that you could do for our country is to exercise the line-item veto, take one of these bills from Congress, crammed full of unrelated appropriations, and start vetoing and then sign the rest of the bill into law and dump it back in the lap of the Congress.

We will sustain those vetoes. We will prevent them from being overridden. That will leave the liberal Democrats who rule this House and the other House with only one shot, and that is to go over to Clarence Thomas and the other folks there in the Supreme Court and try to make their case that this is unconstitutional.

There are lots of strong advocates who argue that this is indeed an inherent power of the Chief Executive.

But I said to the President very frankly:

Mr. President, 70 percent of the American people support the line-item veto. They believe we spend too much in this country and they know that it is depressing the economy and it is hurting all Americans, from the richest to the poorest, because of the economic impact, and so they are with you and they will be with you and you will frame the issues correctly for the debate in the 1992 elections.

Every congressional candidate across this country will have to take a position. Are you in favor of what President Bush did with the line-item veto

or do you oppose it? For once we would have substance injected into our congressional debates.

And do you know what, we would go into the 1992 elections, we would come out with a result and we would have a mandate for change so that in the next Congress we could respond as a Congress and do something affirmative to improve this situation.

Now, that response could take one of three possible forms. We could legislatively authorize the President to make a line-item veto if indeed it were to turn out in the lawsuit that would be sure to be filed by the Democrats that indeed he did not have the inherent authority.

□ 1150

Then we as a Congress could give it to him. We, of course, could also restore the rescission and impoundment authority of the Chief Executive, enjoyed until 1974, when a wounded Richard Nixon had his veto overridden and when it was taken away by the Congress, something every President has utilized from Washington forward through Nixon.

I do not think it is any coincidence, parenthetically, that the last time this country had a balanced Federal budget was during the administration of Richard Nixon.

That year was 1969. Imagine that, the last time this country had a balanced Federal budget, 1969.

The third form of congressional relief that could occur following this November's election would be passage of the balanced budget constitutional amendment. A year ago last summer the amendment was before the House of Representatives. It needed a two-thirds' vote. It got seven votes less than the two-thirds needed and failed passage.

Well, Madam Speaker, I would submit to you that we would find the extra seven votes if we framed the issue on taxes and spending, if we had a national debate occur on this subject, if we had all the candidates participate, and the key to all of that is the line-item veto.

So, Madam Speaker, I would say to the Members of this Chamber and to the White House, to the President, if they are listening, "We need you to make that line-item veto."

Madam Speaker, I sponsored in the House Republican conference, just to kind of followup on my conversation one on one with the President—and I might add, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] supported me in this—a resolution before the conference. Now, the conference I refer to, by the way, is the entire membership, the entire Republican membership of the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, we went officially on record imploring President Bush to execute a line-item veto for the pur-

poses of provoking a court test on this vital issue, which will lead ultimately to restoring fiscal accountability to the Government of the United States.

This is absolutely killing us, this excessive spending.

How is it killing us? Let me tell you: Obviously, it is quite possible to get along without a balanced budget. We have done so since 1969, and this being 1992, some 23 years later, we remain without a balanced budget.

In fact, ironically we have the largest budget deficit in the history of the United States of America this year, and that was after the great budget accord that our liberal Democrats forced upon President Bush that was supposed to balance the budget.

We all knew that was a joke, ahead of time, at least most of us knew it. Now it turns out we have many, many more people unemployed, a depressed economy, tremendously enhanced suffering, a huge national deficit, much greater than anything that we had during the Reagan Presidency. In fact, those earlier deficits look rather good. We wish we could get back to them, as opposed to the high deficits that we are running right now.

So the fact of the matter is it is possible not to have a balanced budget, we have done so since 1969. But what is the effect of not having that balanced budget? Well, you may have noted in some of the financial magazines, for the past two decades, our economy has been growing at about half the rate as was previously the case.

I believe the case can be made that that is due, in large part, to the tremendous drain which the Federal deficit is placing on the economy. It is dragging us down. We spend over \$200 billion a year merely for interest on the national debt, if you can imagine that. It now represents the second single largest expenditure in the Federal budget. It is causing us enormous problems.

I say to my liberal friends, "Why don't we balance the budget and then you and I will fight it out over what we do with what we save? You will fight for more Federal spending programs, and I will fight to return it to the taxpayer."

But the fact of the matter is we will be able to do something with it rather than simply pay it out, pay it out, which is what we do right now, an utter waste.

So I think all of us in this Congress, Democrat, Republican, liberal or conservative, ought to see the advantage of causing this budget to be balanced, reducing the burden on the taxpayers and then deciding what we do with the money that we save.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say first that I am a Democrat who believes we ought to have a line-item veto. Forty-some Governors have it. I see no reason why the President ought not have it.

It seems to me that it is a reasonable thing. I have supported it for some long while.

I also share the concern of the gentleman in the well about the deficit and share the goal of reducing the deficit. But I heard continual reference by the gentleman to the "liberals, it is the liberals this, it is the liberals that." I think this is counterproductive. Honestly, I do not think there is a plugged nickel's worth of difference between the appetite for spending on that side of the aisle as opposed to this side of the aisle, but I think there is a very radical difference in terms of what we want to spend money on. I would like to make this point to the gentleman. I think there is a joint responsibility for this deficit; a major part of it is here and a major part of it is at the White House.

I say that for this reason: If you take a look at the budget President Bush sent to Congress just several weeks ago, it is this President's blueprint of what he wants to spend and what he wants us to raise in revenue. I would ask the gentleman: What does the President propose as a budget for this fiscal year as a budget deficit? Does the gentleman know what kind of a deficit the President is proposing for the fiscal year that we are in?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I am aware of the budget deficit, and I can only tell the gentleman that I voiced my objections to the administration. Obviously, the administration has a role in this process as well; that cannot be denied.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman in yielding to me. Let me answer that by saying that this year in the President's budget document he says the deficit will be \$399 billion, except that in order to get to that he took the surplus over in Social Security and reduced the real deficit by \$74 billion. So, in fact, the document sent to us by the President has a deficit in it for this year of \$473 billion.

Now, whose fault is that? Well, not just this year but then take the deficit out for 5 years; the document presented to us by this administration says to us, "We propose spending \$2.2 trillion more than we take in," a billion dollars a day for every day for 6 years to add to the Federal deficit.

Now, is that an accident? No, it is not an accident. It is a big mistake, a big mistake in public policy.

My greatest fear is that that mistake will be compounded right here in this Chamber by the gentleman's side and my side. Instead of saying that we are not even going to play in that stadium, we will be confronted by the issues here of quibbling about little yardlines,

"Let's play on this yardline or that yardline."

We ought not even be in that stadium. The gentleman is absolutely correct that what people fear most in this country is that we are spending money we do not have, mortgaging this country's future. This deficit is a crippling, crushing burden to the future of this country.

I could not agree with the gentleman more; I think it inhibits economic growth and it is going to retard future economic opportunities in this country.

Somehow, some say, we have to convince the President to lead and the Congress to get the guts to follow and move in a better direction.

The only reason I stood up is to say I certainly share the gentleman's sentiment about the effects of the deficit. But I think it is not productive to somehow suggest to the American people, "You know what causes deficits? It is those goofballs on the left side of the aisle, that party over there."

That is not the case.

This President sent us a budget document just a few weeks ago saying, "I want the biggest deficit in history."

So there is a joint responsibility here.

I will tell you, we had better start figuring out a way to join hands and march down this road together with a little courage—and that includes the White House and the Congress—to figure out how to fix this, if this country is going to have any sort of golden economic opportunities in the future.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I will yield to the gentleman from California in just a moment after I make this comment to the gentleman from North Dakota, because I appreciate his coming down and having the courage, one of the few that I know of on his side of the aisle to actually acknowledge the magnitude of this problem and be willing to support the only thing I could think of that really could make a difference right now, which is the line-item veto.

And, you know, the gentleman is right, we have to get away from the posturing and the politics and do something that is good for the people of this country, because the man on the street out there, whether he is a liberal or a conservative, Republican or Democrat, knows we are spending too much money.

Madam speaker, I yield further to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman yielding further.

I have one more thought, and I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman.

The point I wanted to make about the line-item veto is I think the President ought to have it. I believe he ought to have it. But I do not believe it is going to do anything different to change the deficit in any measurable

way. I demonstrate that by saying we do not have a line-item veto now, but the President sends us a budget, saying, "Here are the deficits I want."

My sense is, whether he does or does not have a line-item veto is not going to alter the fundamental problems we have in the structure of the deficit. So, yes, there are some things that will probably get knocked out and probably ought to be knocked out because they are bizarre priorities. That is why the line-item veto is appropriate.

□ 1200

But I do not think that those who claim it somehow deals with this deficit will have any impact on it at all because when the President sent the budget down here he could have said, "Here's what I think we ought to do to eliminate these deficits." With or without the line-item veto, the priorities are to increase the deficits in the out years.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I personally believe that the issues facing this country are critical enough that even if we did not have the line-item veto, we ought to veto some of these bills, and if the Government comes to a halt, so be it. We will fight out the issues and for once have a real debate here in the House of Representatives instead of an empty Chamber with three Members or four Members and a few people in the gallery. This is something we have got to get into.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate our colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, stepping forward with support for the line-item veto. I would just like to add my voice in disagreement, however, to this concept that we can join hands and the differences between us can be overcome by joining hands and in that way the deficit will be brought down.

The fact is, that to the degree that we suffer a deficit today, to the degree the President is not doing his job of leadership, which I agree he is not, is also to the degree that he has to join hands with those Members on the other side of the aisle. I stood at this podium, at this microphone, in this spot, when we were discussing the proposed deficit reduction package on the floor, which, I might add, was a compromise by the President. The President reached out, and what did he do when he reached out? He reached out and agreed to the second largest tax increase in American history, and when I stood at this microphone to talk about what the results of that might be, I said that this would not end up in a deficit reduction but we would have much higher deficits.

As the gentleman just explained, we have the largest deficit in history com-

ing down on our shoulders, and this was because the President reached out and compromised, actually broke his word to the American people after enormous pressure was put on him by that side of the aisle. They said, "All you have to do is break your pledge, and then we can reach other agreements." So he broke his pledge, and we had the second largest tax increase.

That brought us more unemployment, it brought us higher deficits, and we had the worst of all worlds.

Let me add that with the spending caps the President supposedly was given, his side of the deal was that he was going to break his word on taxes, and that is what he was giving the Democrats. Then the Democrats were supposedly going to give the President some spending caps and assist him in order to control spending.

What have we seen? We have seen gimmicks, trying to get around the spending caps. We have seen Members on the other side of the aisle proposing spending on dire emergency bills, knowing that what is being proposed is not a dire emergency—it is just being used as a vehicle to break their word to the President on spending cuts.

I have one other thought, and then I will be happy to defer to the gentleman and make this a dialog. We also see gimmicks like forward funding, which is nothing more than a gimmick, in a way, to get around spending caps. We are not going to control spending in this House until we are willing to make some tough decisions, and to the degree the President has been able to make those tough decisions, yes, he is responsible. But he cannot make those decisions when the vast majority of the House, for example, do not cooperate, and I am going to point to one specific issue. For example, a number of us here wanted to eliminate farm subsidies for farmers who make over \$100,000 a year. That was the proposal that we put forth, and certainly that is something that seems to me should be supported. If we are giving a subsidy to people making over \$100,000 a year, that is something the average American would question. They would say that we should not give that money away. But that was defeated. Yes, there were Members on this side also, but I have got to say that the momentum for defeating that proposal came from right over there. The President knows that he cannot make those types of fundamental reforms while the liberal Democrats have that attitude over there.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further and allow me to speak, it almost feels like my suit is too tight when I start agreeing with the gentleman. We have a very different outlook on many different issues here.

I voted against the summit agreement as well. I thought it was a sham.

I did not vote for that. They went out to that converted bar at Andrews Air Force Base and haggled and negotiated, and the gentleman is suggesting that, somehow, the President was some innocent victim. People talk as if he were duped and talked into things he was not able to intellectualize. That is not the case, and the gentleman knows that. What happened was that John Sununu, operating at the behest of the President, went out there and negotiated a bunch of things and they came back with an agreement. I personally did not think it was a good agreement. I said so, and I voted against it.

Forward funding? Let me say that forward funding started with President Bush proposing forward funding in some of his budgets. It was wrong then, and it was wrong when the Democrats did it. When they did it earlier last year, I voted against it in vote after vote, because forward funding is crazy. That is exactly the kind of gimmick the President had in his budget, and that some of the committees came out with, and in my judgment it is wrong.

The only other point I want to make is this. The gentleman said that we cannot join hands because it is too evident that when we join hands, the President gets snookered. I think that is sort of the way the gentleman said it. I think the President has a whole lot more talent than that. I think the only way we can ultimately solve this very vexing and dangerous deficit problem in the long term is to figure out a way where we can get the best of what both sides have to offer this country.

The fact is that we both have some pretty good ideas on both sides of the aisle. We are at a gridlock for a number of reasons around here. We no longer work together very well, and we need to start working together for the benefit of the country. There is no reason why people with good minds and with different political philosophies ought not to be able to sit down at the table and have a strong cup of coffee and understand that we cannot spend billions of dollars a day that we do not have. Conservatives cannot do it, and liberals cannot do it, and I guarantee that conservatives want to do it just as much as liberals do. They do it all the time. In fact, the budget that came to us was from one who calls himself a conservative, and he says, "Let's add \$2.2 trillion to the debt." I say that that is a masquerade when one is a conservative and does that. It is the President's responsibility, and it is ours. We have failed, and so has he.

The question the gentleman in the well is raising now is the important question: What do we do in the future to fix this problem? This country cannot afford to allow this deficit to continue unabated and grow and grow and mortgage the future. Somehow all of us, moderates, liberals, progressives, conservatives, Democrats, and Repub-

licans, have to face this problem. We all serve the same people out there, and they do not care much about labels. All they want is for us to put this country back on track, and I hope we can find ways to do that together.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just note that when we try to put something on the floor, obviously the leadership of the Democratic Party does not even permit us to bring our proposals to the floor. This happens over and over and over again, especially now in the case of an economic recovery package. We are not going to get a vote on what the majority of our Members on our side of the aisle would like to propose. It will never be permitted on the floor for a vote. If there is a joining of hands, I think the Republicans over here would be perfectly willing to join hands, if at the very least our proposals were permitted to get a direct up or down vote.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say this: I think your side ought to be able to offer whatever they choose on the floor as a substitute. I don't think the gentleman's side ought to be limited. There are probably some Members who do want to limit it, but I do not think you ought to be limited, at least speaking as one Member.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. But your leadership does not believe that.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, I recognize that a lot of people around here get concerned when things are brought to the floor with lots of gimmicks in them and they suggest they will reduce the deficit when they are going to explode the deficit. We have those problems on all sides. But I am not one who believes that when we have a debate on an economic growth package, the gentleman's side ought to be limited in the package they finally decide they want to bring to this floor.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am upset when the issues we are permitted to vote on the floor at a time of economic hardship are issues like striker replacement bills which encourage strikes or mandated benefits which add extra burdens to business or quota bills, which, for example, are a litigation nightmare to businessmen. All of these bills would actually hurt business' opportunity to compete and to actually grow and to produce jobs, while our bills and our pieces of legislation are issues that we are all talking about, for instance, permitting people to have IRA's and use them for first-time home purchases, and they are not even permitted to get to the floor. So we have the leadership on this side of the House telling us, "Well, I'm sorry, but the bills that are going to come forward are these bills," and they are antieconomic growth bills and our pro-

posal will not even get an up or down vote.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, let me reclaim my time just to comment on that, if I may, and explain to those who may be observing this in the Chamber or hearing it over the airways, that we are now having a rather substantive discussion of issues in the Chamber of the House of Representatives today, and we are talking about something that probably most immediately and directly impacts the people of the United States.

Madam Speaker, prior to my service here, I came from our senate in the State of California, and we had real debates there in the senate, and interestingly enough, when the senate was in session, all of us were compelled to be in attendance. We could not be off in some committee meeting or back in our district. You were compelled to be in the chamber at your seat, listening to the debate, and the law gave the authority to the sergeant at arms in the house and the ability to actually compel members to be there. So they were there, and we had real debates.

The senate of California is made up of 40 members, so it is a lot smaller body. There are some differences we have to take into account, but we had real debates. That legislature, much criticized as it is, towers in many ways above what happens today in this body.

I wish that we could get our Members here on the floor, that we did not allow committee meetings to go on simultaneously with proceedings on the floor of the House, so we could all participate in a real debate and maybe come to some kind of common view, at least about some of the fundamentals that affect this country.

Madam Speaker, this House has something called the House Rules Committee. Our senate had something called the senate rules committee, and I used to serve on that committee. But the functions of those two committees are radically different. Every senator had a right to speak on any bill for 5 minutes, and everybody, having exhausted his or her right to speak, could come back for a second 5 minutes. Every senator had the right to offer an amendment and have it considered by the body.

But here in the the House of Representatives, we do not have that right, and this is what the gentleman from California was alluding to, because this House Rules Committee now serves the function of screening amendments and bottling up those that they do not wish to see debated.

I would say, Madam Speaker, to the people listening to us here that if we could just get the right to offer an amendment and debate it freely and openly here in the House of Representatives, we would probably see a dramatic transformation. If Members had to go on record as to whether or not

they think we ought to reduce taxes or increase spending, I predict we would have a majority in this House doing something that is meaningful.

The gentleman from California referred to the economic recovery package which is going to be coming to the floor next Wednesday, I believe. It is strongly rumored that the Republicans will not be allowed to offer the amendments they seek to offer, that we will be constrained by the House Rules Committee dominated by the Democratic leadership as to what can be offered.

Now, are the Democrats going to live by that same rule? No way. They are going to be able to keep amending right up to the very minute that this bill is brought out here on the floor. That is not fair, and I will say that we are not going to sit by and let that happen. We will use every device at hand in order to prevent that from happening. It is an abuse of the fundamental notions of a representative body of government trying to act in the name of, and at the behest of, the people of this country.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, the point is not that it is just not fair to us, but it is not fair to the American people. The fact is that what we have in the House of Representatives is a cynical use of power by a very elite group within the Democratic Party. There are many members of the Democratic Party in this House who are fine, responsible people who would prefer to see a more open and free-flowing discussion and a consideration of the ideas from both sides of the aisle, as we have heard today. For example, we have a Member from the other side of the aisle who supports the line-item veto.

□ 1215

But yet, the leadership of this House, the leadership of the Democratic Party does not believe in this type of democratic approach to lawmaking in the United States of America.

It was funny when I first came to the House. I remember the leadership of the Democratic Party here in the House got up and mentioned that Republicans always talk about believing in democracy, but how much they dislike politics, and they separate politics from democracy. The point was made that politics and democracy go hand in hand. If that be true, the fact is, on the other side of the aisle, there are some Members in the leadership who may like politics more than they like democracy within this body. And people back home when they are trying to analyze what the heck is going on in Congress want to know why is it that Congress is acting this way, and why is

it that our country does not seem to be working anymore. I would suggest that it is because there are certain people in this body that if they cannot win in a straightforward democratic way are willing to basically suppress other ideas from coming to the floor of the House of Representatives that could cure some of these problems. And sometimes this cynical manipulation of procedure here in the House is done with very political motives in mind.

I happen to believe that there are many people in this country who have come to the conclusion that the economic hard times that we are in is an intentional creation of the Democratic leadership, not necessarily in this House, but Democrat leadership which they have decided that they cannot win control of the Presidency unless we are in economic hard times. In other words, there are people in the Democratic Party that many people believe are intentionally creating economic problems for our country in order to ensure that a Democrat is elected to the Presidency of the United States, because a Democrat cannot be elected in any other way.

What kind of proof do people have? Obviously the policies that have been coming out of this Congress. This is the body that makes the rules. This is the body that makes the laws.

There is nothing fundamentally wrong with the United States of America. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with our country and our people. What is wrong is the policies that are directing our country's economy and their economic behavior. That is why things have gone bad in our country, because of bad policies.

Will Rogers once said there is nothing wrong with Congress that cannot be cured by one good election. I can tell my colleague that if we had a different group of people in the majority in this House we would have different policies. For example, in the last 2 years when we saw this economic juggernaut, this recession heading right for us, we would have had bills on the floor of the House of Representatives which would have been bolstering our ability to compete internationally, bolstering our ability of our businessmen to create jobs and to operate with a profit. But instead what we have had, as I mentioned before, we had a mandated benefits bill which basically was tough on business. We had a striker replacement bill which actually encouraged strikes and management disputes with unions. We had a quota bill which adds tremendous costs onto the employers and makes them very hesitant, especially with mandated benefits and striker replacement, to hire new workers. This is the type of legislation that came to the floor. These were the proposals of the other side of the aisle, while our proposals, the Republican proposals were not even permitted to come to a vote.

We would have liked to have taken out, for example, or taken off the earnings limitation on senior citizens. We believe if you have an earnings limitation on senior citizens it actually is a damper to economic growth because you have some of our most talented people who are out of the job market because the earnings have mandated that they are taxed at such a high level that they cannot afford to work. This is antieconomic growth. We tried to eliminate that, but we could not get these things to a vote on the floor.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I might just emphasize that the gentleman is correct. We cannot get that to a vote on the floor. And we would have liked to have offered an amendment on the floor, but the Rules Committee would not allow that to happen. So we never do get to vote on it. So if there are senior citizens who want to go to work and need to go to work because of the miserable economy their Government has given them, they cannot without being severely penalized through oppressive tax schedules.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. So the President does deserve some criticism. To me, he deserves the criticism of when the pressure was on he gave in to the big taxing impulses of the other side of the aisle, and that compromise led to a degeneration of the economy.

Think of when our problems really began to emerge in this country. It was after the deficit reduction package was passed. The deficit reduction package was the second largest tax increase in American history. The President gave in, accepted that, assuming spending limitations which the other side of the aisle has tried to go around every time they have had a chance. And that is when our economy started heading down. To the degree the President compromised with that side of the aisle, that is the degree to which he should be held responsible for our bad economic times.

There is nothing wrong with the fundamentals of the American economy. There is nothing wrong with the people of this country. We have a better chance for peace and prosperity today than at any other time in my lifetime. There should be reason for optimism and joy, but instead what we have is gloom and pessimism spread throughout this country. And it is because that gloom and pessimism helps politically elect someone who is in another party than the President of the United States. There is no reason for that.

Do you know what the capital gains tax is in Japan? It is zero or 5 percent. The capital gains tax in Germany is zero. When we try to get up and make a proposal that would help us be competitive internationally, what do we get from the other side of the aisle but allusions to class warfare. We get an us versus them, rich versus poor in an attempt to cloud the issue in a way that

ends up with fewer jobs being created because our businessmen cannot compete when they are being taxed, and their investors are being taxed at such a higher level than their international competitors. That is what we get when we propose growth-type initiatives. That is when we are allowed to propose them. Actually, they never are able to come to a floor vote in the first place, although we did, I would admit, at one time we did get a capital gains reduction to a vote, and it won in this House. Then the Democrat leadership in the Senate filibustered it and killed it on the other side of this Congress.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Malcolm Forbes, Jr., said this is the most unnecessary recession since World War II. This is brought about by the mismanagement of governmental policy and those driving that policy sit on the other side of the aisle. They are the liberal Democrats who offer the same old tried and false solutions for the problems of America: More Federal spending programs followed by weaker economic growth, followed by falling tax revenues, followed by, you guessed it, tax hikes in order to make up for the deficit, followed by recession again. It is just cyclical and it is sick. This is like a doctor treating a patient and prescribing a medicine that is making that patient sick. The sicker the patient gets, the more medicine the Democrats administer.

I am not going to let them kill the patient; namely, the Republic of the United States. We have got to turn this around. That is why I began this debate on the note that I do not think we are going to get much cooperation out of the Congress of the United States this year. I hope that President Bush can get their cooperation. I will do what I can do to see that that occurs. But I do not think it is going to happen.

So what do we need if it does not happen? Are we going to sit back and wait another few months and just kind of limp along? No. We need now for the President to exercise the line item veto, to seize control of the excessive spending of this country.

Second, we need him to index the capital gains rates by administrative action, which he has the power to do. It does not require the action of Congress. They can simply do it at the White House. We also need to index depreciation schedules. Those two reforms alone, fiscally, would do wonders to promote economic growth and job creation in this country.

Additionally, the President has called for a 90-day moratorium on new regulations. Regulation is killing this country. Politicians love to talk about redtape, but when it comes to actually cutting it it is a little tougher for them to accomplish. We need to cut the redtape, and let us begin with the administrative agencies that we can control. Let us make sure that the review

teams in the departments are made up of people who are committed to reducing that redtape rather than bureaucrats who created the redtape in the first place and are committed to making sure that it remains in place. I have specific reference to the postcard appeal system in the Forest Service which is being cynically manipulated by those who are determined to stop the harvesting of timber. That is one concrete area where we could make reforms. Let us reform the disastrous wetlands policy which is in effect taking away people's use and enjoyment of their private property. Let us begin with that, as well as reviewing regulations that can be pared back.

I think in this hour we have discussed some very important issues. I think we need to join the debate. It is interesting when I came to the House of Representatives in 1991 I really did not realize it was this bad. I came here thinking we actually could cooperate with the other side of the aisle in the greater interest of this country. I was heartened by the comments of my colleague on the other side of the aisle today, but I must say I do not find those comments generally reflective of the prevailing sentiment on the other side of the aisle.

Col. Henry Robert wrote a little book called Robert's Rules of Order. Most of us became familiar with parliamentary procedure as a result of that work. I believe that is the prevailing work today for voluntary associations and bodies that have free debate. If Colonel Robert saw what goes on in this House of Representatives he would have to base his book on something else, because at the time it was written it was written based on the Rules of the House of Representatives. Today those rules thwart free and open debate. They thwart it. This has been replaced instead by very tight control, leveraged, managed by the Democrat leadership so that issues of controversy that the American people might like, but that the liberal Democrats hate, never have to come and be debated here on the floor. So we do not have to have any tough votes that your opponents can use against you in the election.

I see my colleague from California, Mr. DORNAN, has joined us on the floor and may want to make some comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from northern California. I was taking a tour of the Capitol with some friends from California and I heard my colleague from California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and the gentleman in the well engaging in a dialog on some of the problems we have before us and how the rules of the House are getting in the way, the way they are interpreted by the majority in solving these

problems. One of my guests is a medical doctor, and we were discussing the desire of this House, sometimes politically motivated, to solve some of the medical expenses that are rough for some families. But one thing I was agreeing with this fine American doctor is that American medicine is the best in the world, and there is a good chance that we are going to tear up rather than help in approaching this medical problem. And the rules of the House, the way they are interpreted, are probably not going to allow us a good debate.

One thing I told the doctor that I had discovered, doing a little arithmetic, was that our deficit is now approaching this year the highest in history, \$400 billion, and if it falls short of that, the real deficit, as we know, is not reflected properly by our Government, no matter who seems to be in the White House. It is a tradition that we take our trust funds, our highway trust fund, our airport trust fund, our Social Security trust fund and subtract that from what the real deficit is, and then come up with this phony deficit. But if we take a conservative \$400 billion, I would ask anybody who is a guest in this Chamber ever to work this arithmetic problem. Divide 365 days, and this is leap year so you can use 366, divide 366 days into that debt, that deficit, the \$400 billion, and you get a debt, each day, of \$1,093,000,000. Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, today, February 20, every day, this Congress puts this Nation and our grandchildren into debt \$1,093,000,000 a day. If you work that down to a second, just a second, it is \$12,650 every second. There is another \$12,000, there is another \$12,000. It is unbelievable.

Could we solve the problem in this House with a little fair comity, as we say, with bipartisan cooperation by cutting the cost of the Government? Certainly we could.

This is an anniversary in my life, and I do not think the gentleman knows this.

□ 1230

But I would like to discuss just a couple of countries in the world where the problems seem intractable. One is South Africa. I think they seem to be making more progress with more of what were called insoluble problems than what we are.

I leave in 15 minutes from Andrews to fly to the Soviet Union, what is left of it, the Soviet disunion, the Commonwealth of Independent States, for 4 days on how they are going to take down all of these nuclear weapons that are pointed at us. They seem to be making more progress there.

And in Northern Ireland, they have got an 800-year problem there, and they are working on it, and if they solve that problem before we solve our debt problem, I am going to be one very shocked Irish-American.

Twenty years ago today, I was shot with a bullet in the back in Derry, and the British call it Londonderry because it was once given to the Port of London as though that makes sense, but the port city in Northern Ireland of Derry, I was filming with a Bolex camera, and my own Nikon, for my own television show, the charge of the British First Paratrooper Regiment 20 years ago last January 30 where 13 people were killed including 1 little boy named Tom, whose mother's maiden name was Dornan, and while I was filming this, a British officer ordered a soldier to shoot me. Here is the bullet. That is what hit me in the back, this gigantic so-called rubber bullet. I remembered the date, because I was talking to some Irish kids about JOHN GLENN, now a distinguished Member of the other body, the Senate, having orbited the Earth, which reminds me today is his 30th anniversary, *tempus fugit*, but this bullet hit me in the back from about here to that picture of George Washington over there, so it had lost its velocity, but it still felt like somebody socked me in the back, and it bounced. I turned around to put up my dukes. There was nobody around. I whipped around again, and here is this bullet bouncing down the street, a little kid named Kevin Hargen catches it on the fly and comes running up to me, and he said, "Hey, mister, would you give me a dollar for this bullet?" And I said, "I think I earned that. What is your name?" He said, "My name is Kevin," and I thanked the kid, and he gave it to me. I said, "Get me a cartridge, and I will give you a dollar, if you go behind those British troops and get a cartridge."

So they have gone from those vicious rubber bullets at close quarters that hit people over the heart and stopped their heart and killed them, have hit kids in the face and completely demolished their nose, they have now gone to white plastic bullets that are about a fourth this size that are even more lethal, my point being other than an excuse just to bring this up is that that problem goes back 800 years, the suppression of the Irish by the English, and the English are still in there with troops trying to stop them from killing one another.

We do not know what the end solution is going to be there, but these problems that we have inflicted on ourselves here are not 800 years old. They are about 20 years old with the just absolute runaway government and the cost of government.

We raise taxes better than any nation in the world or any nation that has ever existed; a trillion dollars of revenue we are bringing in this year, and we did it last year. But that is not enough. We want to run a bill of \$1,400,000,000,000, the \$400 billion being the deficit.

I thank the gentleman for taking this special order. He is going to see me

a lot in that well with 1-minute reminding people that this Congress, together with the other body, the Senate, running up every second \$12,649 like clockwork, and every time we go to bed at night and we sleep for about 8 hours, if we are lucky enough to get 8 hours, that is another third of a billion dollars that we are in debt every night that we are sleeping.

We have got problems in this Congress, and the gentleman is hitting the core of it, the imperial attitude of the majority here on how they abuse the House rules.

I thank my colleague for yielding and letting me tell a little peacetime war story.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman. That is an impressive bullet the gentleman revealed.

Madam Speaker, I think this House is dramatically in need of its own quiet revolution.

Let me suggest a few areas where I think we need to move rapidly now to accomplish something. We have heard about the House bank scandal. We have had a committee investigating that for several months.

I think it is time to come clean and reveal the names of those who had the overdrafts. Let it just be revealed who wrote checks with insufficient funds. That would clear us, and it would allow the appropriate action to be taken.

We now hear that as much as \$100,000 was involved in this, that Members may, indeed, according to newspaper reports, have been cynically calculating how to write these checks for insufficient funds and then back the difference and collect the higher interest rate.

This needs to be fully reviewed and brought out, and I think this is symptomatic, frankly, of what happens when one party controls an institution for too long, and in this case it happens to be the Democrats. Had the Republicans controlled this institution for as many years uninterrupted, you may well have seen the same thing.

It is time to have a change, Madam Speaker. We need to reinvigorate this system. We need new leadership. We need new policies. We need the enforcement of an appropriate ethical standard for all the world to see, Members included.

I think we need to overhaul the seniority system. We need to give greater voice to some of the newer Members. They have an equal vote here with their more senior brethren. I wholeheartedly endorse the proposal that, in effect, would set internal term limits by setting a fixed length of time that someone can be a committee chairman or a ranking member. It promotes healthy turnover, and we need that. We owe that to the people we represent to keep these institutions invigorated and addressing the problems that face the people of this great country.

We have far too many subcommittees. They need to be dramatically reduced.

The staffs of the committees need to be slashed in their number in order to reduce, I think, the profusion of laws and of staff people that has happened over the years and, of course, when you have more staff people, to justify their existence, we have to write some more bills and have some more laws.

This country is drowning in laws and rules and regulations. We need to simplify and clarify and reduce the burden.

We have lots of little powerful dukes and barons now who have the chairmanship or the ranking member slots in some subcommittee, and with that goes a pot of money and staff that can be hired with that money. We need to make the commitment, and our minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has made the commitment. He said that when the Republicans take over this House we will cut the committee staffs by 50 percent. We can do that and still have quality laws. Indeed, we will get back, I think, to quality legislation that we have been lacking for so many years.

I am utterly dismayed to hear what has gone on with the House Post Office and the allegations of drug dealings that have gone on there. That needs to be fully rooted out and the wrongdoers punished to the fullest extent of the law.

Once again, the House has its own procedures. It has its own ways of doing things, special arrangements with how the post office is operated. I think we need to come clean and be above board and deal expeditiously and fairly, but strongly, with this matter.

We hear other allegations concerning other operations of the House of Representatives. We simply need the House to rise up and demand that ethical standards be enforced.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chance today to speak on issues of pertinence to the people that we represent, and this will not be the last time that I address these issues. They need to be refocused upon time and time and time again, and we need to do everything in our power as Members here to get away from the inertia, from the drift that we see, which is just business as usual. We need a quiet revolution that benefits the families of this country, the working people of this country, the children, the retired people, one that benefits everyone and benefits them not by spending more money that we do not have but by reforming, revolutionizing, if you will, our methods of operation and by reducing the burden that is imposed upon families and individuals and businesses by the excessive tax burden that exists today.

COMMUNICATION FROM POSTMASTER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Ms. **SLAUGHTER**) laid before the House the following communication from the Postmaster of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER,
Washington, DC, February 14, 1992.

Hon. **THOMAS S. FOLEY**,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that employees of the House Post Office have been served with subpoenas issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

ROBERT V. ROTA,
Postmaster, House of Representatives.

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. **DOOLITTLE**) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. **DOOLITTLE**, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. **THOMAS** of Wyoming, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. **SCHROEDER**) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. **MONTGOMERY**, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. **ANNUNZIO**, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. **KAPTUR**, for 60 minutes each day, on February 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. **MORAN**, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **DOOLITTLE**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **SAXTON**.

Mr. **BALLENGER**.

Mr. **GILLMOR**.

(The following Member (at the request of Mrs. **SCHROEDER**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **FORD** of Michigan.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 353. An act to require the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to conduct a study of the prevalence and issues related to contamination of workers' homes with hazardous chemicals and substances transported from their workplace and to issue or report on regulations to prevent or mitigate the future contamination of workers' homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **DOOLITTLE**. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 24, 1992, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2842. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting the compliance report required by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (GAO/AFMD-92-43), pursuant to Public Law 101-508 (1388 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2843. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting a report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2844. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's 13th annual report on the Automotive Technology Development Program, fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5914; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2845. A letter from the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 for the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2846. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the monetary policy report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 225a; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Education and Labor.

2847. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify the retirement programs for Federal Civilian employees, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, House Administration, Foreign Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

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. **BENNETT**: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4113. A bill to permit the transfer before the expiration of the otherwise applicable 60-day congressional review period of

the obsolete training aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Lexington* to the city of Corpus Christi, TX, for use as a naval museum and memorial; with amendments (Rept. 102-433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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:

By Mr. **FORD** of Michigan:

H.R. 4277. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to delete certain requirements relating to the guaranteed student loan program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. **MONTGOMERY** (by request):

H.R. 4278. A bill to guarantee comprehensive health care services to veterans and their families by ensuring entitlement and eligibility to a wide array of health care services, to make greater resources and funding available for the delivery of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. **COLEMAN** of Missouri (for himself, Mr. **PENNY**, Mr. **BOEHNER**, Mr. **EMERSON**, Mr. **GLICKMAN**, Mr. **GUNDERSON**, Mr. **JOHNSON** of South Dakota, Mr. **NAGLE**, Mr. **NUSSLE**, Mr. **ROBERTS**, Mr. **GRANDY**, Mr. **JEFFERSON**, Ms. **KAPTUR**, and Mr. **WEBER**):

H.R. 4279. A bill to enhance the competitiveness of U.S. processed and high-value agricultural products in export markets and expand domestic employment opportunities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. **RHODES** (for himself, Mr. **HASTERT**, Mr. **GOSS**, and Mrs. **JOHNSON** of Connecticut):

H.R. 4280. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access to health care, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. **COX** of California (for himself, Mr. **PACKARD**, Mr. **DORNAN** of California, Mr. **DANNEMEYER**, and Mr. **ROHRBACHER**):

H.R. 4281. A bill to designate the U.S. Federal building and U.S. courthouse to be located at Fifth and Ross Streets in Santa Ana, CA, as the "Ronald Reagan Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. **FROST**:

H.R. 4282. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit of \$1,000 for the purchase of a domestically manufactured automobile for personal use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. **GEKAS**:

H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide for fixed deficit targets to reduce the deficit to zero by the end of fiscal year 2000; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. **GILLMOR**:

H.R. 4284. A bill to repeal exemptions from civil rights and labor laws for Members of Congress; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Education and Labor.

By Mr. **LOWERY** of California (for himself, Mr. **LEHMAN** of Florida, Mr. **BERMAN**, Mr. **HUNTER**, Mr. **SCHIFF**, Mr. **PACKARD**, and Mr. **COLEMAN** of Texas):

H.R. 4285. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of formula grants for compensating certain trauma care centers for unreimbursed costs incurred with respect to undocumented aliens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

H.R. 4286. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require cable operators to make certain disclosures at the time of installation of cable service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.R. 4287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide middle class tax relief, incentives for job creation, growth, and investment, for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 87: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. MACHTLEY.
 H.R. 88: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 528: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 720: Mr. BREWSTER.
 H.R. 784: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas and Mr. SKEEN.
 H.R. 785: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.
 H.R. 840: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.
 H.R. 875: Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 1126: Mr. DINGELL, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. PASTOR.
 H.R. 1472: Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. CARR.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. DAVIS.
 H.R. 1547: Mr. DAVIS and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.
 H.R. 1556: Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 1573: Mr. COX of California, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LONG, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 1896: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. GAYDOS.

H.R. 2327: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 2726: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2766: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. RAY.

H.R. 2889: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 3138: Mr. TRAXLER and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 3405: Mr. AUCOIN.

H.R. 3544: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 3654: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 3726: Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 3732: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 3774: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3780: Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 3844: Mr. OLIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 3887: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 3971: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. LEHMAN of California.

H.R. 4016: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 4145: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. KYL.

H.R. 4158: Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 4161: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. REED, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 4178: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 4204: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 4220: Mr. HUCKABY and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 4229: Mr. AUCOIN.

H.J. Res. 107: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 293: Mr. ROTH, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ECKART, Mr. WEISS, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.J. Res. 401: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.J. Res. 406: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. LENT, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ROE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RHODES, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. HORTON.

H.J. Res. 407: Mr. WOLF, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. LENT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. KLUG.

H. Res. 107: Mr. GRANDY.

H. Res. 163: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 233: Mr. CRANE and Mr. BEREUTER.

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. 330: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1245: Mr. BLILEY.