

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 11, 1992

The House met at 2 p.m.

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

Let us pray, using the words of Psalm 106:

*Praise the Lord! O give thanks to the Lord, for he is good; for his steadfast love endures for ever!*

*Who can utter the mighty doings of the Lord, or show forth all his praise?*

*Blessed are they who observe justice, who do righteousness at all times!*

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BERMAN 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 with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3337. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the White House, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3337), "An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the White House, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House, and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. CRANSTON, and Mr. D'AMATO, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 792. An act to reauthorize the Indoor Radon Abatement Act of 1988 and for other purposes.

### SUPPORT FOR ECONOMIC AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE FORMER SOVIET REPUBLICS

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's lack of response to critical needs in the former Soviet Union constitutes nothing less than criminal neglect of the United States' foreign policy and national security objectives. It also ignores the fact that the security, health, and prosperity of our grandchildren cannot be isolated from events there.

We have heard a lot of talk from this administration about the new world order and a vindication of past and present policy toward the Soviet Union in terms of winning the cold war and bringing the states of the former Soviet Union into the fold of Western democracies. We have seen a lot of public relations gimmicks—telegenic Washington conferences and airlifts of a few days' worth of food and medicine.

What we are missing is substance. President Bush not only has trouble with the vision thing. He also has trouble with the leadership thing.

No one has been fooled into thinking that our feeble Russian aid effort is on a par with Operation Desert Storm. This is no Berlin airlift, no Marshall Plan. Our aid so far consists of grandstanding ploys, which pay lip service to the importance of the task, while providing none of the new resources needed to accomplish it.

Have President Bush and Secretary Baker stopped to consider the consequences of what is sure to be known as the grand failure of the modern era?

If reform efforts fail and new authoritarian governments emerge out of the wreckage of the Soviet Union, the United States will pay for the failure for decades. Moreover, only in the absence of international instability can we truly devote our attention and resources to our domestic economic and social recovery—and the American people know this.

I urge the President and his advisers to heed Mr. Nixon's advice to provide real, dramatic, and immediate aid to transform the political and economic systems of the former Soviet Union.

When we talk about aid to the former Soviet Union, we are not talking about

charity. We are talking about our national interest. We are talking about putting America first.

### CONGRATULATING THE TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY LADY RAIDERS BASKETBALL TEAM ON THEIR FIRST SOUTHWEST CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Texas Tech University women's basketball program on their Southwest Conference championship. The 23 and 4 Lady Raiders captured their first championship at home last week before the largest crowd in Tech women's basketball history at the municipal coliseum in Lubbock, TX.

The Lady Raiders not only captured their first conference basketball championship, but it was Tech's first women's conference championship in any sport. Talented Head Coach Marsha Sharp, who has been named Southwest Conference Coach of the Year, led her team to a perfect 10 and 0 home record this season, and extended its school record to 16 straight wins at home. In Coach Sharp's 10 seasons at Texas Tech, she has guided the Lady Raiders to 7 20-victory campaigns and 5 NCAA tournament invitations.

Tonight, the Lady Raiders will play Texas Christian University in the first round of the Southwest Conference tournament in Dallas, TX. I commend Coach Sharp and the Lady Raiders on their record-setting achievements this season, and I wish them the best of luck through the Southwest Conference tournament and on to the NCAA tournament.

### DEMOCRATS' TIRESOME POLITICS OF ENVY

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, there are now only 9 more days before the March 20 deadline for the liberals in Congress to finally get a jobs creation bill on the President's desk. It doesn't look like they will make it. First, last month the House passed yet another huge tax increase following their outrageous tax increase in 1990 which doomed the economy.

□ 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.

Then the House last week passed a \$1.5 trillion budget which will increase the bloated Federal bureaucracy even more. The Democrats are still the tax-and-spend party they have been for the past five decades. In fact, the leading Democrat Presidential candidate bashes the Democrat candidate who wants to create jobs. The projobs Democrat candidate talks about incentives for business, including a capital gains tax cut. He scorns the Democrat establishment's tiresome politics of envy.

The leading Democrat candidate eagerly leaps into class warfare. He wants to increase taxes on the job-producers in America. This is what his party did with the so-called luxury tax in 1990. Their tax increase resulted in the loss of tens of thousands of jobs in the boat industry and other industries.

I urge my sensible colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in working toward passing a real growth and jobs creation package. That is the least which the unemployed and other Americans can expect from their elected Representatives in Washington.

**WHAT IS HAPPENING AT THE OTHER END OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE?**

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, every week I am in my district, at the grocery stores and shopping centers, in people's homes, at businesses, and in the schools. And every week I hear the same plea: When is Washington going to help turn the economy around?

I can tell them we are moving ahead in Congress. We have passed a strong transportation bill, we have passed a bill for middle income tax relief, and we're moving legislation to control massive health care costs.

But what, Mr. Speaker, is happening at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue?

The President has no economic recovery plan. The only plan he offered was soundly defeated on both sides of the aisle, and used the discredited policy of tax breaks for the wealthy as its engine for economic growth.

The President has no plan to stop the hemorrhaging of health care costs that threaten the well-being and economic security of millions of American families.

And the President has shown no interest in helping our defense workers, and defense-dependent communities cope with a shrinking Pentagon budget. These men and women have dedicated their lives to winning the cold war, but he would turn them out rather than help their companies adjust to a civilian economy.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing kind or gentle in this. To lead is to act, to gov-

ern is to choose. And though the American people have called for help, the President remains stubbornly silent.

□ 1410

**FULL DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS WHO BOUNCED CHECKS ON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE BANK**

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I am here today because tomorrow I understand we are going to be debating whether we are going to disclose the people who bounced checks in the House of Representatives bank. I understand there is a lot of pressure being put on Members, especially on the other side of the aisle, to not disclose the names, to go along with the Ethics Committee report to cover up and only disclose the names of 19 current Members.

Let me tell Members, I am sure they know that the American public and those watching, as I am sure Members know, want full disclosure. The argument is going to be made that if we can just hold together now, we can protect each other. We can stick together and we will keep this to that one nasty vote that may or may not come on a procedural vote, or we will try to cover it.

I just want to inform the leadership that if we do not get full disclosure tomorrow or Friday that I will be on the floor every single day we are in session offering an amendment or offering a motion for full disclosure. It will be disclosed.

**SHAME ON CONGRESS FOR TURNING THEIR BACK ON AMERICA**

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, first Japan bought the Rockefeller Center. Then Japan bought the great horse, Sunday Silence. Now Japan has announced, ladies and gentlemen, they will buy up all of the farms and the homes that were foreclosed on in the savings and loan crashes. That is right, Japan will begin to buy American real estate.

Let me tell Members how they are going to do this. Because they put up trade barriers to America, and they have complete access to our market, they have a huge trade surplus, and they are going to take American dollars to now buy American homes and American farms, and nobody down here is doing or saying anything about it. Our Nation is literally bankrupt, our national security is at stake, and Con-

gress allows a policy that is so misdirected that we could throw it at the ground and it would probably miss.

I am saying this today: Shame on the Congress for turning its back on the American worker and the American people and the national security of our great Nation.

**CONGRESS OWES ITS CONSTITUENTS FULL DISCLOSURE**

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, we are kidding ourselves if we think that anything less than full disclosure of the names of all the Members of Congress who kited checks at the House bank will satisfy the American people.

Perhaps at an earlier time the public would have trusted our judgment if we disclosed the names of only the 24 worst offenders. But in the wake of scandal after scandal, embarrassment after embarrassment, revelation after revelation, the people simply don't trust Congress any more. It's time for us to start trusting the people. If they were smart enough to elect us, don't you think they're smart enough to tell the difference between an inadvertent and isolated overdraft and an intentional and systematic rip off of the House bank?

We owe it to our constituents and we owe it to the reputation of this institution to release all the names.

**PRESIDENT HAS NO JOBS BILL**

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, last night, on three network TV stations, Vice President QUAYLE asked why Congress will not act on the President's jobs bill. I think this question deserves an answer and here is the answer. There is no President's jobs bill.

No plan to make the transition from a military economy to a civilian one. No plan to tell our allies in Europe and Japan to pay their fair share and bring the money home and create jobs rebuilding our infrastructure, educating our kids, and cleaning up our environment. No jobs plan at all.

What the President does do in his budget is cut the following programs: The Trade Adjustment Act, which assists workers displaced by foreign competition; the Job Corps; the Older Americans Community Services Employment Program; and certain programs within the Job Training Partnership Act, a dislocated workers' program.

He even eliminates the Bureau of Labor Statistics Program that tracks mass layoffs.

Well I have news: people know this country is in trouble and no matter what diversions the Vice President can point to, jobs and the very hopes and dreams of our people are at stake.

#### VOTERS DEMAND FULL DISCLOSURE OF HOUSE BANK RECORDS

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

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the House bank scandal is a stain on this Congress. Charges of a coverup have emerged.

It is time to go public. I call for full disclosure of the bank records of everyone involved.

Until we do that, we are all suspect, including Members like me, who never bounced a check, and also those who may have innocently overdrawn 20 bucks.

Many do not believe the Ethics Committee will condemn Members who were routinely overdrawn. Many assume the House leadership knew what was going on and did not object. But the voters did not know; and they do object.

We bring this House into disrepute by keeping secret facts about Representatives that voters demand and have a right to know.

Our good name is being used to cover those who did, as our balances were used to cover their rubber checks. That is wrong.

Full disclosure is the only way to clear the name of the House.

#### WE NEED A CRIME BILL NOW

(Mrs. LOWEY of New York, asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House approved comprehensive crime-fighting legislation on November 27, 1991. Over 100 days have passed, but partisan bickering and gamesmanship have kept the bill from becoming law; 66 murders occur in this country on an average day, during those 100-plus days, almost 7,000 lives have been lost.

On February 14, 1992, 16-year-old Andre Frank, a good student and star football and basketball player at Mount Vernon High School, was shot to death. Then, on March 9, Kasiem Merchant of White Plains, who dreamed of becoming a professional athlete, had those dreams snuffed out in a senseless shooting.

We cannot let these tragedies continue.

Mr. Speaker, now is not a time for politics; it is a time for action. The longer that crime bill is delayed, the more innocent lives are lost. We need strong action now.

#### HOUSE BANK SCANDAL

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the full public disclosure of all Members who bounced checks at the House bank.

There is nothing more important to this institution than public trust. Regrettably, that trust has been violated by the reported activities concerning the House bank.

The credibility of the House of Representatives will be tarnished even further if we adopt the Ethics Committee's resolution publicly disclosing only 24 names. This is a cover up, and every Member of this body knows it.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of Virginia and the Nation have a right to know the names of all Members who abused the House bank. Members who bounced only one or two checks or a few checks can explain that to their constituents; I am sure they will understand. Members who bounced checks repeatedly can try to explain that to their constituents.

Covering up this scandal will leave a dark cloud over this institution. We must try to restore faith in representative government. As difficult as it may be, this House ought to do what is right: Full disclosure. As Mark Twain indicated, it will gratify some, and surprise the rest.

#### PROBLEMS WITH VETERANS' BENEFITS

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, over a year ago the President and the majority of the Members of this Congress sent thousands of young men and women in this country to the Persian Gulf and put them in harm's way.

Recently, in my hometown paper, I read where several of those young men and women have been having difficulty with the Veterans' Administration and with the military in securing their proper readjustment benefits. This morning I received a very sad note from a neighbor and friend of mine, Mrs. Rita Bongiorno.

She writes: "My son, Joseph P. Bongiorno III, was killed in the Scud attack in the gulf war.

□ 1420

"I have asked the Veterans' Administration for a marker for Joe's grave, and I have been turned down."

Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, and to the administration and to the Veterans' Administration, we owe these young men and women of America more, and more particularly to the families that they have left behind.

I am going to turn this letter over to my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who was seated next to me just prior to these remarks. The gentleman has told me he will personally look into this matter, and for that, General MONTGOMERY, I thank you.

#### DISCLOSURE OF BANK RECORDS WOULD LIFT CLOUD OVER CONGRESS

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this body will soon have the opportunity to lift a great cloud from the Congress by disclosing the names of all those who did the so-called check bouncing at the House bank.

This is not just about bouncing checks, it is about trust with the American people. If we only reveal 24 or 36 or 66 or some other number of check bouncers, what are the American people to think? They are going to think we are protecting our buddies, and they will be right.

We represent the people of this country, not our colleagues in Congress. All records of anyone involved with the bank should be revealed. The records should be allowed to speak for themselves and the American people should be allowed to form their own opinions.

What some Members of Congress are doing with their overdrawn checking accounts is an exact microcosm of the handling of our national budget. They are both national disgraces.

I urge you to vote for full disclosure so we can stop wasting time on this self-created crisis and begin dealing with more serious problems facing this Nation.

#### VETERANS' COMMITTEE FIRST TO USE FM SYSTEM FOR HEARING-IMPAIRED

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], certainly we will follow up. There is no reason for this young man not to get a grave marker, and I assure the gentleman we will follow right up on this.

Mr. Speaker, on March 5, the Joint House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees became the first to use a wireless transmitting system which enables individuals with hearing impairments to participate in hearings. This device amplifies sound with the use of a simple headset.

This is the first time this equipment has been provided by the New Joint Office of Congressional Special Services,

which is under the jurisdiction of the Honorable Donald K. Anderson, Clerk of the House, and the Honorable Martha S. Pope, the Senate Sergeant at Arms and James Billington, Librarian of Congress.

This special hearing equipment is just a small part of the services provided by this new congressional office to help individuals with disabilities participate fully in the legislative process.

The use of this equipment and other assistive services is brought about by the recently passed Americans With Disabilities Act.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee is proud to have had the opportunity to inaugurate this vital new service.

#### THE IDITAROD SLED DOG RACE

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today as we ask for disclosure, full disclosure and as we attack the President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Alaskan tradition which highlights a truly historical event and a competition that is known worldwide.

The event I am speaking about is the Iditarod Sled Dog Race.

At 4:15 this morning Martin Buser, an Alaskan of Swiss descent and his 11 dogs crossed the finish line in Nome to win the 20th Iditarod Sled Dog Race.

In doing so, Mr. Buser won the 1,159 mile race in a record time of less than 11 days.

This was truly a remarkable achievement in a truly remarkable event.

On Tuesday, I introduced House Resolution 392 which honors the 20th anniversary of the Iditarod Sled Dog Race.

This resolution recognizes the historic roots of the Iditarod trail, the life-saving serum run of 1925 and the first 20 years of competition in the "Last Great Race on Earth."

And while most of the mushers and their dogs are still on the trail, it is only fitting that we honor this great Alaska tradition with a commemorative resolution.

The Iditarod is one of the annual highlights in my great State and it is appropriate to honor the courageous people and dogs who braved the elements to deliver the life-saving serum to the people of Nome in 1925 and the men, women, and dogs who today keep that memory alive.

They exemplify the spirit of Alaska. To Martin Buser and his dogs, I say congratulations on a marvelous achievement.

To the more than 70 other mushers still competing, I say good luck and God speed.

And to the hundreds of volunteers who devote thousands of hours each year to make the Iditarod Race a re-

ality, I say thank you for a job well done.

#### MFN TRADE STATUS TO CHINA SEEN AS UNACCEPTABLE FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the United States cannot have a foreign policy which says on one hand: we believe in democracy, we believe in free speech, we believe in the right to dissent; and on the other hand, offer most-favored-nation trade status to the totalitarian government of China—a government which for many years was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of students in Tiananmen Square, who called out for nothing more than human freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress has not yet been successful in overriding a veto of President Bush. Today is the day to begin that process. Let us say to American workers that we think it wrong that they be forced to compete for jobs against slave labor in China; let us say to those courageous men and women in China that we stand with them in their struggle for democracy; and let us say to the President that we want a consistent democratic foreign policy, one that does not reward totalitarianism and brutality.

#### THE REGULATORY RELAY PROGRAM

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of Federal regulations as part of Congressman DELAY's regulatory relay program.

Last week a constituent of mine who runs a medium-sized oil and gas business came to tell me about how excessive Federal transportation regulations affect him and his employees.

This driver qualification file contains some 17 forms which potential propane truck drivers must fill out, many of them include tests which the applicant must take. By contrast, this page with six lines typed on it lists all the qualifications to be President of the United States.

This vehicle maintenance packet contains several forms which drivers must periodically fill out to document that they have taken necessary steps to maintain their trucks.

These three booklets list thousands of regulations which drivers must abide by while they are in transportation. They must always be in reach of the driver.

Finally, this booklet contains forms which must be filled out at the end of

each day, after the driver has inspected virtually every part of his vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, this is overregulation. I will hold a special order tonight to go into further details.

#### CHINESE COMMUNISTS THUMBING THEIR NOSE AT US

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, yes, today we are going to take up the President's job bill. It is called: "You want a job? Move to China."

We are going to give the Chinese most-favored-nation status if he gets his way.

These are the people who have been ignoring us on all the human-rights things that we have been calling out, one of the last Communist countries left, and on top of that they send the missiles to Iraq and all those wonderful dictators in the Mideast and thumb their nose at us. But we are going to give them most-favored-nation status.

They are now No. 2 in imports in this country. We owe them more money than any other country but Japan. So if you want a job, go to China; vote with the President today.

□ 1430

#### FAIRNESS IN FULL DISCLOSURE

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, there are two excellent reasons why we ought to be demanding a full and fair disclosure of the individuals in the House who have been guilty of overdrafting in the recent bank. One is that if indeed the Ethics Committee report will be adopted, there will be about two dozen names disclosed, and everybody in the world knows there are at least 300 individuals on that list.

Well, where does that put those Members who never did overdraft a check or who did a minimal amount of overdrafting? It is unfair to them if only 19 names are disclosed. The people back home are going to wonder, is our Congressman on the remaining list between No. 19 and No. 300?

But there is a second more powerful reason, and that is the public demands it. This is a public institution, using public moneys for the discharge of our responsibilities. It is a public issue on whether or not the Members of Congress can comply with their duties. It is a public issue in every form.

#### IN SUPPORT OF OVERRIDE OF PRESIDENT'S VETO ON CHINA MFN

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

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the administration is involved in yet one more coverup. This coverup is the prison laborers in China. For over a year now the State Department has been holding cables reporting on prison labor in China. When Congress has asked for these cables, the administration denies access to them.

Why? Because this administration is more interested in currying favor with the dictators who run China than the American workers who lose their jobs because of this policy, when the young people in China want just a little better taste of freedom.

When we take a look at our own State Department in complicity with the people who run prison labor camps, it is time, Mr. Speaker, to change this administration from one that is the enemy of American workers and the Chinese who want freedom to an administration that will be a friend to American workers and the Chinese people who want freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the override of the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

Since the Tiananmen massacre, President Bush has asked Congress to grant MFN status to China without conditions. The President has asked Congress to overlook gross violations on human rights as well as China's horrendous trade and nuclear proliferation policies.

Just this week, the State Department has once again tried to prevent Congress from seeing the truth about China and the administration's failed policy of appeasement. The State Department has refused to give Congress copies of cables which will show, according to human-rights groups, that the State Department has covered up China's use of forced labor.

The cables apparently demonstrate that the State Department has known, since early 1991, that China was operating prison factories which produced goods exported to the United States. The State Department kept quiet about this information, however, because the Department feared that concrete evidence regarding China's use of forced labor would encourage Congress to take away China's MFN status.

The State Department's refusal to give Congress copies of these cables is not only an insult to this institution, but further evidence that the President does not want Congress to see the brutal reality of life inside China's prisons. It is evidence that the President does not want Congress to know the lengths to which the administration has gone to give MFN status to Beijing's dictators.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the override of the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

#### THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to quickly release the names of all Members who have abused the privileges of the House bank.

There is a basic principle involved here, known as the people's right to know.

We must never forget that our title is "Representative." That simply means that we are the people's representatives.

As the people's representatives, we have a responsibility to conduct all business, that does not involve national security, in the bright light of daylight. We must let the sunshine in on all of our activities, so that the people we represent can see clearly and thus evaluate our actions on their behalf.

The simple truth is that our obligation is not to our colleagues who have violated the public trust; our obligation is to the people of America, that is who we represent, the people of America, and they have a right to know.

The way to restore the image of this great institution is to let the sunshine in, on all of our transgressions, so that we may heal ourselves. Let us have full disclosure now, and not let one brush taint this institution forever.

#### AMERICAN PEOPLE ENTITLED TO FULL AND DETAILED DISCLOSURE OF HOUSE BANK CHECK-WRITING ABUSES

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, rarely have two Members of this body been given a heavier burden to bear than the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] who headed up the investigation by the Ethics Committee of the House bank check problem, and rarely have two Members discharged this burden with greater nobility and honor than these two gentlemen.

I desperately wish I could support the committee's recommendation, but I cannot. I believe the people of this Nation are entitled to a fuller, more detailed disclosure.

Despite what some say, this is not a Democrat versus Republican matter. It is not a rich Member-poor Member matter. At issue, Mr. Speaker, is the credibility, the respect and the integrity of this House. When those, as I believe are at stake, then I must vote for fuller, rather than narrower disclosure.

#### IN OPPOSITION TO MFN STATUS FOR CHINA

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the President's veto against placing restrictions on most-favored-nation status for China.

In my opinion, these restrictions are not strong enough. Weakening the conditions imposed on MFN status originally passed by the House was a grave injustice.

However, the restrictions included in H.R. 2212 are a start. It is time to get tough with a country that continues to restrict the press, condone religious persecution, and deny access to human rights monitoring groups.

Let us take just a moment to look at the situation. We have a Communist country with a lousy human rights record, lousy trading practices, and a history of weapons sales to Iran and Syria.

How then can we, in good faith, allow the repressive regime of China the privilege of receiving MFN status?

Our current policy has failed. Human rights continue to be violated, and Tiananmen Square demonstrators are still jailed.

Unfortunately, progressive efforts have not been effective enough in placing China back on track. It is time for Beijing to wake up.

#### THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S OWL RECOVERY PLAN

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

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to a document that was entered into the RECORD today.

It is the Bush administration's inter-agency recovery plan for the northern spotted owl, a document of great importance to Oregon.

Secretary Lujan's hand-picked team worked on it for over a year. Then someone woke the Secretary up from a 12-month nap. And was shocked, shocked at the plan's recommendations. So now he wants to delay the process further, and have a new hand-picked group come up with some other scheme.

And while the many Federal agencies involved dither and fight over this, Oregon communities are dying.

Mr. Speaker, countless jobs have already been lost because the administration has no solution, no plan, and no answers for how to resolve the spotted owl crisis.

This tragedy of errors must end. Congress must act on the forest crisis this year, but first we have to know what is going on inside the administration. I applaud the plans of House committees

of jurisdiction to hold immediate oversight hearings into the mishandling of this affair. At last, we may finally discover who is really calling the shots in the Bush administration on this whole sorry mess—or if anyone is.

**IN SUPPORT OF FULL DISCLOSURE ON HOUSE BANK**

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today once again to ask that you and the House leadership join me in supporting full disclosure on the House bank.

There appears to be some concern among my colleagues that full disclosure will unfairly cast a pall upon innocent Members of Congress. I believe it is just the opposite: Full disclosure will squelch the flames. It will put out the fire among the American public that's fueled by Congress' secrecy on the House bank.

I and other Members believe that only full and complete disclosure of bank records will begin to instill confidence in the Congress.

The eyes of the American people are on the House of Representatives this week, Mr. Speaker. They are watching to see if we are going to be open and honest with them, or if we are going to try to cover up.

Newspaper editors all over America are calling for full disclosure. I believe we should take their comments seriously and vote for full disclosure.

**REINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO SUPPORT AMERICAN HIGH TECHNOLOGY**

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, a recession is no time to be shortsighted about American technology, or American jobs.

Today I am reintroducing legislation to support American high technology with a program that will help our companies plan, commercialize, and compete in the world.

And I would like to thank my colleagues—the majority leader and Congressmen GEORGE BROWN, VALENTINE, and MARKEY—for joining me as original cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of California has a great stake in the race to research and develop new technologies. The American electronics industry now employs 3 million people, and the heart of that industry is in Silicon Valley.

High-technology companies in California and nationwide know that this legislation is not a case of Government picking winners and losers.

This Technology Commercialization Loan Program is designed to get American technologies to market with an American label from an American factory.

That is what this Congress should be supporting, and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for that support.

□ 1440

**NOTHING LESS THAN FULL DISCLOSURE IS ACCEPTABLE**

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to rise today to express my concern regarding the North Korean Scud-C missile shipments to the Middle East, to the nations of Syria and Iran and to commend our Government for their efforts to monitor and, if necessary, interdict those shipments. If only we would couple that with the moratorium on arms sales to nations such as Pakistan.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have to address the revolution going on in America, a revolution, frankly, which the leadership in Congress is still trying to ignore. The proposed House Ethics Committee resolution to name only the 24 worst check kitters while letting others off the hook from any public accountability just does not cut it. Anything less than full disclosure will not, either.

The public at large thinks we have something to hide and will hold this whole body in contempt unless we deal with them in an up-front and honest manner.

Mr. Speaker, the American voter is not stupid. Let them decide if their Representative made an accidental mistake or instead abused the public trust in a systematic and routine manner.

Voting against full disclosure will be a vote for a coverup. Mr. Speaker, let us reject that resolution; let us release the names and start to clean up this institution.

**LET US WAKE UP AND DO SOMETHING TO HELP AMERICA'S WORKING PEOPLE AND THEIR FAMILIES**

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

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, if the folks here want a real issue, let us talk about the economy. Herbert Hoover got stuck with the policies of Calvin Coolidge and then continued them on to defeat in 1932.

Today George Bush is stuck with the Reagan-Bush recessionary policies of the 1980's, and his fate is going to be the same as Herbert Hoover's, simply because the people are scared to death.

Mr. Speaker, they are frightened because they are losing their health insurance, they are losing their homes, they are losing their businesses, they are losing their jobs; and they have lost so many jobs that the unemployment rate today is 7.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, how far down into the depths of poverty do people have to go before this Congress and the President are going to wake up and do something to help America's working people and their families? The people know that the rich are getting richer and the people know that the poor are getting poorer, and our people are getting angrier and angrier.

**BOUNCING CHECKS DO RETURN**

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the prior speaker, a good friend of mine who votes conservative every now and then, the check scandal is a real issue.

Mr. Speaker, it was 50 years ago this very day that one of our greatest military heroes ever, Gen. Douglas Arthur MacArthur, against his will, under orders from President Roosevelt, left the small battered island of Corregidor, which fell within 2 months, and Bataan was about to fall within the month, with the death march following. On the PT boat skippered by Lieutenant Bulkeley, Douglas MacArthur said, "I shall return," and left the Philippines to rendezvous with the submarine on the Philippine Island of Mindanao and, by sub, go to Australia to begin the comeback.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend my whole 1-minute and 1 hour tonight talking about that. But, "I shall return," now applies to rubber checks because when you write a bad check, it is going to return, it is going to return, it is going to return. And this list of checks on the front page, 900, 800, 700, a half million dollars' worth of checks; full disclosure, Mr. Speaker, as your party called for in Watergate, Contragate, Abscam, et cetera.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair would remind our guests in the gallery that we are delighted to have them with us but they are to refrain from responding either positively or negatively to any statements made on this floor.

**FORMER PRESIDENT NIXON SAYS PRESIDENT BUSH IS UNIQUELY QUALIFIED**

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the

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

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am not one who regularly criticizes the press corps in this country, but we have seen a very, very poor interpretation of something that was done with the very best of intentions.

Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago I received from former President Richard Nixon a 5-page paper entitled "How To Lose the Cold War." In it former President Nixon talks about the important things that we as a country should be doing to assist those emerging from totalitarianism in the former Soviet Union, now the Commonwealth of Independent States.

He pointed to the fact that there is a very unique and important opportunity now, we should strengthen our relationship with President Yeltsin. Unfortunately, the press has misinterpreted this, and in every interpretation I have seen from the National Public Radio to the Washington Post people have been saying that former President Nixon was criticizing President Bush.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it is in the record. Our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, put it in the record, that 5-page paper.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that all in the press and my colleagues look at it. The last line says, "President Bush is uniquely qualified to address the challenges that we have in dealing with the Commonwealth of Independent States."

We cannot forget that, and I hope very much that the press corps will get that straight.

#### SYRIAN JEWRY

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, with the 1948 Arab attack on Israel, there was a great exchange of populations. Eight hundred and fifty thousand Jews fled Arab lands with no possessions and no money and settled in the Jewish State of Israel as penniless refugees. They were immediately absorbed into Israel, they were granted citizenship and were, in every essence, integrated into the state. On the other hand, 500,000 Palestinians fled Israel to Arab and Moslem States. Israel permitted them to take their possessions and their money. Yet the fleeing Palestinians were put into camps by their own brethren and were not granted citizenship. They were granted little ability to integrate into the community of their new states and were left in camps where most remain today.

The 200,000 Palestinians who chose to remain in the Jewish State, were

granted citizenship and today represent about 16 percent of the voting population. They truly enjoy more benefits than their counterparts who fled to Arab nations. Recently, I was in Israel and had the opportunity to talk with these Palestinians who are Israeli citizens. They indicated to me that they have no intention of trading their Israeli citizenship. They left me with the impression that most Palestinians in similar circumstances, share this feeling. This proves that the integration of the Palestinians into Israel and the community has succeeded and has been beneficial.

Furthermore, in an effort to assist those Palestinians who remain in camps in Arab and Moslem States, Israel has made attempts to reach a meeting ground by offering to Arab nations housing in Gaza for these refugees which would be more suitable than the camps where they are today. The Arab States, however, continually reject the offer.

This brings me to a point which is important to keep in mind. Israel has made consistent attempts to allow Israeli Palestinians the freedoms and the democratic voice that are not being granted to their brothers abroad. Yet those Arab and Moslem States, where a great number of Jews remain since this massive population exchange, have been given few freedoms and remain as virtual hostages. In Syria alone, there are approximately 4,000 Jews who remain. Efforts to obtain their release, or to gain permission for their emigration, have been fruitless. Should they be suspected of having visited Israel illegally or be caught attempting to emigrate or travel abroad without permission, they will be subject to prosecution.

The Syrian Government stated in 1989 that it would positively consider emigration requests for either the purpose of family reunification or for unmarried Jewish women who are unable to find a suitable husband in the small Jewish community. Yet contrary to those statements, the emigration numbers in these cases increased in 1989 alone while in 1991, the Syrians permitted only 20 unmarried Jewish women to emigrate to Israel.

Furthermore, the Syrian Jews are more closely watched than all other Syrians. They are locked in the country, contrary to their choice and it seems that they have become Syria's political hostages. They are unable to travel freely, they are unable to emigrate freely and they are heavily monitored by the government. This is an outright violation of internationally agreed upon fundamental human rights. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I call on Syria to immediately rescind these prohibitions, to permit both free travel and free emigration and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

#### THIS CONGRESS CANNOT EVEN KEEP THEIR OWN CHECKBOOKS

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I got blindsided last fall by a news crew, a TV news crew, asking me about check kiting on the part of Members of the House of Representatives. I confessed that I did not know what they were talking about at the time. It was the day the news story broke.

They explained to me, and I said, "Well, that helps provide an understanding of why this Congress cannot ever manage to balance our national budget. They cannot even keep their own accounts balanced."

□ 1450

Mr. Speaker, this is something that the public really has a right to know about, and the Washington Times printed the top 10. There are about 7,500 bounced checks by the top 10 offenders, and they total roughly \$3 million in bounced checks. That is just the top 10.

Now the fact is that anyone probably knows how to bounce a check. They accidentally do not keep their books straight. That is one thing, but that is why it is essential to remove the cloud that hangs over this body by having 100-percent full disclosure and letting the voters decide this.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need 24 sacrificial lambs. We can tell the voters the whole truth.

#### ONLY FULL DISCLOSURE WILL EARN THE RESPECT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, nothing that the House of Representatives can do to resolve the House bank scandal will restore the trust and dignity the institution has lost in the last several months. The House could, however, do even more damage to its already sullied reputation if it adopts the majority recommendation of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and releases only the names of the two dozen worst abusers of the check writing privileges of the House bank.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no mistaking what the American people want us to do. They want us to give them the facts so that they can judge for themselves whether their Member's use of the House bank was proper or improper.

Mr. Speaker, the issue here is really quite simple. Will the House continue to conduct business as usual, protecting its Members by keeping information from the public, or will the House

finally make itself accountable to the American people, acknowledging its past mistakes, and begin to apply a higher standard of conduct for its Members? Only by full disclosure, Mr. Speaker, will the House come clean and begin again earning the respect of the American people.

**THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT TO KNOW WHO BOUNCED THE CHECKS**

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress is under indictment by the American people. They want us to be more accountable, and, when it comes to bouncing checks, they want all the information. They want us to release the names of all of those Members who have bounced checks.

Mr. Speaker, if we are only willing to announce 24 checks, this Congress better be ready for the largest march on this institution by the people of this country that we have ever experienced in our history because the people are mad, and they want to know who bounced the checks.

**WE NEED FULL DISCLOSURE**

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people here today that are watching this great debate about the House bank. There are a number of people at home, too, Mr. Speaker, that are watching.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of addressing a high school group here recently from my home district, and, as I do with any high school group, I always start off with the same thing. I ask them, as my way of discussing the Federal budget, "Do all of you have a checkbook," and invariably a couple raise their hand, and I ask them, I say, "How much money do you have in your checkbook," and one or two will say, "Well, maybe I've got \$10, maybe I've got \$15," and I ask them; believe it or not I ask them this question: "How much can you write your check for?"

Mr. Speaker, they all recognize in high school, in high school, they all recognize that a check cannot be written for over the amount, and yet right here in this institution, Mr. Speaker, there are people who make decisions about billions and trillions of dollars that do not know that simple principle.

Mr. Speaker, it is time, if this is truly the people's House, as I was told this last year when I raised my hand to take the oath, then it is time for the people to understand what their Representatives are doing.

We need full disclosure.

**ALEXANDRIA-ARLINGTON ECONOMIC STABILITY**

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article in the Metro section of the Washington Post today that describes two communities that define good government. Arlington and Alexandria have escaped much of the fiscal crises that are affecting local governments throughout this country, and they have been doing that through good fiscally conservative management, by holding off on the demands to expand local employees and public programs, and to pay as they went.

I take a little personal pride in that; while I was mayor, we reduced the tax rate by 30 percent and our debt per capita by 50 percent, but the reality is that the real credit goes to the citizens of Alexandria and Arlington, the Arlington County manager, Tony Gardner, and my very close friend, the Alexandria city manager, Vola Lawson, the members of the Arlington County Board, and the Alexandria City Council. They have labored long and hard to come up with a future vision of their localities and have been willing to make the sacrifices to realize that vision. And, as a result, they have two communities that could not be finer places to live in and work in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to insert that article in the RECORD and bring my colleagues' attention to it.

**THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT AND OUR BANK'S BAD FINANCIAL PRACTICES**

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege every day to hear the remarks of my fellow Congressmen. This morning they were talking about some bad financial practices, and they must be corrected, and they have been corrected. The bank has been shut down, but there are bad financial practices going on every day, and I have not heard one person address the fact that the President a month ago submitted to this Congress a budget that was \$350 billion in the red.

Now for those of my colleagues who are not from Mississippi I can say that that is enough money to run the State of Mississippi for 70 years, just this year's deficit, and the interest on that deficit is now \$500 million a day. That is money that will not educate one child, will not cure one disease, will not pave one inch of highway, will not buy one round for one M-16.

So, for the Members of this body who are so adamant about reforming the fi-

nancial situation of this Congress I say, "Let's start with the balanced budget amendment, and let's start with the law that requires our President to submit a balanced budget, and this Congress to pass one."

**APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BOB MICHEL, Republican leader:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,  
Washington, DC, March 10, 1992.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Sec. 5005(d)(1)(C) of Public Law 102-240, I hereby appoint Mr. Kenneth Bird of Woodridge, Illinois, and Dr. John C. Taylor of Mason, Michigan, to serve as members of the National Commission on Intermodal Transportation.

Sincerely,

BOB MICHEL,  
Republican Leader.

**UNITED STATES-CHINA ACT OF 1991—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 2212) regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the veto message of the President to the bill (H.R. 2212) regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield time to other Members for the purposes of debate only.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212, the United States-China Act of 1991, and urge my colleagues to override the President's veto of this important bill. As all Americans know, the hardline leadership of China brutally suppressed a peaceful demonstration for democracy in June 1989. Since then, the House has voted numerous times for legislation to increase pressure on the Chinese Government to improve its behavior in the areas of human rights, trade, and weapons proliferation. At each stage, the administration said that such legislation was unnecessary. They said the Chinese hardliners would be won over by diplomatic persuasion, rather than by hard and fast legislative requirements. They are still saying the same thing. I strongly disagree.

Let me say at the outset that I do not want to isolate China from the positive influences of Western democracies. I do not want to undercut the influence of the moderate, free-market forces within China. But I do not believe that H.R. 2212 will have that effect. This bill has been carefully crafted to establish objectives that the Government of China can meet, in order to retain its most-favored-nation [MFN] status. It provides that the President may not recommend the continuation of a Jackson-Vanik waiver for China in 1992, unless he reports that China accounts for and releases citizens detained in the 1989 Tiananmen Square incident. The bill also provides that the waiver may not be extended unless the President reports that China has made overall significant progress in achieving a number of objectives relating to human rights, trade, and weapons proliferation.

During the time that the Congress has been considering this legislation, the behavior of China's leaders has not improved. More Tiananmen Square demonstrators recently were sentenced to prison, after a long period of detention without trial. Many more demonstrators remain unaccounted for. Negotiations to open China's market to increased exports from the United States and other countries have not made significant progress. And reports continue to surface about possible sales of Chinese missiles to volatile regimes in the Middle East and elsewhere. How can the President credibly argue that the current approach is working?

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives approved H.R. 2212 by an overwhelming vote of 409 to 21 on November 26, 1991. The bill was approved by the other body on February 25 of this year by a vote of 59 to 39. I believe that enactment of this bill will send the right message to China's leadership—that the United States wants and expects more responsible behavior in the areas

of human rights, trade, and weapons proliferation, in return for continued free access to the United States market. I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

□ 1500

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the President gave clear warning that H.R. 2212 could not represent a united foreign or economic policy position for the United States with respect to China. Rather, the bill represents a policy of isolationism and retaliation that the President cannot possibly choose. As expected, he immediately vetoed the bill.

Today, we consider whether to force a divided and questionable policy on the President. I urge my colleagues to sustain the veto and to look for more cooperative ways to develop a constructive and realistic approach to this strategically important country.

The draconian step of rupturing trade relations is probably the most unproductive thing we could do. Our desired goals and objectives in China can only be achieved if there is a strong United States presence.

A normalized trade relationship is essential if we are to reform Chinese policies and make that country a more responsible member of the international community. Trade must exist for this strategy to be successful.

Finding the appropriate leverage is the key. We can point to very recent successes in using this strategy.

Negotiations, using section 301 reciprocal trade sanctions, have yielded a sweeping agreement with China for the protection of intellectual property rights. Also, as a result of United States pressure, China has agreed to abide by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and has agreed in writing to observe Missile Technology Control regime guidelines. China is also participating in the President's Middle East arms control initiative.

As a member of the U.N. Security Council, support from China for U.N. efforts in the gulf is crucial. In addition to supporting Operation Desert Storm and other past U.N. activities in that region, China continues to play a key role in pressing Iraq to abide by the terms of the cease-fire and eliminate its weapons of mass destruction.

The importance of China in world economic and political affairs cannot be underestimated. The United States cannot afford to walk away from this strategically important country of more than a billion people. Even though the relationship has become severely strained and the current harsh leadership has frustrated our desire to see a free and open China, we cannot abandon our efforts to make a difference.

Our friends in China count on American leadership. Chinese students, business people, dissidents, and emigres all support a continued United States role through trade as well as academic and political contacts. They support effective pressure, but very much oppose and fear the possibility of the United States withdrawing MFN and undermining the struggling reformist movement. The fears of Hong Kong are even greater.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time for the Congress and the President to be at odds over this issue. We need to pool our hearts and minds and efforts to face the daunting task of leveraging the Chinese leadership into the mainstream of international practices. We need to look for effective solutions that do not inflict pain on ourselves and our friends.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2212 is the wrong signal and the wrong policy. I urge my colleagues to support the President and vote to sustain his veto of H.R. 2212.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE].

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, today offers us the unique opportunity to send a message, both to Premier Li Peng and to President Bush. By casting a vote in support of this veto override measure, you will be sending a message that the human rights abuse perpetrated by the Chinese Government up to following the Tiananmen Square massacre just will not stand.

Without the H.R. 2212 conference report, President Bush will be sending a message of his own to those who hold power in China, namely that the privilege of enjoying MFN status comes easily, in fact, without any accountability. This message strikes me as odd, in view of the fact that other U.S. trade preference programs hold candidate countries responsible for their records on everything from worker rights and intellectual property rights protection to market access.

In my view, the time is right for conditioning extension of MFN for the PRC. Figures released recently indicate that Beijing has a great deal to lose in risking MFN status, \$12.7 billion to be more exact. This was the 1991 United State-China trade deficit that placed China second only to Japan in the bilateral trade surplus it runs with the United States.

Again, I urge my colleagues to cast their vote in favor of this veto override and to send Mr. Bush the message, "unconditional approval of China MFN, this will not stand."

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, I will vote for enactment of this bill over the President's veto.

Despite the efforts of the administration, the Chinese Government has continued to trample the human rights of its citizens and flout the norms of international conduct.

People around the world were shocked when the Chinese leaders unleashed the army against peaceful demonstrators in Tiananmen Square. In the nearly 3 years since then, the Chinese Government has never apologized for this grisly deed or accounted for all those who were killed, injured, or imprisoned as a result.

Meanwhile, Chinese export and import policies continue to bedevil world prosperity and world peace. Despite their reassurances to the contrary, the Chinese continue to assist other nations develop weapons of mass destruction. Despite some improvements, the Chinese continue to reap the benefits of an unfair trade relationship with the United States.

Although the administration has tried hard to engage the Chinese on these and other issues, the results have been meager at best. For this reason, I believe that we must place realistic conditions on the continuation of normal economic relations.

The only conditions that would absolutely have to be met under this bill are those which relate to observance of basic human rights. First and foremost, this includes accountability for the grave insults to individual life and liberty associated with the Tiananmen Square massacre. On all the other issues included in the bill, the Chinese would be required to make only overall significant progress.

Mr. Speaker, if the Chinese leaders want the economic benefits of free trade, then let them meet the minimum standards on human rights that are contained in this bill. Like the President, I fear for the effects in China if trade privileges are withdrawn. Nevertheless, I feel we cannot go on doing business as usual with this outlaw regime.

□ 1510

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. I also want to commend the subcommittee Chair, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and the leadership on both sides of the aisle who have been so cooperative with the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, since the House passed this legislation, the situation as far as China is concerned has only worsened. For that reason I call upon my colleagues today to once again vote in support of this legislation to condition most-favored-nation status to China on improvement in human rights and on the cessation of the proliferation of nu-

clear weapons, as well as significant progress in trade areas.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address certain of those points. Since the vote in November, we have learned that in the last two quarters of 1991 the trade deficit with China has grown to \$4 billion in each of those two quarters, or over \$8 billion for the last half of 1991.

The trade deficit is going in the wrong direction, in the direction of a greater deficit for the United States. That is \$25 billion in trade surplus for China since Tiananmen Square. All this results not from competitiveness of their products, but rather from obstacles to our products going into China.

On the question of the sale of missiles, the conditions that our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], referred to as a condition in the bill, there are allegations now of China's assistance in Syrian missile production and the export of unsafeguarded technology by China.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent op ed in the New York Times the other day by William Safire in which he talked about how China would try to get around the conditions of this legislation, which prevents the sale of M-9 and M-11 missiles to Syria and Iran, by sending scientists from China to Syria to help construct a nuclear weapon.

It is interesting to hear our colleague from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] talk about the Chinese signing in writing their commitment to missile technology control. We have requested but have not been able to see any such statement in writing by the Chinese Government and the State Department has had it, supposedly, for a long time now. I do not think that document can be produced. That says to me that whatever it says, it is not adequate to make the reassuring case for the other side.

Mr. Speaker, as far as my colleague from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] mentioning the intellectual property agreement as being a sign of progress, indeed it is, and it is a tribute to this House of Representatives for the 409-to-21 vote made here in this body, that the Chinese Government sent a message to their negotiators at that table and said "Compromise, compromise, compromise. Because if we do not compromise on this, for sure this MFN bill will pass and they will override the President's veto."

So it is not the administration, but this House of Representatives and, to a lesser extent, the U.S. Senate, that deserves credit for the progress on the agreement on intellectual property.

On the subject of human rights, prodemocracy advocates in China are still being arrested. In fact, on the very day of the Senate vote, February 25, seven prodemocracy advocates were sentenced to prison terms for speaking out peacefully for democracy in China.

It is sad to report that the administration has said, "Well, we want to do things another way."

Mr. Speaker, I also want to call attention to the fact that the administration was a source of grave disappointment in its efforts to scuttle a recent resolution by the United Nations Human Rights Commission condemning China's human rights actions in Tibet. This sent another message to China that they did not have to conform to international standards of human rights.

Imagine that. There is a United Nations list of countries which violate the human rights of their people and of others, and China is not in it. This list just came out last week. China is not on it because of the actions of this administration to scuttle the resolution. Rather, we agreed to some watered down version which was too late to have China placed on the list. This is when the administration says, "Let us do it our way." It did not work.

So when our colleague from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] says he sympathizes with the emotions and that we feel strongly about this, I have to contend that we do not need sympathy for our emotions. We have the merit of our ideas, which will win the day today. It is not on the basis of emotion, but the hard facts—the fact that China is violating our trade agreement to the tune of nearly half a million American jobs, that China is contributing to nuclear proliferation to a much less safe world for us to live in, a world that we went to war to protect last year because of the spread of nuclear proliferation. And in terms of human rights, basic freedoms, it is in our interest to live by our principles.

Mr. Speaker, I do not call that emotion. I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], I would hope the gentleman will respect the thinking and the principles that are the basis of this legislation. It is not on the basis of emotion, but on the basis of principles that I ask our colleagues to vote "aye" to override the President's veto.

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

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has attempted to distort my comments. I think anybody in this country that does not feel emotionally about a deprivation of human rights certainly does not live within the framework of what this country stands for. I do feel very strongly about it. That is precisely what I said in the opening remarks that I made.

I also regret that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is not aware of the development that China has in writing agreed to observe the missile technology control regime guidelines and parameters. That has been certified to me today by the State

Department. I suggest that the gentleman contact the State Department to verify that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the distinguished minority leader of the House.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I know most of our colleagues believe it is in the national interest to impose conditions upon MFN status for the People's Republic of China, and I respect that belief. I fully understand the humanitarian and patriotic motivation at its heart.

But in my view, our national values and our national interests and the cause of human rights in China are best served by sustaining the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, all of our colleagues know the economic arguments for a continuation of MFN status without conditions. I will not bore Members by repeating those in detail. But let us just remind Members that conditions will put at risk \$6 billion in export to China. Thousands on U.S. jobs are in jeopardy if we set off a trade between the two countries.

Finally, no other country around the face of the globe is withdrawing MFN status. If we do so we will be all alone by the telephone, not to mention the fax machine and every other link with the world's fastest growing economy, I might say.

But as important as these economic realities are, those that want to override the President's veto tell us the question ultimately must be debated on the issue of human rights. Well, I will agree. I believe it is the humanitarian argument upon which the President's policy must stand or fall, so let us look carefully at which point of view best suits an effective human rights policy toward China.

From 1949 to 1972, when China was isolated, millions of Chinese were killed, most of them through state-imposed famine. At that time there was not even a glimmer of hope for freedom in China.

In the interval period of time, I would say certainly the situation is different now. I can recall visiting China immediately after the deposing of the Gang of Four and how I was queried by normal Chinese people. They would ask, "What is it to own a home in the United States? What is this thing called a mortgage? What is private free enterprise all about?"

Having traveled in the Soviet Union and comparing the two countries, I said, "My goodness, China is further ahead than the Soviet Union ever is on developing any kind of vestige of private free enterprise."

□ 1530

The United States has a relationship with China, carefully nurtured under Presidents of both parties for 20 years.

That relationship is not perfect. We all agree with that. Chinese Communists are still acting like Communists, but China's rulers, torn between their doctrinaire hatred of the free market and their need for hard currency, have allowed certain enclaves of capitalism to prosper. Millions of Chinese are looking outward to the world.

If we go over there today, and particularly in Southeast China, and see what is going on, the most important relationship they have developed is with the United States, the world's only superpower.

We are not just another trading nation to the Chinese people. To them we are a model, the exemplar, the superpower that has achieved greatness through freedom.

By imposing conditions we put at risk all that the Chinese people have gained. Quite frankly, over the last few years, if Tiananmen Square proved anything, it is that China's current rulers, if they feel threatened, will act with brutality even when the voice of economic prudence dictates another course. We all know that.

In the Tiananmen Square incident, when the first wave of militarists went into the city, why, there was this friendly rapport between the military people and the people of the Square to the degree that their leaders had to send in another wave and get this job done.

They are scared, scared stiff of what they see happening. Ceausescu was a friend of theirs at one time, and they found out how quick he could be obliterated, in a week. They also looked at the Soviet Union and saw, my goodness, how things changed. Things changed in a hurry, and "you're out on the street."

These octogenarians who are currently in power in China are one of these days going to slough off their mortal coils and they are not going to be there any more. That is the time I want to be playing to, quite frankly.

Sentence them to 5 or 10 or 20 years of watching a Chinese free market make nonsense out of their Maoist dogmas, if you please. If we really want to advance the cause of human rights in China, then do not abandon the Chinese people, as distinguished from their leaders, by giving their rulers the excuse to retaliate against them.

Let me pause here and say I know there is a great concern about the delivery of missile-related technology from the People's Republic of China. The gentleman just made reference to that, as did the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI]. It is a complicated issue.

I have been told, too, by the State Department, and it was confirmed again by the President's NSC adviser, Brent Scowcroft, just this morning, that the People's Republic of China has agreed to observe internationally recognized guidelines on such technology.

The United States continues to monitor the situation. It is not yet clear if recent sales violate those guidelines.

History will record our time as the great transition, one in which the world of the cold war was dying while a new world awaited to be born. Whatever the shape the new world might take, one thing is certain: China is going to play a major role.

We are currently so obsessed in this Chamber and around the country by the Japanese. But it is China that is going to be at the heart of our concerns 25 years from now. How can we avoid it with over 1 billion, 100 million people and what is at stake there, with all that potential?

What a tragic irony it would be if our good intentions led to severing the ties with the very people that we want to help. Again, the distinction between the people and their rulers. Do not punish the Chinese people for the crimes of their rulers.

I would ask the Members to vote for our national values and our national interests, and help the cause of human rights in China by sustaining the President's veto of this bill.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I just want to respond to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER]. I would ask the gentleman to forgive me if he thought I was distorting his statement. We have asked the State Department for that statement from China and they have told us that they would not release it. I asked the Secretary of State, in fact, at the meeting of the Committee on Appropriations last week. So it is on the basis of that rejection that I made the statement that the statement is not available for us to see, and to judge the extent of the commitment of China on nonproliferation of weapons technology.

The question before us is about succession, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] said. It is who comes to power next in China. This sends a message to who comes next in the power struggle in China that who comes next should respect human rights, nonproliferation, and fair trade with the United States.

That is why we have the support of all the predemocracy dissidents, starting with Dr. Fang Lizhi, in support of this legislation—because it will impact the succession in China. If we override the veto we just might get the Chinese to free the prisoners and have MFN with China based on principle.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I really cannot believe that those who are opposed to attaching conditions to MFN

for China have been in the past among the loudest voices for attaching human rights conditions in the form of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Soviet Union, the previous Soviet Union. What is good for the goose, it seems to me, is good for the gander.

I think it is absolutely right to attach conditions on MFN to China. In fact, I have to tell the Members I do not think these conditions in this bill go far enough. I certainly hope we override the President's veto. I think we ought to go beyond these conditions, though. I think we should insist that the Chinese Government, when it does business in the United States, must abide, for example, by the rulings of the United States of America courts. The Chinese today are flaunting the American courts, and I want to tell my colleagues about one small company in my district that is a victim of this arrogance.

In 1988, an Oregon timber company obtained a \$24 million timber contract from one of the Chinese Government's principal trading firms. Then when the price of logs dropped, the Chinese broke the contract and refused to pay this tiny business in the State of Oregon.

Today this company has won two court decisions in the American court system upholding the validity of its contract with the Chinese, but the Chinese continue to thumb their noses at the company, at the United States district court, at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and at a \$10,000 fine being imposed by the American courts, which so far has added up to \$1 million in penalties.

I think it is unconscionable not to apply these limited conditions in this bill to the Chinese on China MFN when the Chinese Government is lawlessly crushing American small businesses right here at home.

So for heavens' sake, those Members who have said to the Soviet Union in times past, "Human rights are important, we want to deal with the Soviet people but human rights are important for the Soviet people," for heavens' sake, apply the same standard to the people of China by overriding this veto and attaching human rights conditions to China MFN.

Mr. Speaker, the time for patient diplomacy has passed. It is clear the President's China policy has failed.

We know that a new wave of dissident trials has swollen China's prisons and labor camps.

We know the Chinese Government is throwing gasoline on the fire in the Middle East. Less than 1 year after Americans fought in the burning sands, the Chinese were selling arms to Syria and others.

We also know about their use of prison labor to make products for export to the United States.

But their contempt goes even further, as one Oregon firm recently found out.

Continuing normal trade relations has sent the wrong message to the Chinese Govern-

ment: That the bloodshed of Tiananmen Square did not count, that selling missiles to the highest bidder does not count, that United States law does not count.

By overriding this veto today, we can send the Chinese Government the right message: That all of these things count very much indeed. I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] to override the President's veto of this legislation.

We have an opportunity today to make it clear not only to the leaders but to the people of China that our country is on the side of democracy rather than dictatorship, and of reform rather than repression.

The President seems to believe that the best way of advancing the cause of human rights in China is by providing them with unlimited most-favored-nation tariff status. But I would suggest that a policy of constructive engagement is no more likely to work with respect to China than it did with respect to South Africa.

I share the concerns of the President and of some of my friends on the other side of the aisle that a total elimination of MFN for China would be entirely counterproductive. I do not think the elimination of MFN would bring the brutal regime in Beijing to its knees. I certainly do not think it would result in an improvement in the human rights situation in that country. It would certainly be harmful to our friends in Hong Kong.

But I want to say to my colleagues that the override of the President's veto and the adoption of this legislation would not require the elimination of MFN. It merely establishes a set of entirely reasonable and responsible conditions which China would have to meet in order to qualify for MFN. It does not require perfection. It merely calls for progress. China's leaders would not be obligated to establish a political nirvana nor a parliamentary democracy. All they have to do is to release some prisoners, relax some restrictions a little, perhaps permit the VOA to broadcast into China. I think that is a small price to ask China to pay for the ability to export \$19 billion to the United States.

□ 1530

If we override this veto; it is a price they will be willing to pay, whereas if we sustain the veto, it is a price they will never be asked to pay and, therefore, a price they never will pay.

Therefore, for the benefit of the Chinese people, and to be faithful to our own values and ideals as a Nation, I urge the Members to override the President's veto and to pass this very responsible legislation.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], a very respected and distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of sustaining the President's veto.

This is not an issue of conditions. The conditions in this proposal are so stringent that in fact it will result in the withdrawal of MFN for China.

I share the concerns of those who bring this legislation forward, but I believe that we are divided only on means, not on goals. Withdrawing MFN status for China will hurt those very provinces of China that are the leaders in market reform, in developing and disseminating democratic political ideas. Withdrawing MFN from China will in fact strengthen the leadership that opposes the changes that are taking place in the southern parts of China that do not want market economies to succeed, that do not want democratic political ideas to be spread.

If we retain MFN for China we retain trade with that nation, and indeed United States exports to China grew 30 percent last year, and our trade with China is growing more rapidly than with any other nation in the Pacific rim. This gives us leverage, and as a result of that trading relationship we have gotten China to sign, for example, an intellectual property rights agreement that preserves jobs in my district. Having fought that battle with Taiwan and with Korea and with other Pacific rim nations, I know absolutely that without a good agreement protecting patents, protecting intellectual property rights, jobs in New England will go down the tubes.

I am pleased that the threat of losing MFN has resulted in the signing of that agreement. I am pleased that the danger of losing MFN has led China to cooperate with us on nuclear issues, on maritime issues and on access to their ports for our shippers, that we have backed up that leveraged attack on Chinese political and economic policies that we oppose with concrete discipline of our relationships with China where they have clearly abrogated agreements with us. For example, in the textile area where we have rigorously imposed our law, and through penalties to the Chinese, we have been able to assert our interests in that textile area.

Not only will the policy of leverage enable us to maintain trading relationships with China and watch that trade grow positively and foster market economies and democratic political ideas in China, but it will allow us to send the message that we will strongly stand behind the principles that have motivated the founding of our Nation and the principles that motivate the forces of change in China.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE].

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong—no, fervent—support of this veto override attempt.

There is no gentle way to put it: The President's China MFN policy is just plain wrong. Treating China the same as our civilized and humane trading partners is wrong. How many more carrots is the United States State Department going to recommend we offer the brutal Chinese leadership before finally realizing that our policy of appeasement has failed?

I must admit—and this is no slight of the extraordinary efforts of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI]—I deeply regret that the legislation before us represents the strongest message we can send at this time. However, because this vote today is the most powerful message this body can convey, we have a responsibility to do so.

The fact still remains that China doesn't deserve MFN trading status at all—with or without conditions attached. Since the brutal 1989 massacre at Tiananmen Square, analysis after analysis—including by the State Department—has revealed that restrictions on those wishing to leave China have worsened. Freedom-loving Chinese protesters, who just want a taste of the civil liberties you and I take for granted, are still being imprisoned and tortured.

Back in the days when the United States and Soviet Union were adversaries, and the so-called China card meant something, we were forced to conduct our relations with China very delicately. Nobody in America wanted to drive the Chinese over to the Soviet's side because of the corresponding security threat that would pose to the United States. Today, however, the China card does not apply, and America need not pander to the People's Republic of China.

In short, we owe the Chinese leadership nothing. Its government-subsidized and prison-labor produced goods put American textile workers, mushroom growers and processors, and others out of work. Next, the United States already has a 12.7 billion dollar trade deficit with China. And last, because our State Department permits it, China continually blocks progress in United States-Taiwan economic relations. Again, we owe the butchers of Beijing nothing—nothing.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest terms possible to override this veto. We can only hope that our colleagues in the other body will have the fortitude and good sense to do the same.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous occasions over the

last 3 years to discuss most-favored-nation trading status for the People's Republic of China. The arguments against an unconditional extension are well known, and I would not add much by repeating them now.

I simply want to inform my colleagues to keep two images in mind as they weigh their votes today. Remember the image of that lone, brave soul stopping a column of tanks, and remember the image of the Goddess of Liberty standing briefly and valiantly in Tiananmen Square.

I also ask my colleagues to do something else. Hold the image of a thousand faces in your hearts. Look into the eyes of the brave young men and women who are languishing in Chinese prisons and facing torture simply because they had the courage to stand up for freedom. Look into the eyes of their loved ones wondering what will become of them and wondering whether the world really cares. Hold them in your hearts. Look them in the eye and cast the only vote that conscience will allow.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to join my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in voting to override the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

When we first granted most-favored-nation [MFN] status to the People's Republic of China, we sought to congratulate the Chinese Government for the progress it had made in discarding the isolationism and repression of its recent past. We hoped to bring China into the community of civilized nations through a peaceful revolution of free trade and exposure to Western products, thoughts, and ideas. By doing so, we hoped this relationship would decrease global tension and improve the lives and prosperity of citizens in both of our nations.

At first our plan worked. China began to move toward economic reform and began to work with us in the international community. But then it began to go wrong. Rather than use MFN to the mutual benefit of both nations, China manipulated our markets with the skill of Sun Tzu, author of the Ancient Art of War. Their import licenses, high tariffs, and outrageous governmental quality control regulations are not the tools of fair trade one expects from a most favored nation but, rather the means for a competitor to close his markets. In 1980, we dreamt of a China with open markets and over 1 billion new and eager consumers of American products. Instead in 1992, we have a China with closed markets and a government that subsidizes more than 90 percent of its exports. Since 1986, China has racked up a trade surplus of over \$28.4 billion with the United States and has added almost \$13 billion more to our trade deficit in 1991 alone.

There has been much debate since we first considered this legislation in July of last year about how the United States could best influence the Chinese Government, particularly in light of the outrageous crackdown on the peaceful, prodemocracy movement at Tiananmen Square in the summer of 1989. Since then, the administration has repeatedly said it knows how to work with China, and that it is crucial that we do not offend or isolate the People's Republic of China. But when you look at the trade policies of China in recent years and read the Foreign Affairs Report on Human Rights Practices issued last month, you quickly realize that the only time in recent years when China ever abided by our human rights standards and our trade laws was last year when we in Congress debated the prospect of denying MFN. It is no coincidence that China's trade surplus with the United States almost doubled in the third and fourth quarters of 1991, after the President said he would veto any efforts to condition MFN. China needs American trade more than we need trade with them and accordingly, China will abide by the standards we set.

By passing this legislation and overriding this veto today, we will force the Chinese Government to abide by the rules of civilized society. By failing, we will give them a blank check—our tacit approval—for them to continue the status quo and to continue acting as a rogue nation beyond the pale of normality.

I urge my colleagues to join me in overriding the President's veto today.

□ 1540

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPELGATE].

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, there are serious stringent morals as well as economic questions here.

Why should the United States of America deal with a Communist nation who kills innocent people, denies human rights, kills innocent people for exercising what we do every day in free speech, makes a profit on slave labor, profits which they make in the United States, and then why now will George Bush forgive them for sending missiles to Iraq that killed our young people in that war? And then we reward them by sending them American high technology.

Have they earned our respect? Hogwash. They have not earned anything.

Today ask the FBI; today they said they are investigating hundreds and hundreds of espionage cases in the United States by Communist Chinese. This is an insult to veterans who fought to preserve our democracy. It is an insult to American workers who lost their jobs, and it is an insult to senior citizens who helped build the country.

You must override. If you do not, you will have to answer to the people.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2212, a veto override regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and the Trade Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], for bringing this measure to the floor at this time. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her untiring work. She has been a beacon of hope for people throughout Asia who pray, struggle, and dream for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Communist China has set in motion domestic and international policies that harm our workers and mock our ideals. China should not be rewarded with a \$15 billion trade deficit.

The Communist Government has been selling nuclear and ballistic technology to Syria, Iran, Algeria, and other militant Arab States; that government also arms the thugs ruling Burma; it nurtures the despicable Khmer Rouge; it has brutally occupied Tibet; China has undermined the President's efforts in preventing North Korea from developing nuclear capabilities; it has enslaved Chinese and Tibetan prodemocracy activists and uses their forced labor to produce cheap goods for export; and it threatens the emerging democracies of Taiwan, Mongolia, and Nepal.

Years ago, right after the Vietnam war, we developed a special relationship with China. The purpose that was given was to isolate and pressure the Soviet Union. There is now no Soviet Union and no political, geostrategic or moral reasons for continuing this lopsided relationship.

During the war in the gulf, China sold Iraq lithium hydride, a chemical precursor of fuel for ballistic missiles and chemical and nuclear weapons. Even though over 400,000 U.S. troops were there it did not mean a thing to the leaders in Beijing. During the vote in the Security Council to move against Saddam, China was the only permanent member to abstain.

Nothing whatsoever has changed since the Tiananmen Square massacre. Severe sentences are still being handed down to those arrested for peaceful demonstrating for democracy. Tibet is still brutally occupied, and, Deng's

son-in-law still sells arms to the drug pushers that rule Burma.

Accordingly I support H.R. 2212 and urge my colleagues to vote for the override.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to override the President's veto of conditional MFN status to China.

As we consider this vote, my colleagues, I hope we will consider the case of Bao Tong, who has been imprisoned with serious, serious health problems for 2½ years.

Mr. Bao is not a student protester but a political secretary, the political secretary to the Standing Committee of the Politburo, by far the highest official to be imprisoned in connection with the 1989 democracy movement. He was a proponent of political change, and now his Government accuses him of leaking state secrets and spreading counterrevolutionary propaganda.

Mr. Bao has refused to acknowledge guilt or issue a statement of self-criticism saying, "I have not done anything wrong." He will be tried secretly.

Consider also that last November, Secretary of State Baker told reporters that China had agreed not to export M-9 missiles to Syria. One week later, according to the New York Times, China secretly agreed to help the Syrians build their own missiles in Syria, and Chinese scientists are helping develop weapons technology at two plants in Syria, one in Aleppo and one in Hama. There are continued reliable reports of Chinese sales of missiles to Syria and nuclear technology to Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the President's policy of appeasement and to overwhelmingly override this regrettable veto.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who is not greatly concerned about the horrendous human rights violations which have taken place in China. There is not a Member, there is not a human being, who is not irate about what happened on June 4, 1989, in Tiananmen Square. There is no Member of this House who is not concerned about the transfer of arms and weapons.

But it seems to me that as we look at this issue, we have no choice but to support the President. Why? Very simply because this country has proved as a model for the emerging democracies.

It has been exposure to the West which has led Eastern and Central Europe to fall. We now have the Commonwealth of Independent States, and there are people in China who are desperately seeking the same kind of economic opportunity which we in the West enjoy.

The very dynamic provinces in southern China, Guang Dong and Fujian, have proven that the marketplace can work there.

I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], our distinguished Republican leader, put it best when he said that the best way to stick it to the Commies is to force them to live with a free-market system.

We know that the concerns of Fang Lizhi have come forward, and my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], has mentioned the fact that she supports the veto override.

The message that I got when I was the first Member of Congress to meet with Fang Lizhi in London after he was released from having been held by the Chinese Government is as follows: He said, "Please ensure that you talk about human rights violations, but do not let China be in a horrible economic state when we see these older leaders fade from the scene."

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have no choice other than to set this great example. Continue this kind of trade status, most-favored-nation status, so that we can, in fact, allow the reform movement to succeed.

After all, it is financed by those who are in those southern provinces of Fujian and Guang Dong, and let us not cut off the resources for the reform movement in China.

Support the President.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Chinese Government has ignored international censure for its human rights abuses.

At last week's meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, the regime was successful in suppressing debate of a resolution urging China to ensure the full observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms of Tibetans as well as those of all other citizens. This was led by the United States.

It was led by the United States on the basis that has been presented in similar fashion here to uphold the President's veto.

The President is recognizing Serbia and Croatia, and we are recognizing people all around the world who have fought for their freedom, but when it comes to people who are fighting for freedom in China, it does not count.

The reek of hypocrisy that is involved in the President's veto is almost beyond belief. How anyone can say that they are going to sustain the veto on the basis that somehow this is going to provide a basis for freedom in China is absolutely beyond belief. It does not take any more than a minute to recognize that hypocrisy.

Vote to override this veto and stand up for what the United States truly believes in.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

□ 1550

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the earlier speakers talked about the people of Eastern Europe, extending trade to them, that this was somehow an argument for extending trade to China.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we did not extend most-favored-nation trade status to Eastern European countries when they were under tyrannical regimes, nor did their people want us to, and we should not do it for China.

The President for the last several years has asked us to follow a trade policy with China that is divorced from morality. It makes us as Americans uncomfortable, but more than that, it has not worked.

We should override this veto. This is a reasonable measure. It is not a meat cleaver; rather, it is a lever.

This bill conditions future extension of most-favored-nation status to China on an achievable human rights trade and proliferation criteria. This legislation will help achieve real progress in improving human rights in China and in addition it speaks loudly and clearly to the millions still oppressed in China and Tibet. We have not forgotten your plight.

Let us override the veto.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON].

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, 6 days ago when we were debating the budget, some of those who wanted to spend more money on the military came and talked about China, Iran, and Syria, as a reason why we need to spend our resources with a large military budget to stimulate rebuilding our country and educating our children and doing something about crime.

Is this the same China they are now talking about extending most-favored-nation status to?

I have looked all around the globe, and I can only find one China, the same China that makes us spend all our money defending ourselves from them because they use M-9 and M-11 missiles and send them to Iran and to Syria, is the same China that we want to extend most-favored-nation status to? That does not make sense.

We start then spending money on ourselves, and our children, and our future, and get the drug dealers off the street. That makes sense to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 2212, notwithstanding the objections of the President.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa

[Mr. GRANDY], a member of the committee.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have risen many times in opposition to an attempt to curtail trade with China, and I do so again today and encourage Members to sustain the President's veto.

I do so with the same figures that I have used before on this floor. Nearly 30 percent of U.S. agricultural commodities are harvested for export. American manufacturing cannot survive without export.

What we are doing today is presuming to cut off the world's largest single consumer market and cut off American farmers and consumers from that market.

Parenthetically, I might add that whatever the result of the GATT talks might be, whatever the North American Free Trade Agreement might provide for the American agribusiness concerns that underpin 22 percent of our gross domestic product, the future for our agricultural economy is in the Far East. It is along the Pacific rim, and you cannot consider those countries without considering China.

Let me read a report by Michael Mandelbaum of the Council on Foreign Relations' Project on East-Western Relations, who says this about the democratic reforms achieved in China up to this point:

The booming private economic sector in China subverts the communist system by demonstrating the superiority of free markets, and it lays the basis for a new political and economic order in China.

That is the purpose of the President's refusal to take conditions on MFN. That should be the purpose of this body as we try to promote economic growth in this country and around the world.

The problem is, if we condition MFN, if we do not sustain the President's veto, what we do is hand a trump card to the leaders in Beijing who prefer a halt to progressive entrepreneurial factories, like the ones in Guangdong. They prefer diminishing the exposure of its citizens to ideas of free market and democracy.

Our troops are already in the field there through democratic reforms and the rise of capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not fall prey to the emotional debate here, we have a chance to do something real about the economy in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take a close look at what we are doing today in the context of where our Nation stands at this point in time. We have passed numerous unemployment extension bills, we have a populace increasingly concerned about losing their jobs and what can be done for economic growth, we have Presidential candidates and many of our colleagues toting America first and calling for a new isolationism.

So what are we proposing to do here today? We are proposing to put America second; we are proposing to give away American jobs; we are proposing to increase costs to American consumers; and we are proposing to sacrifice our domestic agenda in the name of questionable foreign policy.

Talk about a Congress which is out of touch with the American people—this legislation is a prime example of that fact. We have laudable goals—improvement of human rights abroad, slowing down nuclear proliferation, increasing market access for U.S. goods—but, once again, some of us are proposing to try and achieve these goals by utilizing a means that is of highly questionable effectiveness and which imposes significant and greater costs on our country and our citizens than it does on the nation we are trying to effect. That means using trade as a political weapon. It did not work to embargo the Soviet Union. It will not work here.

What so many of those who promote protectionist policies and trade embargoes never realize is that the United States cannot survive without exports—our domestic market is simply not big enough to support our economy. Nearly 30 percent of U.S. agricultural commodities are harvested for export. American manufacturing cannot survive without exports. So what does H.R. 2212 do? It cuts off the world's largest single consumer market to American farmers and American companies.

Not only must we reject this bill due to its inconsistency with our domestic needs, but we must also reject it because of its inconsistency with the advancement of democracy and free markets in what remains of the Communist world. One of the primary reasons the Republics of the former Soviet Union are having such a struggle today is that they lack the underpinnings of stable democracy: A private sector, a middle class of property owners, and business connections with the outside world. Yet these are the underpinnings that are currently being developed in many provinces in China that are supported by international trade, largely with the United States. As Michael Mandelbaum of the Council on Foreign Relations' Project on East-West Relations recently stated:

The booming private economic sector in China subverts the Communist System by demonstrating the superiority of free markets \* \* \* [and] it lays the basis for a new political and economic order in China.

However, H.R. 2212 would serve to stall these developments.

As I shared with you when we originally debated this legislation, while we may ultimately convince the Beijing government to alter its oppressive human-rights policies, I do not believe we will ever coerce them. And this legislation represents an outright attempt at coercion. This unilateral sanctioning of the People's Republic of China will do more harm to the progressive reforms and reformers in China and more harm to American farmers, American workers, and American consumers than it will to the hardliners in Beijing. They prefer isolationism. They prefer a halt to the progressive entrepreneurial factories in the southern provinces like Guangdong. They prefer a diminishing of the exposure of its citizens to the ideas of free markets and democracy.

If the House overrides this veto, it is saying to the American people—your interests don't come first, your jobs must be sacrificed in the name of a foreign policy that probably won't work, but we know you'll understand. I can tell you right now that lowa farmers and consumers don't understand and they want their interests put first. Those interests are with the President in supporting the veto and defeating this legislation. The President, once again, is trying to help our domestic agenda and once again, Congress is standing in the way. I refuse to stand in the way and I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to override the President's veto of legislation which would place conditions on most-favored-nation status for China.

Over the last 3 years a great deal of attention and praise has been focused on President Bush's capabilities in foreign affairs. Indeed, many in our country have concluded that, at least until the Presidential campaign got underway, foreign policy was the only issue that mattered to the President.

But it is gradually becoming clear, Mr. Speaker, that this administration's conduct of foreign policy has been a mixture of occasional crisis management mixed with a rudderless, superficial devotion to the status quo. President Bush's policy toward China is but one example of the administration's moral and intellectual bankruptcy in foreign policy, and his veto of this legislation deserves to be overridden.

While we should all continue to admire President Bush's handling of the Persian Gulf war, if we look elsewhere across the international landscape, we find it littered with the remains of the administration's colossal foreign policy blunders. The administration has continually expressed its preference for dealing with established authorities, regardless of their record or the long-term implications for U.S. interests. It is a pattern which should concern us all as we consider our policy toward China.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has failed to implement an imaginative foreign policy that has both vision and purpose, and which reflects American values and democratic principles. President Bush, would have us believe that, again, given his personal relationships with the leadership in China, he knows best how to encourage reform in that country. The administration can point to the recent agreement on intellectual property rights as an encouraging sign. But this agreement came about only after the United States threatened to retaliate. Moreover, China's human rights record remains appalling, and the administration has chosen to ignore it.

More ominously, Mr. Speaker, China continues its policy of exporting so-

phisticated military and nuclear technology to some of the world's most dangerous regimes, including Iran, Syria, and North Korea. Even though China recently decided to abide by the Missile Technology Control Regime and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, China's own behavior should cause us to be wary of its commitment to abide by the terms of these agreements. China has acted in an irresponsible and cavalier manner on this critical issue, and the world is a much less safer place because of it.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of this legislation. The conditions this legislation that would place conditions on China's MFN status are hardly burdensome. They only require the President to certify that China has: first, accounted for and released nonviolent demonstrators who were arrested at Tiananmen Square; and second, made overall significant progress in human rights, trade practices, and weapons non-proliferation. In other words, Congress is merely asking the President to certify that China is acting in a responsible and civilized manner before it can receive the benefits of unfettered trade with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote to override the President's veto because I believe the debate itself about United States policy toward China has pressured the Chinese leadership to move in the right direction on at least the issue of intellectual property rights. I am also encouraged by recent statements by the Chinese leadership that they intend to pursue economic reform. But they must realize that economic reform must go hand in hand with political reform. If they hope to be major players on the world stage, the Chinese leadership must understand the importance of responsible arms exports policies and the protection of basic human rights.

Mr. Speaker, the students who were killed at Tiananmen Square held the same values and aspirations that we in this country hold: Democracy and economic opportunity. Our foreign policy should not be based on personal relationships with world leaders. Instead, our foreign policy should embody these values and principles not only in China, but in every part of the world.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], a respected member of the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for up to 4 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today we consider one of the most important veto messages of this Presidency. The question is should we pass, over the President's objections, a bill that is certain to end normal trade and economic relations with China, and there-

by foreclose United States influence over a number of key issues in that expansive country. Or should we continue to extend regular tariff treatment to China, stay engaged with the progressive business and governmental leaders, and work for meaningful progress on a variety of important goals.

The consequences of this legislation are severe and far reaching. Therefore, we must think carefully about the alternatives and about the need to develop a consensus between Congress and the Executive on the best course to pursue in reaching our shared goals.

Congress certainly has valid concerns about Chinese policies on trade, human rights, and nuclear proliferation. The President has stated emphatically that he shares these concerns. Rather than an isolationist response such as H.R. 2212, we must together pursue policies that have the best chance of changing Chinese behavior.

Isolationism is a failed policy, for the United States as well as for China. We need only to look at the last few months to see that progress continues to be made in key areas, even with the current archaic regime in power. Improvements have been achieved since Tiananmen Square, but much remains to be done. MFN gives us the best hope of staying engaged, creating appropriate and effective leverage, and tailoring our actions so that we succeed in getting further meaningful changes in Chinese practices.

In January, we achieved a meaningful intellectual property rights agreement with China after tough negotiations and creative use of economic leverage. A similar course resulted in China's agreement in writing to observe the Missile Technology Control Regime. China continues to support the U.N. consensus on eliminating Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Through constant pressure and dialog, China has made slow but steady progress on human rights. Many remain imprisoned for their political beliefs and we owe it to them to continue to battle on their behalf, rather than abandoning them along with MFN.

Some would advocate that the United States embrace a scorched earth policy when it comes to China and pass such a bill as H.R. 2212. This will teach China a lesson and bring them to their knees. They argue that once MFN has been taken away, China will accept the United States position on all key issues and a democratic, market-oriented society will be established.

This is very unrealistic thinking. One could speculate forever on what changes in Chinese practices such a scorched earth policy would bring. One result is certain, however, and that is—you get scorched earth. Our friends and enemies alike will be burned beyond recognition before any Phoenix can rise from the ashes.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to set aside petty politics and to sup-

port our President in the pursuit of an effective foreign and economic policy with respect to this major world power. A standoff between the United States Congress and the President on such a defining issue can only undermine United States influence in China and throughout the region. Isolating China can only push that country back further into the dark past.

In this matter, Congress should stand united with our President. He has a broader responsibility, broader experience, and a broader constituency than any individual Member in this Chamber. He also has a clear constitutional mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

□ 1600

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] to close the debate.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding this time and giving me the privilege to close the debate on this issue of importance to the American people, important because of the safety of the world we live in, important because of jobs for American workers, and important because of the principles on which our country was founded and which we vow to support throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, reference was made earlier to the FBI warning about China using immigrants as spies in the United States. This is an article from the San Francisco Chronicle this morning, where the FBI is warning that hundreds of Chinese immigrants are under investigation for scientific and military espionage, and I place that into the RECORD at this point.

**CHINA USING IMMIGRANTS AS SPIES, FBI WARNS—STUDENTS AND EXECUTIVES BEING RECRUITED**

WASHINGTON.—The FBI is warning Chinese Americans against what it says are insidious recruitment attempts by China's intelligence services intent on obtaining U.S. scientific and military secrets.

The agency is investigating hundreds of cases of suspected espionage by China, whose spying rivals that of the Soviet Union in its heyday, say senior FBI counterintelligence officials.

But China's tactics differ markedly from those of the defunct KGB. Whereas the KGB worked mostly through the Soviet Embassy—the FBI says about one-third of the embassy personnel used to be intelligence officers—China's activities are far more diffuse and subtle.

Some agents spying on U.S. military and intelligence agencies do operate out of the Chinese Embassy but most are planted among the growing community of Chinese students, business executives and academics in the United States, the officials say.

Their prime target is Americans of Chinese heritage, especially scientists or business executives with access to sensitive information, said Patrick Watson, the FBI's deputy assistant director for intelligence.

The FBI believes that such unconventional methods call for an unconventional response.

The FBI "is appealing to the United States Chinese community and to the newly arrived people from the People's Republic of China with a request to help your new home country," according to an ad that ran recently in several Chinese-language publications in the United States.

"The Chinese in America are known to be law-abiding, freedom-loving, and have a strong conviction in democracy," it said.

"Any attempts or occurrence of harassment, intimidation or intelligence gathering \*\*\* should be reported," it cautions.

The agency also has devised a presentation for business executives and scientists who deal with China to sensitize them to possible overtures.

Many of China's intelligence collectors are not spies in any traditional sense. Rather, they are scientists or engineers gathering information for use by their particular institute, said T. Van Magers, the FBI's expert on China.

Sometimes, these scientists ask the help of the Ministry of State Security in fingering vulnerable American scientists; other times they work on their own, Magers said.

"It's very decentralized," he said of China's spying.

And it finds growing opportunities, he added. The number of diplomats and commercial representatives grew from 2,500 in 1990 to 3,400 now, and the student community has grown from 45,000 to between 60,000 and 75,000, he said.

"The vast majority aren't engaged in espionage," he said. "But you can easily hide your intelligence officers in that large a presence."

You can also easily hide spying behind the guise of legitimate scientific exchanges.

It was such an exchange—visits by Chinese academics to the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory—that is believed to have enabled China to obtain some of the information to develop the neutron bomb it tested in 1988.

The General Accounting Office reported that year that dozens of Chinese had visited the lab without a security check, and some were later found to have links to Chinese intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, the administration claims that by placing these clear and reasonable conditions on MFN that we will isolate China and hinder reform. This is precisely the opposite argument that the President used when denying MFN to the Soviet Union and the Republics. It is precisely the opposite argument that the administration has used with regard to trade with Vietnam. In these cases, trade has been seen as an important tool for encouraging reform. The administration's argument could be no farther from the truth—we seek not to isolate China. We seek a consistent United States policy that uses our trade leverage to encourage reform in China so that we will be able to enjoy a better relationship with the Chinese people.

According to Fang Lizhi and other prominent Chinese democracy advocates, "Placing conditions on China's MFN status is the strongest and most important signal you can send both to the leadership and to the people of China."

**EMIGRATION**

There is another reason why we should vote for this legislation today. Most-favored-nation status is not normally given to Communist nations with centralized economies. It can only be given to a Communist country if the President submits a waiver to Congress and if the country is making progress toward freedom of emigration. MFN was withheld from the Soviet Union until free emigration was codified.

In China, there is not freedom of emigration. During his visit to China in November, Secretary Baker was assured by the Chinese Government that people who were not under charge could leave the country. That promise was never kept. In fact, many prominent dissidents—the wife of Wang Juntao, Hao Xlao Tian, Han Dong Fang and others—have not been allowed to leave China. The families of Chinese students living in the United States—Chai Ling and others—have been denied travel permits to come to the United States. Why does the President apply a different standard to the Chinese Government?

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD at this point the letter signed by Fr. Fang Lizhi, Shen Tong, Li Lu, Liu Binyan, Yu Dahai, Chai Ling, Chen Yizi, Haiching Zhao, and Wan Runnan:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Thank you for your continuing support and recent votes on China MFN. We now ask you to vote yes to override the President's veto of H.R. 2212 which places reasonable, flexible conditions on continued renewal of China's MFN status.

We have intimate knowledge of China's repressive policies. Because of our convictions and our demands for respect for human rights and the rule of law in China, we have been forced to flee our homeland or face persecution. We know first-hand the scars of the intellectuals, embittered by years of suppression; feel ourselves the deep reservoir of discontent that seethes among Chinese students and workers; and cannot forget the friends that remain behind braving the rotten prisons, forced into the countryside, prevented from carrying out their work or constantly harassed.

Every Representative is aware of the magnitude of continuing human rights abuses in China. Since 1989, these travesties have been widely covered by the media in every corner of this country. We have been overwhelmed by the response of the American people to the plight of people in our country and we ask that you reflect upon their sentiments when casting your vote on the Conference Report.

President Bush's China policy has had little effect on the human rights situation in China. Rather than improving the situation, it has emboldened and strengthened the hardliners in the leadership. The President's meeting with Chinese Premier Li Peng capped the hardliners' bid for a comeback as they go into an important policy meeting next month. In the internal debates, the hardliners are bragging that even the person responsible for the massacre and continuing repression in China is acceptable to the U.S. Government.

We ask that you send a different signal to the Chinese people and to freedom-seeking

people everywhere. Placing conditions on China's MFN status is the strongest and most important signal you can send both to the leadership and to the people of China.

Sincerely,

Dr. Fang Lizhi, Astrophysicist/Leading Dissident; Shen Tong, Exiled Student Leader, Tiananmen Square; Li Lu, Exiled Student Leader, Tiananmen Square; Liu Binyan, Leading Journalist and Dissident; Yu Dahai, President, Chinese Alliance for Democracy; Chai Ling, Exiled Student Leader, Tiananmen Square; Chen Yizi, Advisor to ousted reformer Zhao Ziyang; Haiching Zhao, President, Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars; Wan Runnan, President, Federation for a Democratic China.

Mr. Speaker, this is a list of people who have all risked their lives and their security for democracy in China.

Mr. Speaker, over 200 years after the shot heard round the world was first fired, it reverberated in Tiananmen Square. America the model—the Goddess of Democracy the symbol. What was then seen as inconceivable to the Chinese regime is now seen as inevitable to the Chinese people. It is just a matter of time.

Please vote to support the Chinese people; vote to support American workers; vote to make the world freer, trade fairer, and the world safer. Vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge the excellent work of the members of the Ways and Means Committee staff—Rob Leonard, George Weese, and Joanna Shelton. I also wish to commend Craig Middleton of my staff for his tireless efforts on this legislation and his strong commitment to human rights.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 2212, which conditions the extension of most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status for the People's Republic of China on genuine human rights reforms and limits on arms control activities. I believe that the Communist government must be held accountable for the murder and continued imprisonment of thousands of peaceful prodemocracy.

The continuation of MFN trading status for China must be conditioned by strict, certified Chinese adherence to human rights conditions. While almost every country in the world has MFN trading status and while I do not like to link trade issues with political ones, I feel this is one of the only ways left for us to influence China. While there is a real chance that the Chinese Government could react negatively to conditioning MFN status, punishing Chinese prodemocracy supporters and our global initiatives for actions by the United States, I also believe that there is a chance that it could provide the Chinese Government with an incentive to reverse current abuses and, once again, follow the path of real reform.

The real teeth in H.R. 2212 are the human rights conditions. Essentially, the bill would require the Chinese Government to release the remaining prisoners from the crackdown that

followed the Tiananmen massacre and provide a complete accounting of the massacre and its aftermath on the human rights of the Chinese people. Despite some advances on this issue that have resulted from diplomacy, particularly by the United States, it is widely assumed that the Chinese Government will refuse to meet any such conditions. In turn, failure to comply with these conditions would inevitably lead to a loss of MFN and severe damage to the Chinese economy, which is highly dependent on exports to the United States.

I do recognize the short-term economic costs of this bill on the American economy and on that of California. Despite this, however, I continue to believe that the morally right course of action is to apply realistic human rights conditions to MFN status to China. In addition, the long term benefits of a reformed Chinese Government will certainly outweigh the short term economic costs. All of our major economic trading partners in Asia were once severely autocratic states. As they reformed and became more democratic, trade flourished with the United States. Over a quarter of American exports currently flow to this region. This has resulted in the creation of thousands of jobs in California and the Nation.

I also recognize the possibility that China could negatively react to this bill and ignore our efforts to halt the arms race in the Middle East, South Asia, and elsewhere. But the lack of real improvement in the situation in China and the continued repression warrant tougher economic and political pressure.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, as we revisit the issue of human rights abuses in China today, I have to wonder if anyone in the international community still takes this administration's commitment to human rights seriously. This country's foreign policy record is far from perfect, but the one area in which there has been some consistency over the years is the issue of human rights. Unfortunately, our credibility on human rights issues is off to a shaky start in the month of March. Besides the Presidential veto of this bill, we are now kowtowing at the United Nations as well.

Just last week at the United Nations, its Human Rights Commission was set to consider a resolution critical of the People's Republic of China's ongoing human rights abuses in China and Tibet. The resolution was originally based on the Secretary General's report which documented horrible human rights abuses inside Tibet. Well, the United States could not support the original resolution because it seemed to raise the issue of self-determination for the Tibetan people, a right, by the way, which many in this body and other governments believe the Tibetan people should have. Most of us here expected the administration to modify the language, but even after it had been watered down to almost nothing, our U.N. representative could not even garner enough votes to get it past a procedural motion.

It is difficult to maintain respect when you do not stand up for the principles you say you believe in. The American people are losing respect for this administration's human rights policy, as are the citizens of other nations who look to us for leadership. And though they

smile and continue to call President Bush a friend, I am afraid that officials in the People's Republic of China may respect us least of all, because they know what is going on inside China and Tibet with regard to human rights.

I encourage my colleagues to support this override, let's remind the administration that the present policy is not working.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor to urge Members to override the President's veto and vote for this bill.

But this bill is not about taking MFN away from China. The truth of the matter is that I don't want to remove China's MFN. Neither does Ms. PELOSI, the author of this bill. This bill conditions MFN and we truly hope that China will be forthcoming and make a good faith effort to meet the conditions so MFN can be maintained.

This bill is about our principles as a nation and China's principles.

Every Member of this House hopes for good relations with China. One fifth of the world's population lives there and it is a military and growing economic power. But we cannot bend over backward to maintain our good relations and lose our principles in the process.

Taking MFN away from China is one way to send a message to the Government of the People's Republic of China. But there is a better way to deliver a message of hope to the Chinese people themselves. This is why I have proposed creation of a surrogate radio broadcast to the people of China to be called Radio Free China. It is to be modeled after the hugely successful Radio Free Europe, which sent messages of hope to the people behind the Iron Curtain during the Cold War.

Radio Free China will meet the thirst for information inside China and Tibet, providing the people with news and other information that is particularly relevant to them and their situation. The Chinese need to know that their oppressed condition is not universal, that most people around the world enjoy much more freedom than they do and that people around the world care deeply about the denial of their basic rights as human beings.

Radio Free China would give them the hope and knowledge needed to change conditions in China. It would serve to build within the Chinese people a greater understanding of the meaning of political and economic freedom and democracy and would force the Chinese Government to allow greater measures of each.

We simply cannot turn our backs on the Chinese people and Tibetans and accept their oppression as an international affair. It is not. It is the affair of us all. Radio Free China will help to remedy this situation.

I urge Members to support the Chinese people and vote to override.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, once more I rise to join my colleagues who have been battling since June 1989 to hold the butchers of Beijing accountable for the bloody massacre at Tiananmen Square and for their ongoing brutal repression of the most basic human rights.

The President has vetoed the most comprehensive attempt so far to push the Chinese Government to make democratic and human rights reforms, and to alleviate international security concerns. In doing so, he has dealt a

serious blow to the prodemocracy movement in China, and he has insulted the dignity of thousands who were slaughtered mercilessly as they peacefully protested for democratic change in Tiananmen Square.

The President's veto sends a message to the world that nations which disregard human rights, shun democracy, and contribute to the proliferation of the world's most dangerous weapons will still be eligible for preferential trading status with the United States. Not only will his veto harm the movement for peaceful change within China, but it will also hurt American workers who are being laid off because they cannot compete with products manufactured by Chinese slave labor.

President Bush's policy toward China is misguided, inhumane, and outrageous. I urge my colleagues to send a message to Beijing by voting to override the President's ill-advised veto.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to override the President's ill-advised veto of H.R. 2212, legislation to make China eligible for most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status subject to certain conditions.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2212, which overwhelmingly passed the House on July 10, 1991, by a vote of 313 to 112. The Senate passed the bill by a vote of 55 to 44 only a few weeks later. The conference report was adopted in the House by the overwhelming margin of 409 to 21.

The President has insisted throughout the long debate on this issue that attaching any conditions on the question of human rights to MFN legislation would undercut his policy of constructive engagement with China and would prompt China to turn inward. The facts, however, strongly suggest this would not be the case.

While the President has bent over backward to accommodate his friends in Beijing, China's trade surplus with the United States has continued to increase, advocates of democracy in China continue to be imprisoned and harassed, and China continues to flaunt United States and international concerns about its export of missiles to Syria and Iran. What does the President have to show for his policy of constructive engagement with China?

Since 1989, China's trade surplus with the United States has grown by more than \$25 billion. While China continues to dump millions of dollars' worth of textiles and clothing into the United States, American textile workers are losing their jobs. While Chinese political leaders voice rhetorical support for human rights, hundreds and perhaps thousands languish in China's own gulag prison system because of their political or religious belief. While China professes to be cooperating with the United States in limiting exports of military weaponry to the Middle East, it continues to ship missiles and military technology to regimes with a well-known history of belligerence and aggression in that politically unstable region of the world. Indeed, new revelations are being published almost daily about the extent of China's weapons export activities.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, just recently an American clothing manufacturer discontinued buying finished pants from a manufacturer in Saipan when it was disclosed that the workers

in the Saipan plant, many of whom were former Chinese nationals, were being paid well under the federally mandated minimum wage in what amounted to sweat shop or slave labor conditions. The same phenomena is occurring in China today where prisoners are being used to make clothing and other products which are then dumped into the United States market in violation of trade agreements with China.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the President to use more foresight and finally recognize the fact that today's rulers in China will not retain power forever. When such authoritarian leaders pass from the scene and a new and hopefully more democratic and enlightened leadership takes power in China, they are going to be mindful of who stood by them when they needed support for democracy and human rights in China and they are going to be mindful of those nations and people who placed trade interests and commercial interests first instead of human rights. Human rights was important in the Soviet Union, Poland, East Germany, and Nicaragua. Human rights are also important in China. The United States should not follow an indefensible double standard. Rather, we should support democracy and human rights. I urge my colleagues to join me today in voting to override the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with granting unconditional MFN status to China at this time. Their record on nuclear proliferation, human rights and trade practices is not a good one. Before granting status to them it is important to verify that they have made improvements in these areas.

While the cold war is over, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is now a reality. China may be contributing to this problem. As late as 1991, China secretly transferred technology to Iran. Intelligence reports have also recently said that China has made a shipment to Syria of 30 tons of chemicals needed to build a solid fuel missile and plan to transfer 60 tons more in March and April.

While China has agreed to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, it needs to be signed before we can grant MFN status. There are still issues that need clarification before we go ahead with the signing. For instance, they have not yet agreed to require full IAEA safeguards as a condition for their nuclear exports.

Other concerns to me are China's policies of coerced abortions, forced sterilization and an overall appalling human rights record. Significant progress needs to be made on the inhumane treatment of prisoners and religious persecution.

I hope that we can resolve these issues shortly and that MFN status may be granted. We may also have some disagreements with them regarding trade, but overall I think MFN could help to clear those up.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by vetoing H.R. 2212, the President asks us to ignore all that we find despicable about the repressive regime in China. He asks us to abandon our commitment to human rights and ignore the murderers and terrorists in Beijing. He thinks we can reform the Chinese Government by calling them our friends.

Mr. Speaker, after we were horrified by the images of Tiananmen Square in 1989, Mem-

bers of this Congress called for a revocation of China's MFN status until that country's human rights record improved. And, from day one, the President opposed us. He has sent his diplomats to bargain with China's repressive government while Chinese students and members of the democracy movement, peacefully seeking to exercise basic human freedoms, were imprisoned, tortured, and executed.

These diplomatic overtures of the Bush administration have failed. China continues to violate the basic human rights of its own citizens. China continues to export goods produced by forced prison labor. China continues to destabilize the Middle East by selling weapons to Syria and Iran. China continues its illegal occupation of Tibet and its brutal campaign to destroy the Tibetan religion, culture, history, and national identity. And, for all this, China still enjoys a trade surplus with the United States which runs more than \$12 billion—second only to Japan.

Mr. Speaker, sanctions worked in South Africa. Because we were unrelenting in our rejection of apartheid Nelson Mandela walks free today. Because we made South Africa an international pariah, black South Africans slowly began to win their basic human and civil rights.

I urge my colleagues today to join me in an unequivocal rejection of China's hard-line, repressive policies and an absolute refusal to confer upon them the privileges of most-favored-nation. Vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, while the world rushes toward democracy the China wall of authoritarianism refuses to crumble. After witnessing no human rights progress since the 1989 massacre of the courageous students at Tiananmen Square, what good reason does the United States have to blindly grant China most-favored-nation status? MFN status is reserved for nations in good standing. On what basis can one categorize a nation that denies basic human rights to its citizens, flagrantly violates nonproliferation agreements by selling weapons to terrorist nations, and engages in internationally marketing products made from forced labor, a nation in good standing? With one-quarter of the world's population, China is the largest oppressed nation in the world.

I strongly support H.R. 2212, a bill conditioning MFN status for China in 1992, because I believe the Chinese Government should not take our good will for granted. In 1991, the United States had a \$12.5 billion trade deficit with China. In a time of recession, this is an inexcusable position for the United States to be in with a country as undeserving as China.

The legislation we are voting on today would permit the President to renew MFN trade status for China in 1992 if the President certifies that China has made significant progress in the areas of human rights, trade practices, and weapons nonproliferation. The burden should not be on the American people to justify why they should not give advantages to China, rather, the burden should be placed on the Chinese Government to justify why the American people should help them. Quite frankly, I am not convinced.

I supported the entry of China into the United Nations. I believe educational and cultural

exchanges between our two nations are important and should continue. However, to grant the same trade status to China as we do to the democracies of Canada and Great Britain destroys the essential purpose and usefulness of the MFN designation.

While freedom rings throughout the world, why does China continue to feign deafness?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, in June 1989, people around the world held their breath as democracy was crushed in Tiananmen Square. I, for one, will never forget the picture of a lone Chinese student stopping a tank in the square. Or the bloodshed that followed.

Today, we have the opportunity to send a message to that student, and the thousands like him, that the United States has not forgotten their struggle.

When Congress passed H.R. 2212, we called on President Bush to assure that China meet certain conditions before we offered them the enormous benefits of MFN status. These conditions are not outlandish. They are wise.

China must account for and release all non-violent prodemocracy demonstrators jailed during and after Tiananmen Square.

The Chinese must stop unfair trading practices.

China must adhere to international rules regarding nuclear proliferation.

And finally, China must protect the freedoms which we here in the United States take as basic, inalienable: the protection of human rights; the end of religious persecution; freedom of the press; freedom of peaceful assembly.

We will do a great disservice to the memories of those who have struggled for democracy not just in China, but in the former Soviet Union, in Eastern Europe, in Central America, all around the world, if we reward a nation which has killed and imprisoned those who stand for democracy.

I urge you to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to act justly and decisively to overturn the President's veto of Ms. PELOSI's resolution tying the continuation of MFN treatment for China next year to several well-considered conditions dealing with its human rights, trade, and arms sales policies.

President Bush claims, I suppose, to be holding the elusive China card, but he misses the reality that the deck has been shuffled and the game has changed. Cold war geopolitics no longer serve or define American interests here. By refusing to take a stand with respect to China's immoral and unlawful actions, the President reveals both his cynicism and his myopia.

It is neither kind nor gentle for the Bush administration to continue kow-towing to the butchers of Tiananmen. It is neither right nor prudent for the Bush administration to send a business-as-usual message to a nonmarket economy that severely limits foreign access, exports goods made with prison labor, and deliberately mislabels products to evade U.S. Customs. And it is insanity for Bush to keep winking, if not turning a blind eye, at China's export of advanced weapons and technology to unstable regions of the world.

Let us not be misled by claims that conditioning MFN will isolate Chinese reformers. To

the contrary, unconditional MFN actually strengthens the hand of Li Peng and other hardliners who believe they can break any promise or law and face no consequences. We must not allow political expediency to compromise American principles—freedom, democracy, and the respect for individual rights are the foundations of this Government and the inspiration for many others.

If we learn anything from the dramatic developments that have taken place around the world in the last few years, it is that moral strength can overcome tremendous repression. But the President, in vetoing this legislation, asks us to set aside these emboldening ideals as counter productive to our long-term ends of liberalization in China. He asks us to defer to his expertise in handling foreign policy; but I can detect no wisdom in either his position or his rationale.

Let us examine what this legislation that he has vetoed is about. What were the problems that we were trying to address? What are the remedies that this legislation uses to try to make the situation in China better?

Nearly 3 years after their massacre of peaceful protesters in Tiananmen Square, China's rulers continue their fundamental disrespect for the rights of Chinese citizens. Since the Tiananmen crackdown, there have been secret trials of those that participated in the prodemocracy demonstrations, and many have since been sentenced to execution or imprisonment.

H.R. 2212 addresses these and a litany of other gross human rights violations, by making renewal of China's MFN trading status contingent upon the President's certifying that the Chinese Government has accounted for and released these nonviolent demonstrators. The bill also calls for overall significant progress in ceasing the export of goods produced by prison labor; ending religious persecution in China and Tibet; insuring access for international human rights monitoring organizations; terminating bans on freedom of the press and peaceful assembly; and stopping the harassment of Chinese citizens residing in the United States.

The repressive policies of the Chinese Government are cause for more than just moral concern, however. America's economic interests are at stake, as well as our ideals. Above and beyond the fact that extending MFN to a centralized economy is inherently contradictory to free trade principles, China is guilty of a great many trade violations. Despite his claims to the contrary, the President's permissive stance has caused the U.S. trade balance with China to deteriorate at a rapid pace—our \$12.7 billion deficit with China is now second only to Japan. America can't afford this, and we shouldn't put up with it.

Beyond dealing with fair labor practices in China, H.R. 2212 seeks redress by calling for the protection of U.S. patents and other intellectual property rights; fair access to Chinese markets for American exporters; and an end to other unfair commercial activities, such as trans-shipping goods through other countries to avoid U.S. import restrictions.

The United States must stand up for Chinese political and economic reforms. We must also use our influence to counter China's irresponsible conduct in contributing to weapons

proliferation in the Third World. I am tired of President Bush lecturing us on diplomacy while M-9 and M-11 missiles flow to Syria and Iran. If the Bush administration will not act, then Congress must take up the slack. H.R. 2212 would do this by pressing the Chinese to adhere to international agreements restricting the export of sensitive missile technology, nuclear technology, and chemical and biological weapons.

Overriding the President's veto is the right thing to do for humanitarian, economic, and strategic reasons. It is right for America, it is right for China, and it is right for all nations seeking peace and freedom.

When we voted on H.R. 2212 in November, 409 Members of the House saw the value and importance of this bill. Let us hope that 3½ months of more bad news from China will have convinced the remaining 21. I don't know who the President thinks he's kidding. I hope it's not this House.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, don't let anyone be fooled. The threat of trade sanctions will cause China to change its policies.

It's just happened in the maritime area.

American-flag vessel operators have been serving China for several years. They compete with Chinese operators and vessels from other countries. But the Americans found out quickly that this was not fair competition. The Chinese Government was placing major obstacles in the way of the Americans.

These doing-business restrictions caused the following unfair burdens on American carriers: an inability to engage in full branch office activities within China; an inability to assess rates in China consistent with tariffs filed with the Federal Maritime Commission because of Chinese rate interference; restrictions on various port, trucking, and other intermodal activities; and discriminatory and exorbitant charges assessed by China.

The Federal Maritime Commission investigated these problems under its authority provided by the Foreign Shipping Practices Act, a statute that I authored in 1988. This law provides that if a foreign nation imposes unfair barriers on American-flag ships, then retaliatory measures may be threatened and taken against vessels of the offending country.

The Federal Maritime Commission determined that China was in fact imposing substantial unfair trade barriers against American vessels. It threatened retaliatory measures. As a result, subsequent commercial and governmental negotiations led to a change in Chinese policy. The doing-business restrictions in large part have been or are being dismantled. American carriers have become the first foreign transportation companies with their own China operations and subsidiaries. The Foreign Shipping Practices Act has achieved its stated purpose.

I commend the Federal Maritime Commission, and particularly its Chairman Chris Koch, for such a timely and aggressive use of the Foreign Shipping Practices Act. Also to be complemented are Capt. Warren Leback and his colleagues at the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation, who negotiated with Chinese authorities. And I salute American President Lines and SeaLand Services, the American carriers who spoke out

against the unfair burdens being placed in their way.

This maritime example shows how we can use the threat of trade sanctions to convince Chinese authorities to alter policy. Let us override the veto of H.R. 2212.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 357, nays 61, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—357

Abercrombie	DeLauro	Hoagland
Ackerman	Dellums	Hobson
Allen	Derrick	Hochbrueckner
Andrews (ME)	Dicks	Holloway
Andrews (NJ)	Dingell	Hopkins
Andrews (TX)	Dixon	Horn
Annuzio	Donnelly	Horton
Anthony	Dooley	Houghton
Applegate	Doolittle	Hoyer
Aspin	Dorgan (ND)	Hubbard
Atkins	Downey	Huckaby
AuCoin	Duncan	Hughes
Bacchus	Durbin	Hunter
Ballenger	Dwyer	Hutto
Barnard	Dymally	Hyde
Barton	Early	Inhofe
Beilenson	Eckart	Jacobs
Bennett	Edwards (CA)	James
Bentley	Edwards (OK)	Jefferson
Bereuter	Edwards (TX)	Jenkins
Berman	Emerson	Johnson (SD)
Bevill	Engel	Johnson (TX)
Bilbray	English	Johnston
Bilirakis	Erdreich	Jones (GA)
Blackwell	Espy	Jones (NC)
Bilely	Evans	Jontz
Boehlert	Fascell	Kanjorski
Boehner	Fazio	Kaptur
Bonior	Feighan	Kennedy
Borski	Fish	Kennelly
Boucher	Foglietta	Kildee
Boxer	Ford (MI)	Klecicka
Brewster	Ford (TN)	Klug
Brooks	Frank (MA)	Kolter
Broomfield	Franks (CT)	Kostmayer
Browder	Frost	Kyl
Bruce	Gallo	LaFalce
Bryant	Ganley	Lagomarsino
Bunning	Gaydos	Lancaster
Burton	Gejdenson	Lantos
Bustamante	Gephardt	LaRocco
Byron	Geren	Laughlin
Camp	Gibbons	Lehman (CA)
Campbell (CO)	Gilchrest	Lehman (FL)
Cardin	Gilman	Levin (MI)
Carper	Gingrich	Lewis (FL)
Carr	Glickman	Lewis (GA)
Chandler	Gonzalez	Lloyd
Chapman	Goodling	Long
Clay	Gordon	Lowery (CA)
Clement	Goss	Lowery (NY)
Clinger	Green	Luken
Coble	Guarini	Machtley
Coleman (MO)	Gunderson	Manton
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	Markey
Combest	Hall (TX)	Martin
Condit	Hamilton	Martinez
Conyers	Hancock	Mavroules
Cooper	Harris	Mazzoli
Costello	Hatcher	McCloskey
Cox (CA)	Hayes (IL)	McCollum
Cox (IL)	Hayes (LA)	McCurdy
Coyne	Hefley	McDermott
Cramer	Hefner	McEwen
Darden	Henry	McGrath
de la Garza	Hergert	McHugh
DeFazio	Hertel	McMillan (NC)

McMillen (MD)	Pursell	Snowe
McNulty	Rahall	Solarz
Meyers	Ramstad	Solomon
Mfume	Rangel	Spence
Miller (OH)	Ravenel	Spratt
Miller (WA)	Ray	Staggers
Mineta	Reed	Stallings
Mink	Regula	Stark
Moakley	Rhodes	Stearns
Molinari	Richardson	Stenholm
Mollohan	Ridge	Stokes
Montgomery	Riggs	Studds
Moody	Rinaldo	Swett
Moran	Ritter	Swift
Morella	Roe	Synar
Morrison	Rogers	Tallon
Mrazek	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Murphy	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin
Murtha	Rose	Taylor (MS)
Nagle	Rostenkowski	Taylor (NC)
Natcher	Roth	Thomas (CA)
Neal (MA)	Roukema	Thomas (GA)
Neal (NC)	Rowland	Thomas (WY)
Nowak	Roybal	Thornton
Oakar	Sabo	Torres
Oberstar	Sanders	Torricelli
Obey	Sangmeister	Towns
Olin	Santorum	Trafficant
Olver	Sarpalius	Traxler
Orton	Sawyer	Unsoeld
Owens (NY)	Saxton	Upton
Owens (UT)	Schaefer	Vento
Packard	Scheuer	Viscosky
Pallone	Schiff	Volkmer
Panetta	Schroeder	Walker
Parker	Schulze	Walsh
Pastor	Schumer	Washington
Patterson	Sensenbrenner	Waters
Paxon	Serrano	Waxman
Payne (NJ)	Sharp	Weber
Payne (VA)	Shaw	Weiss
Pease	Sikorski	Weldon
Pelosi	Sisisky	Wheat
Penny	Skaggs	Wilson
Perkins	Skeen	Wise
Peterson (FL)	Skelton	Wolf
Peterson (MN)	Slattery	Wolpe
Petri	Slaughter	Yates
Pickle	Smith (FL)	Yatron
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Poshard	Smith (OR)	Zeliff
Price	Smith (TX)	Zimmer

NAYS—61

Alexander	Gekas	Moorhead
Allard	Gillmor	Myers
Anderson	Gradison	Nichols
Archer	Grandy	Nussle
Armye	Hansen	Oxley
Baker	Hastert	Pickett
Barrett	Ireland	Quillen
Bateman	Johnson (CT)	Roberts
Brown	Kolbe	Roemer
Callahan	Kopetski	Shays
Campbell (CA)	Leach	Shuster
Coughlin	Lent	Smith (IA)
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Davis	Lightfoot	Sundquist
DeLay	Livingston	Vander Jagt
Dickinson	Marlenee	Vucanovich
Dornan (CA)	Matsui	Williams
Dreier	McCandless	Wyden
Ewing	McCreery	Young (AK)
Fawell	McDade	
Fields	Michel	

NOT VOTING—16

Coleman (TX)	Kasich	Savage
Collins (IL)	Levine (CA)	Valentine
Cunningham	Lipinski	Whitten
Dannemeyer	Miller (CA)	Wylie
Flake	Ortiz	
Hammerschmidt	Russo	

□ 1629

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of California and Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Wylie against.

Mr. LIVINGSTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FRANKS of Connecticut, LAUGHLIN, and GONZALEZ changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote 43. Had I been present during this vote, I would have voted "yea" on roll-call 43.

□ 1630

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader how we will proceed with the program for the balance of the week? We earlier in the day had an exchange of views with one another, and neither side knew for sure where we may or may not be. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] could enlighten us, I think we would all be appreciative.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 11 tomorrow morning and take up H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act. But we will take up the rule and general debate only.

Then we will be in contact with the distinguished minority leader and leadership on the other side about taking up the ethics report. We will take up the ethics report this week. It may start tomorrow and finish on Friday, or it may start on Friday and finish on Friday. But we will take it up and complete it this week.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me inquire about Friday, because all of us have had our travel plans for some time already and have had to adjust them in view of the Friday session. Would we orchestrate the schedule so as to give our Members any time of certainty on Friday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we will endeavor, obviously, to get finished in a timely manner. Obviously we need to consult with the gentleman and others about the hours of debate and when it will be held. We will certainly keep in mind the need for Members to get back to their districts on Friday afternoon.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would hope that we would be able to come in at 10 o'clock on Friday to facilitate that. I know in our earlier discussions we were talking about maybe no less than 4 hours of debate, depending upon the ethics question, whether or not it was two specific proposals or one plus a substitute, et cetera. So we are not trying to cut people off on the time question. By the same token, it probably has to have some limits.

Mr. Speaker, we will have a caucus on our side early in the morning, in which case then I can have a better idea to communicate to the Democratic leadership where generally we are and how we think we would like to proceed. Obviously then we will try to work it out to the satisfaction of all the Members.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, we will certainly consult with the gentleman fully and make those decisions.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question to the majority leader?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, is there any particular reason why we do not come in until 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, this is the time we had announced. There are meetings and caucuses that will be going on, committee meetings, and other matters.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2824

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2824.

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

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1755

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1755.

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

There was no objection.

#### TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977 RELATING TO INCOME EXCLUSIONS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2324) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to make a technical correction relating to exclusions from income under the Food Stamp Program, and for other

purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I do so to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] for an explanation of the legislation.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2324 makes a very simple citation correction in current food stamp law to prevent the Government from inadvertently penalizing certain blind people who apply for food stamps and receive Social Security insurance.

Section 903 of the 1991 farm bill amendments was intended to exclude from food stamp income any SSI benefits that are allocated to a so-called PASS account—which stands for “plan for achieving self-support.” Unfortunately, the statutory citation used in section 903 was incomplete. Now we are in danger of having the benefits in PASS accounts excluded for all SSI recipients except the blind.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will make the necessary technical correction that will include the blind, as we intended, to be among the SSI recipients eligible for this exclusion. I urge the passage of the House to support this bill.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2324. Public Law 102-237, the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1991 provided that for certain SSI recipients, funds saved under the Social Security PASS account will be excluded from consideration in determining food stamp eligibility. A Social Security PASS account includes funds set aside for a plan for self-support for SSI recipients.

However the reference to the Social Security Act in Public Law 102-237 did not include the appropriate citation. S. 2324 corrects that technical error and provides that blind persons will be included in the provision as was originally intended.

According to CBO the cost of the bill is less than \$500,000 per year.

The Department of Agriculture supports S. 2324 and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2324

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

#### SECTION 1. EXCLUSIONS FROM FOOD STAMP INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(d)(16) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(d)(16))

(as amended by section 903(3) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-237)) is further amended by striking “section 1612(b)(4)(B)(iv) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382a(b)(4)(B)(iv))” and inserting “subparagraph (A)(iii) or (B)(iv) of section 1612(b)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382a(b)(4))”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the earlier of—

(A) December 13, 1991;

(B) October 1, 1990, for food stamp households for which the State agency knew, or had notice, that a member of the household had a plan for achieving self-support as provided under section 1612(b)(4)(A)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382a(b)(4)(A)(iii)); or

(C) beginning on the date that a fair hearing was requested under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) contesting the denial of an exclusion for food stamp purposes for amounts necessary for the fulfillment of such a plan for achieving self-support.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF SECTION.—Notwithstanding section 11(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2020(b)), no State agency shall be required to search its files for cases to which the amendment made by subsection (a) applies, except where the excludability of amounts described in section 5(d)(16) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(d)(16)) was raised with the State agency prior to December 13, 1991.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on S. 2324, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 272) to proclaim March 20, 1992, as “National Agriculture Day,” and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the chief sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Agriculture

Committee, it is my pleasure to be the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 272. This resolution will designate March 20, 1992, as a day of national observance to honor all the men and women involved in American agriculture.

The goal of National Agriculture Day is simple. Under this resolution, Congress and the President can help focus national attention on the importance of American agriculture to our country.

Some may ask why we should have a National Agriculture Day. Some may point out how few Americans today mark their occupation as farmers or ranchers.

It is true that less than 2 percent of our Nation's population is engaged in the production of the food and fiber these days. The number of people who call themselves farmers or ranchers has declined greatly during this century. But that does not make agriculture any less important in our society.

Mr. Speaker, American agriculture today is more productive, more competitive and, I believe, more important to the American economy than ever before.

The American agricultural sector is noted for its productivity. One American farmer or rancher today annually produces enough food to feed 100 people on average. The productivity of American agriculture allows the other 98 percent of Americans to engage in other activities not tied to the land. The productivity of American agriculture assures American consumers a stable supply of food and fiber products at affordable prices.

Our agricultural sector has also become more competitive. During the 1980's, the U.S. agricultural economy went through a painful economic downturn caused by a combination of global and domestic factors. The agricultural producers who survived those difficult times are today more efficient and more competitive than ever before.

Finally, I believe American agriculture today is more important to the American economy than ever before.

Today the United States is the world's largest exporter of agricultural products. Agriculture is the only economic sector that continually provides a positive trade balance for our Nation.

Agriculture is not just farmers, it is the entire food and fiber system. When you look at it that way, you realize that agriculture is our Nation's largest industry. Roughly one out of every six American jobs is related to the production, processing, distribution, or marketing of food and fiber products. Seventeen percent of our Nation's gross national product is related to agriculture.

National Agriculture Day is more than just a day to honor our Nation's farmers and ranchers. It is also a day to honor the millions of Americans

whose livelihood involves the production, processing, distribution, and sale of food and fiber products in our country.

It has become fashionable in recent years to criticize the Federal programs of our Nation's farmers. However, I firmly believe that only by keeping American agriculture strong can the rest of us be assured of the long-term supply of food and fiber products at reasonable and stable prices.

The fact is, every American is affected by the economic health and vitality of our Nation's agricultural economy.

Mr. Speaker, March 20 is also the first day of spring. The warmth of spring marks the beginning of a new growing season for the farmer. So it is quite appropriate that we celebrate National Agriculture Day on the first day of spring.

The observance of National Agriculture Day will remind all Americans how important a healthy agricultural industry is for our Nation. This day allows our Nation to collectively say "thank you" to all the men and women involved in American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to urge my colleagues to support the passage of House Joint Resolution 272.

□ 1740

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] for his comments on House Joint Resolution 272.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, every year at this time the Congress honors America's farmers and ranchers who provide this country with the array of food and fiber that our citizens have come to expect. This is not just another legislative commemorative that I rise to endorse today. March 20 is National Agricultural Day.

Our farmers today provide for us and a great deal of the world, cultivating and managing about the same amount of land that was cropped by our producers in 1910. They plant, tend, and harvest their crops using the best management practices of 20th century agronomy; they manage their herds and flocks with great efficiency, using safety, animal welfare, and sanitary standards second to none. We have built a sustainable agricultural industry in this country of which I am proud. It feeds and clothes us and is key to our economic diversity.

U.S. agriculture is the country's largest exporter. They create a half-million off-farm jobs in financing, storing, packaging, processing, merchandising, and shipping farm commodities. Another half-million jobs on the farm are dependent on our exports. In normal crop years, the output of

about 30 percent of U.S. harvested acreage goes into export markets, generating about a fifth of farmers cash receipts.

We should recognize, too, American agribusiness on March 20: From the local elevator operator to the terminal facility manager; from the fertilizer supplier to the agricultural banker; from the local trucker to the barge operator; from the millers and processors to the packing houses that provide a healthful supply of meat products to our Nation's retailers. It is a complex industry that provides jobs to about a fifth of the Nation.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 272 designating March 20, 1992, as "Agriculture Day." I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] for introducing this legislation.

Our Nation is fortunate to have a strong agriculture system. However, with the current economic conditions facing our Nation's farmers, including the low prices received for their commodities, it is altogether appropriate that we demonstrate that we have not forgotten our farmers, for they are truly the backbone of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 272, to proclaim March 20, 1992, as "National Agriculture Day."

Since 1973, the first day of spring has been celebrated as National Agriculture Day by farmers and ranchers, commodity and farm organizations, and all persons involved in the agricultural system. I believe that this is a worthy tradition and one that merits continuation.

The U.S. agricultural sector serves all Americans by providing food, fiber, and other basic necessities of life. In fact, the American agricultural system provides American consumers with a stable supply of the highest quality food and fiber for the lowest per capita cost in the world.

The State of Wisconsin farm income for 1990 was \$6.387 billion. Additionally, 22 percent of the total work force of 2,616,000 in my State are involved in the area of production, processing, and distribution of agricultural products. Understandably, I am very proud of these facts.

Therefore, I am proud to support the passage of House Joint Resolution 272, and salute all the men and women in our Nations agricultural system. They richly deserve our grateful appreciation.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of proclaiming March 2, 1992, as National Agriculture Day. House Joint Resolution 272 would recognize and commend our Nation's farmers.

I regularly visit with farmers and their families throughout the 10th Congressional District

in Michigan. During these visits, Michigan farmers share with me their thoughts and their concerns about agriculture today and the future of the industry. We have entered into a decade where Michigan farmers, and farmers throughout the Nation, are providing food competitively and efficiently in the world market.

This is a time when the United States faces the best opportunity ever to expand its markets abroad. While beans, corn, and wheat will continue to be major crops, many U.S. farmers will produce specialized crops and find their own niche in the marketplace for their products. In fact, some Michigan farmers have found their niche in promoting trade with the European Community and with the Russian Federation, exporting cherries, beans, and meat products.

We've already come a long way in developing new and industrial uses of agricultural commodities. For example, soybean-based ink is now commonly used by newspapers. I even use it for my Congressional newsletter. Kenaf, an annual fiber crop, may soon be used for newsprint. New uses for nonfood agricultural products help create new domestic and foreign markets, while at the same time create new jobs and help spur new industries.

Few have a closer relationship with our natural resources than farmers. Farmers, as stewards of the land, are the leaders in conservation efforts to protect and preserve our soil and water resources. While water and wind erosion, air quality, and water quality remain concerns, farmers lead the way in preserving natural resources while producing valuable crops efficiently.

National Agriculture Day recognizes one of America's greatest industries—farming. America's farmers allow every American the greatest choice and the best quality food available anywhere. As consumers, we have access to the most abundant and safe food supply in the world.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing and commending agriculture, our Nation's first industry, and the hardworking men and women who have made it the envy of the world.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 272

Whereas agriculture is the Nation's largest and most basic industry, and its associated production, processing, and marketing segments together provide more jobs than any other single industry;

Whereas the United States agricultural sector serves all Americans by providing food, fiber, and other basic necessities of life;

Whereas the performance of the agricultural economy is vital to maintaining the strength of our national economy, the standard of living of our citizens, and our presence in world trade markets;

Whereas the Nation's heritage of family-owned and family-operated farms and ranches has been the core of the American agricultural system and continues to be the best means for assuring the protection of our national resources and the production of an

adequate and affordable supply of food and fiber for future generations of Americans;

Whereas the American agricultural system provides American consumers with a stable supply of the highest quality food and fiber for the lowest cost per capita in the world;

Whereas American agriculture continually seeks to maintain and improve the high level of product quality and safety expected by the consumer;

Whereas the public should be aware of the contributions of all people—men and women—who are a part of American agriculture and its contributions to American life, health, and prosperity;

Whereas women play a vital role in maintaining the family farm system, both as sole operators and as working partners, and are also attaining important leadership roles throughout the American agricultural system;

Whereas farmworkers are an indispensable part of the agricultural system as witnessed by their hard work and dedication;

Whereas scientists and researchers play an integral part in the agricultural system in their search for better and more efficient ways to produce and process safe and nutritious agricultural products;

Whereas farmers and food processors are responding to the desire of health-conscious American consumers by developing more health-oriented food products;

Whereas distributors play an important role in transporting agricultural products to retailers who in turn make the products available to the consumer;

Whereas our youth—the future of our Nation—have become involved through various organizations in increasing their understanding and our understanding of the importance of agriculture in today's society;

Whereas it is important that all Americans should understand the role that agriculture plays in their lives and well-being, whether they live in urban or rural areas; and

Whereas since 1973, the first day of spring has been celebrated as National Agriculture Day by farmers and ranchers, commodity and farm organizations, cooperatives and agribusiness organizations, nonprofit and community organizations, other persons involved in the agricultural system, and Federal, State, and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 20, 1992, is proclaimed "National Agriculture Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities during the week of March 15 through March 21.*

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

NATIONAL WOMEN IN  
AGRICULTURE DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 176) to designate March 19, 1992, as "National Women in Agriculture Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG], in order to acknowledge the work of the gentlewoman from Indiana, since she is the original sponsor and author of this joint resolution.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As author of the House legislation to designate March 19, 1992, as "National Women in Agriculture Day," I am pleased that this bill has come to the floor today. One of the biggest misconceptions about agriculture is that it is a field where only men are involved. In reality, women hold important roles in agriculture in ever-increasing numbers.

Over the years, more women have entered farming in their own and farm women spouses have more frequently been considered co-operators with their husbands. In fact, the 1987 Census of Agriculture identified 132,000 farms whose operators or senior partners were women. This represented over 6 percent of all farms and was an increase of 10,000 in 5 years, at a time when the overall number of farms was falling.

In addition to farming, women have been involved in agriculture in much broader ways such as research and development, food exporting, lobbying, and holding top positions in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Because these women deserve recognition, I introduced legislation to designate March 19, 1992, as "National Women in Agriculture Day." This day will focus the public's attention on the significant and too often overlooked role women play in our Nation's agricultural system.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I agree with all of the statements made by the gentlewoman from Indiana. This is an area which certainly needs recognition and should receive recognition. Women in agriculture play a very important role.

Many times they are the only producer on the farm and take the role as the head of that particular farming operation. They are instrumental in the success of many farming operations. They work side by side with their spouses.

They have not received the recognition in the past that perhaps they should have, but certainly in northwest Missouri we recognize their important contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I support the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I am proud to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 176, to proclaim March 19, 1992, as "National Women in Agriculture Day."

Women have been a vital part of the American agricultural experience since the very beginning of our Nation's history. Our Nation's agricultural system is founded on the concept of the family farm operation where husbands and wives provide much of the labor and management needed.

Unfortunately, it was not until recent years that women began receiving the credit and recognition they deserve for their role in contributing to the growth and success of American agriculture.

The woman's role in the successful operation of our Nation's farms and ranches should not be underestimated. An increasing number of women are farmland owners and operators. Others work side by side with their husbands in caring for livestock or working in the field. Still other women, particularly for the beginning farm operation, supplement the family's income with off-farm jobs.

The role of women in American agriculture is changing. Today women are viewed not only as equal partners in agriculture, they are also increasingly taking leadership roles on policy issues.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the great strides made by women in American agriculture. Our Nation and American agriculture are better for it. The economic future of American agriculture depends on it.

I commend our colleague, Ms. LONG of Indiana who serves on the Agriculture Committee with me, for her sponsorship of this resolution in this body. I urge the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 176.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 176, which proclaims March 19, 1992, National Women in Agriculture Day.

Women have always been essential to the success and productivity of America's great agricultural enterprise, but that role has not always been well recognized. I am glad that perception is now catching up with reality.

Farm women today are integral to farm management and assume leadership positions in all segments of our diverse agricultural economy. My own congressional district in Missouri provides an outstanding example of today's woman in agriculture: The in-

coming president of the Missouri Cattlemen's Association, Sheri Spader, is both an effective manager in her family's cattle operation and a strong leader in the Nation's second largest cattle-producing State, Missouri.

Such women work side by side with their husbands and families to keep America's family farms strong and productive. They not only play an integral role in the economic health of the farm; they sustain and nurture the families that traditionally have been the backbone of American agriculture and reflect the values that have been the foundation of our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, while nothing we can say will adequately express the gratitude we owe these women, I am pleased to endorse this resolution and urge its passage.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 176

Whereas women hold important leadership positions within the American agriculture system, a system with a level of efficiency that leads the world;

Whereas women are full working partners on the family farm;

Whereas the family farm offers the best means of ensuring the protection of our natural resources as well as guaranteeing future generations of Americans an abundant and safe supply of food; and

Whereas the public should be aware of the contributions made by women in the American agricultural system to the health and prosperity of all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That March 19, 1992, is designated as "National Women in Agriculture Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY: A NATIONAL DAY OF CELEBRATION OF GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 240) designating March 25, 1992, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to our colleague and friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, as the principal sponsor of the House companion measure to this bill, I would like to express my deep gratitude to Mr. SAWYER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, to Mr. RIDGE the ranking Republican on that subcommittee, and to Chairman CLAY of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for so expeditiously moving this bill to the floor.

March 25 is a very special day in the hearts of Greek Americans and Hellenes everywhere and to all freedom-loving Americans. It heralds both the anniversary of Greece's independence and its role as the cradle of democracy for the entire world.

In 510 B.C. the ancient Greeks came up with the idea of democracy. Now we see that very idea being implemented all over the world. This free form of government that we oftentimes take for granted seems to be taking shape in Eastern Europe and in the once communist USSR.

Indeed, the spirit of March 25 lives on in defense of the principles for which so many of the free world's people have given their lives. These principles are embodied in the Greek words "Eleftheria I Thanatos"—Liberty or Death!

The ancient Greeks forged the very notion of democracy, placing the ultimate power to rule in the hands of the people themselves. As we know, our Founding Fathers drew heavily on the political and philosophical experience of ancient Greece in forming our Government, and I thank all my colleagues here today for passing this legislation in commemoration of the Democratic heritage shared by the United States and Greece.

Mr. RIDGE. Madam speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me. I thank the gentleman from Florida for depicting, as he always does, the flavor of the celebration of Greek independence, which means so much to those of us of Greek heritage.

What has to be said and resaid for those of us who have tasted that elegance of the celebration every March of every year since we were born is that it was blended into a church type of celebration as well as an ethnic, patriotic type of celebration, along with a celebration of the American flag standing beside that Greek flag, which

was hoisted in celebration of the breakout of the Ottoman Empire in 1821. So it becomes a multicolored, multifaceted, wonderful experience for youngsters who on the one hand have their parish priest engaged in one of the most serious of the church calendar services while at the same time the ethnic and patriotic celebration for Greeks of Greek independence is shared by Greek-Americans, who with their flag, the American flag, conjoin all of that in one grand moment every March 25.

□ 1650

It has made better citizens of us, better Americans, knowing that some of the tradition upon which this very Chamber was based, the ancient Greek classical ethic, translated then into the mid-1800's, reinforced by the Greek revolution of that period, and now to have full generations of Greek-Americans understand the strength of America that has relied on such ethnic and patriotic and church-related activity of some of these citizens.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his colorful tapestry that he wove to explain that celebration to us, and continuing my reservation of the right to object, I yield to my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for House Joint Resolution 390, designating March 25, 1991, as Greek Independence Day.

On March 25, 1821, the Greek people took arms against four centuries of Ottoman rule, fighting bravely and valiantly to achieve freedom from Turkish domination.

Greek Independence Day has special significance to all Americans. It was the ancient Greeks who formulated the concept of democracy which is the keystone of the American political system. Democracy is but one of the many contributions of the Greek people to the development of civilization. Art, philosophy, science, and law are but a few of the disciplines in which the Greek people have enriched our culture.

The contributions of Greek-Americans to the development of our great Nation are much too numerous to mention. Our distinguished congressional colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], the gentleman from Maine, [Ms. SNOWE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] and in the other body, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] as just a few of the current examples of Greek-Americans who have excelled and made significant contributions to our Government.

Through the commemoration of Greek independence, we have the opportunity not only to salute our own Greek-American community for their

contributions, but to commemorate the independence of the Greek people.

Accordingly, I commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his work on this important measure and I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. RIDGE. Madam Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and join in the comments of the previous speakers, thanking both the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] and all of our colleagues of Greek heritage in this Chamber.

I would only add that all of us who share a common love of democracy and the rule of law that we all share in that Greek heritage, in that sense, all of us in this Chamber, the other Chamber, and across this great Nation take pride in that heritage and pride in being Greek-Americans ourselves on a day like today.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 240

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States of America draw heavily upon the political and philosophical experience of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy;

Whereas March 25, 1992 marks the one hundred seventy-first anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire;

Whereas these and other ideals have forged a close bond between our two nations and their peoples; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable to celebrate with the Greek people, and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which our two great nations sprang: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 25, 1992 is designated as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy", and that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the designated day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

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

EDUCATION AND SHARING DAY,  
U.S.A.

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Commit-

tee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 410) designating April 14, 1992, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to acknowledge the work as chief sponsor and author of the legislation of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader, and also to yield to our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 410 to designate April 14, 1992, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.," and commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and our minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], for introducing this measure.

The quality of education is essential to our American heritage of cultural and political freedom. Our schools are instrumental in providing for our scientific and technical competence. Education holds the key to the future. By designating April 14, 1992, as "Education Day, U.S.A.," we call attention of the American people to the necessity of improving our educational system, which promotes good moral and ethical values.

Madam Speaker, the future of our Nation, our way of life, and our democratic system of government is dependent on a highly educated citizenry, a citizenry that must be equipped to compete with other nations of the world. We must nurture our desire for learning and to motivate students and teachers to assure that we maintain leadership to continue our American democracy.

House Joint Resolution 410 also calls attention to the Lubavitch movement, which promotes many of our ethical values and principles upon which the educational system of our great Nation was founded.

In choosing April 15, 1992, we are also honoring Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, the leader of the Lubavitch movement who will be celebrating his 90th birthday and the 42d anniversary in which the rebbe ascended to the world leadership of the Lubavitch movement.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution which focuses attention on the educational values which are so vital to the future of our Nation.

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

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

There was no objection.  
The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H. J. RES. 410

Whereas Congress recognizes the historical tradition of ethical values and principles which are the basis of civilized society and upon which our great Nation, the United States of America, was founded;

Whereas President George W. Bush, distinguished leader of our great Nation, stated "Ethical values are the foundation for civilized society. A society that fails to recognize or adhere to them cannot endure.";

Whereas these ethical values and principles have been the cornerstone of society since the dawn of civilization when they were known as the Seven Noahide laws;

Whereas the Government of the United States and its citizens are committed to the ideals of social equality and the right of each and every person to share in the bounty the world has to offer—ideals deeply rooted in our Nation's history and boldly affirmed by the miraculous changes of the past year;

Whereas our Nation has recently witnessed the beginning triumph of these values through wonders around the world of biblical proportions;

Whereas the end of the Cold War heralds the beginning of an era where individual rights and human dignity become paramount and where the dream of a world in which material and spiritual deprivation is replaced by human kindness and compassion becomes a reality;

Whereas the absolute necessity of mutual responsibility and concern for the needy has been of particular concern to "the Rebbe", Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, leader of the Lubavitch movement;

Whereas the Lubavitch movement, through the establishment of over 1,000 social welfare and educational institutions throughout the world under the leadership of the "Rebbe", has long supported and promoted dedication to education and selfless concern for others;

Whereas Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson has recently issued a worldwide call for a revitalized dedication to loving kindness, charity, and sharing between man and his fellow man;

Whereas Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson is universally revered by all faiths, respected as spiritual leader of world Jewry, and his 90th birthday falls on April 14, 1992;

Whereas in tribute to this great spiritual leader, "the Rebbe", his birthday will be designated as "Education Sharing Day U.S.A." and this year, his 91st, will mark a new beginning in an age-old commitment to education, accompanied by an increase in general acts of sharing with another, in order to return the world to the moral and ethical values contained in the Seven Noahide Laws; and

Whereas this will be reflected in an international scroll of honor signed by the President of the United States and other heads of state; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 14, 1992, the birthday and the start of the 91st year of Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, leader of the worldwide Lubavitch movement, is designated as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A." The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was

read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ADDRESS HOUSING NEEDS OF ELDERLY AMERICANS

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, a growing crisis is unfolding in elderly housing across this country. Our elderly housing facilities are plagued by crime, drugs, and violence. Residents with clashing lifestyles are forced to live side-by-side and critical social service needs are not being met. So today, I am introducing legislation to address this problem.

The bill addresses this problem in three complementary ways. First, it increases housing choices. The bill allows public housing agencies and residents to choose from a variety of housing options to best serve their needs and their lifestyles.

Second, it sets tougher screening and eviction guidelines. The bill will ensure that violent and unruly people cannot get in—or stay in—our housing facilities.

Third, it establishes the critical service coordinator position. The service coordinator will ensure essential health and social services are delivered to those who need them.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to act, the crisis in elderly housing will only get worse. This bill is an even-handed approach that is fair to all residents. It aims to do one thing: To stop the turbulence in elderly housing. I urge my colleagues to join me in authorship and support of this vital legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the problems facing public housing authorities, housing sponsors, and residents in elderly housing, and the approaches taken in the Improvement of Housing for Elderly and Disabled Act, to address these problems.

We have heard horror stories from across this country on the conflicts, and in some cases, outright violence, that have erupted in elderly housing facilities. These conflicts are caused not only by the differing lifestyles of the older residents and their younger, disabled neighbors. They are also caused by unclear screening and eviction guidelines and unmet health and social service needs.

The differing lifestyles of the residents has contributed to the turbulence in elderly housing facilities. While mixed situations can work, some residents have special needs which can best be met by targeting services to their needs. Public housing authorities are clamoring for the opportunity to develop innovative methods of meeting the often distinctive housing needs of their increasingly diverse resident groups, and we should provide them with the tools they need to do so.

This legislation allows public housing agencies to establish designated housing options which can take advantage of economies of scale in the provision of services and management expertise. In so doing, public housing authorities will be able to offer choices in developing alternative housing arrangements for their residents with increased options including section 8 vouchers and certificates, group homes, family public housing, mixed facilities, service-enriched facilities, and senior facilities.

However, the public housing authorities must develop housing arrangements which meet the needs of their populations and the composition of their waiting lists without offering preferences or priority to any one group. Clearly, the bill offers an incentive for better management.

Another key aspect of the problem is the composition of the elderly housing waiting lists. The growing numbers of nonelderly disabled persons on the waiting lists mean service needs will only increase in days ahead. In Milwaukee, for example, the nonelderly make up over 60 percent of the waiting lists for elderly housing. Clearly, we must increase and improve our delivery of essential health and social services to these residents, most of whom can coexist with their neighbors when they are given the services they need.

This legislation enhances the vital delivery of health and social services by funding the service coordinator position for public housing and some federally assisted housing. The service coordinator position will work efficiently with residents and care providers to determine and meet the residents' service needs. For this crucial elderly and disabled resident service coordinator, the bill authorizes \$30 million for public housing agencies, \$15 million for tenant-based section 8 housing, and \$5 million for project-based section 8 housing.

An additional problem results from unclear screening and eviction guidelines. Some residents have been allowed into the facilities without any chance of peacefully coexisting in a community setting and not threatening their neighbors. To address this problem, the legislation establishes a clearcut criteria for screening and eviction purposes in all public and federally assisted housing. To qualify for residency, applicants must meet the essential terms of tenancy outlined in the bill. To remain in the facilities, applicants must not violate those same standards. With increased direction, housing sponsors will be required to house only those who can coexist with their neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an innovative approach to a complex problem. I urge my colleagues to support it, and at this point I would like to enter a section-by-section analysis of the legislation into the RECORD.

## SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Sec. 1: Title.—"Improvement of Housing for the Elderly and Disabled Act."

Sec. 2.—Requirement of HUD regulations.

Title I.—Authorizes PHA's to provide housing choice for elderly persons and persons with disabilities.

Sec. 101.—Authorizes designated occupancy housing for older persons, for persons with disabilities, and for mixed populations as housing authorities see fit.

Waiting lists must be observed before initiating designated housing options;

Existing preferences remain intact;

Authorizes housing authorities to open mixed housing, shared housing, family housing, group homes, section 8, and to reconfigure existing units as appropriate.

Sec. 102.—Prohibits forced moving of existing residents.

Sec. 103.—Conforming amendments.

Title II: Establishes Essential Terms of Tenancy for public and federally-assisted housing. Also authorizes funding for the Service Coordinator position for public and some federally-assisted housing.

Sec. 201.—Requires PHA's and housing sponsors to comply with the Essential Terms of Tenancy provisions as a condition of receiving federal assistance.

Sec. 202.—Establishes Essential Terms of Tenancy as a criteria for screening applicants on the basis of direct threat to neighbors or potential failure to meet financial obligations.

Sec. 203.—States that any violation of the Essential Terms of Tenancy is sufficient cause for eviction.

Sec. 204.—Requires the provision of Service Coordinators for older residents and residents with disabilities for PHA's and housing sponsors of Section 8, Section 236, and Section 221(d)(3). (PHA's \$30 M, Section 8 tenant: \$15 M, Section 8 project: \$5 M).

Sec. 205.—Requires PHA's to assist elderly and disabled applicants in finding housing units outside of public housing.

Sec. 206.—Conforming Amendments.

Sec. 207.—Definitions.

#### NEW ORLEANS MARDI GRAS INDIANS: A CELEBRATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN CULTURE

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

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday in New Orleans, more than 1 million people reveled in our city's annual celebration of Mardi Gras.

For many, Mardi Gras means parades, colorful costumes, beads, and doubloons. But, there is more to be found hidden from the cameras in the neighborhoods and back streets of New Orleans.

From the first Mardi Gras celebrations, a dozen or so Mardi Gras Indian tribes have contributed a special African-American spirit to carnival, parading and chanting in colorful feathered and hand-beaded costumes through the back streets and neighborhoods of New Orleans on Mardi Gras.

This neighborhood celebration is what most people miss when the television cameras pan the throngs on Canal Street and the French Quarter.

Besides their colorful costumes, the Mardi Gras Indian tribes contribute a unique street music to New Orleans' famed musical repertoire. This street music combines chants, bells, drums, and tambourines. These special rhythms have been recorded on several albums and performed on stage across America and Europe by at least three of the Indian tribes, the Golden Eagles, the Wild Magnolias, and the Wild Tchoupitoulas.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor the Mardi Gras Indians and their unique contributions to New Orleans' heritage and culture by presenting to the U.S. House of Representatives a special memento of Mardi Gras 1992—a framed, 13-color serigraph entitled "New Orleans Mardi Gras Indians: A Celebration of African-American Culture."

Mr. Speaker, in order for Members and others to better appreciate the history of the New Orleans Mardi Gras Indians, I am including in my remarks a newspaper article from the February 9, 1992, editions of the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, written by Joan McKinney and entitled "U.S. Capitol Invaded by Mardi Gras Revelers."

#### U.S. CAPITOL INVADDED BY MARDI GRAS REVELERS

(By Joan McKinney)

WASHINGTON.—You could have pralines for breakfast and see an Indian chief, who isn't an Indian, wearing pink and rose-dyed ostrich feathers Friday morning in the nation's capital.

It's not what the U.S. Capitol complex is accustomed to on Friday mornings. But the pralines, the Indian chief, a king cake, Bloody Mary's and masks abounded as hundreds of Louisianians wandered through U.S. House and Senate office buildings and the Capitol. Under way were congressional delegations' breakfasts, brunches and lunches.

It's all part of the three-day observance of Mardi Gras in Washington.

This year's innovation was the presence of T. "Bo" Dollis, the beaded, feathered, head-banded, braided chief of the Wild Magnolia Tribe.

Dollis was here courtesy of freshman U.S. Rep. William Jefferson, D-New Orleans. Jefferson told his breakfast guests in the Rayburn House Office Building that he wanted to showcase "the African-American contribution to Mardi Gras" and to let the Washington partygoers see how Mardi Gras is celebrated "in the back streets and the neighborhoods of New Orleans."

That world of the neighborhood "is what you miss" when the television cameras pan over the crowds in the French Quarter, Jefferson said.

Dollis leads one of about a dozen tribes, each generally attached to specific black neighborhoods of New Orleans.

The black Indians pre-date the well-known Zulus, the coconut-throwing black krewe founded about 1909 to spoof the all-white krewes.

The Indian tribes first appeared in Mardi Gras some 10 to 15 years after the Civil War. The first written account of them was in 1863, according to a New Orleans music magazine.

One theory is that these black tribes are an outgrowth of friendships between West

African slaves and native American Indians sympathetic to the slaves.

Writing in "Spirit World," Michael P. Smith says that the American Indians and the West Africans shared a high regard for communal ceremony, for oral history, for elaborate spiritual and religious rituals—traditions largely foreign to the European culture.

When Jim Crow laws banned the Sunday musical celebrations of slaves in New Orleans Congo Square, the slave groups reformed secretly and took the names of Indian tribes, according to a historical account released by Jefferson's office.

Today, the tribes still meet on Sundays, when the members practice their street performances.

The street music is singing, chanting and the sound of bells, drums and tambourines. The music both honors the Indians and also means that the blacks have assumed some of the Indians' spiritual identity, according to Smith.

A New Orleans music critic has described the street performances as "an ancestral memory" and an "outward expression of the 'secret societies' which kept alive West African, Caribbean, Choctaw and Black Creole heritages of African-Americans in New Orleans."

Smith says that the songs recount black history and express masculine codes of conduct.

In recent years, the tribes have been the subject of a television documentary. Dollis recently performed on "Saturday Night Live," has recorded three albums and soon will release a fourth. The Wild Tchoupitoulas and the Golden Eagles have recorded albums.

In their beginnings, the highly competitive tribes fought in their street meetings. Today, they do war with words and symbolism when they meet at street intersections in New Orleans. But elements of the bloodier days survive, as the tribes still have "spy boys" who scout for the oncoming enemy parades and "flagboys" who wave the banners of battle.

The tribes also are known for spectacular costumes, each hand-sewn by its wearer and each made new, or reassembled every year. And it takes about a full year to make each costume.

"I began beading when I was 12, but I didn't get to mask until I was 14," Dollis said.

His costume had beaded shoulder patches depicting a bear and a fighting Indian warrior. A beaded frontpiece showed Indians celebrating a buffalo kill.

Dollis sang for Jefferson's breakfast, in the style an album cover says is "the African call-and-response tradition, calypso storytelling mode."

If the words were foreign to some of Jefferson's guests, Dollis said, "between Indians, we all know what's going on." Indeed, the street-savvy in the crowd answered the chants of their chief.

Dollis also performed Thursday night with New Orleans pianist Ronnie Cole, at a seafood bash/cocktail party called "Louisiana Alive."

The chief's additional serious business here—and Jefferson's—was the unveiling of the first silk-screen poster honoring the New Orleans Mardi Gras Indians. Proceeds from sales of the limited-edition poster will be shared among the tribes, who will use the money to cover Mardi Gras expenses and to preserve, and express, their traditions.

□ 1700

## TORT REFORM—A MUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion the last 6 months on the two most critical problems facing our Nation: the economy and health care. Of all the solutions being offered, the major culprit seems to escape unscathed, and understandably so. The reason—the culprit is perhaps the most powerful force on Capitol Hill. I am speaking of the American Trial Lawyers Association whose influence has permeated the Halls of Congress for two decades.

So, we talk about health care reform and come up with all kinds of creative solutions emulating other systems used around the world. These systems include the most dismal failure, which is national health insurance, or should I say socialized medicine. But we never talk about the trial lawyers.

In 1960, the total amount of money paid by the medical practitioners in America for medical malpractice premiums and/or judgments was \$60 million. In 1988, that figure became \$7 billion. In addition the most conservative estimate of medical defensive costs including testing for protection against lawsuits is \$17 billion. In other words the medical community is forced to pass on \$24 billion a year to the patients of America.

A cancer surgeon from my hometown of Tulsa told me yesterday that he charges \$450 for a breast biopsy and the cost for medical malpractice for that technique is \$300. Two-thirds of the patient cost goes to cover medical malpractice. There can be no health care reform in this country until we achieve medical malpractice reform.

Now our economy is facing a similar dilemma. We are unable to employ people in this country because a large percentage of our manufacturers are being shipped overseas.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, aviation is my specialty so I will use it as an example. In 1971, manufacturers in the United States turned out 14,389 single engine aircraft. This constituted almost all of the small aircraft on the world market. Aircraft had become a major export for the United States. Twenty years later in 1991, this country only manufactured 608 single engine aircraft. We went from 14,389 to 608 in 20 years. The manufacturers, the few that are still solvent, have stated that there is one reason for this. That reason is that our manufacturers of aircraft cannot be competitive on the global market and at the same time pay for the exposure of product liability.

Specifically, Beech Aircraft testified before our Aviation Subcommittee that

the average cost per vehicle that they manufacture to pay for the potential exposure of product liability is \$85,000. In other words, if they can manufacture the airplane for \$60,000 they have to market it for \$145,000 to offset the cost of product liability. That same airplane can be manufactured in Germany, Italy, or France for \$60,000 because their laws do not make the manufacturer responsible, interminably, as ours do.

Not too long ago, Piper Aviation went bankrupt. An American company bought some of Piper's tooling and assets and is going to start manufacturing airplanes again. Guess where? Canada, because they can't be competitive manufacturing them in America. Of course there are many other examples we can use. We were distressed to find out that the last American manufacturer of motorcycle helmets is going out of business. We are now importing all of our helmets from abroad, primarily from Japan and Italy. The sole reason we can't manufacture them in America and be competitive is product liability.

So, the culprit that I referred to lives in the form of influence from a small number of trial lawyers who have been exploiting our health delivery system and our manufacturers. This force is a very influential one in Congress. Trial lawyers drop hundreds of thousands of dollars into the campaigns of candidates who will protect their cozy deals. And who loses? The American citizens seeking medical treatment and hundreds of unemployed workers whose jobs have been exported overseas.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we stand up to the big boys. We will not achieve health care reform and a healthy economy until such time that we are willing to take on the trial lawyers who control our Congress.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3732, BUDGET PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-453) on the resolution (H. Res. 394) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3732) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to eliminate the division of discretionary appropriations into three categories for purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT BY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RULES ON STATUS OF H.R. 3732, BUDGET PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is to notify Members of the status, in the

Rules Committee, of H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act of 1992. The committee has granted a rule which provides for general debate only. The committee will meet next week to grant a second rule dealing with amendments to H.R. 3732. In order to be fair to all Members, the committee will extend the deadline for filing of amendments.

The new filing deadline will be Monday, March 16, at 12 noon for any Members who still wish to submit amendments on this bill. Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment to H.R. 3732 should submit, to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment, no later than 12 noon on Monday, March 16.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 3732.

#### HOUSE BANK SCANDAL

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

Mr. HANCOCK. Madam Speaker, over the weekend the news about the House Ethics Committee and its handling of the House bank scandal hit the newspapers in my district. I was outraged to learn that the bad checks written at the House bank now total \$10.8 million and that the scandal involves 355 current and former Members of the House.

I was even further outraged to learn how the Ethics Committee has chosen to deal with this scandal. The committee is recommending that only 24 of these violators be exposed.

They want to cover up the misconduct of the hundreds of other Members involved—including habitual violators—some of whom have bounced checks for hundreds of thousands of dollars. In his press conference, the chairman of the committee admitted this decision was a political compromise.

The only thing more disgraceful than the House bank scandal itself, is this attempt to cover it up and protect those Members involved. Taxpayers and voters across this country are outraged as well. They are saying: "It's business as usual in Washington. Nothing has changed." And the sad truth of it is: They are right. They are 100-percent right.

The integrity of this House—the legitimacy of this institution as an instrument of the people—demands a full, open, and complete accounting of this scandal, without any further political compromises.

Those Members who committed the acts of passing bad checks drawn at the House bank should be exposed—each and every one of them—no matter how many Members are involved—no mat-

ter who they are—Republican or Democrat.

Now, those Members whose checks bounced through some innocent error, will have the opportunity to explain themselves. Those who are innocent of any real wrongdoing have nothing to fear from the voters. But the deliberate abusers must be exposed. The Ethics Committee should release the names of all those involved.

I'm sure I am risking the wrath of some by saying this and saying it so plainly. Some will be offended—especially the check kitters and those who cover up for them. But I accept that risk. If men of principle cannot stand in this Chamber and speak the truth, without fear of retribution, then it is further proof of the corruption in this institution.

If anyone thinks I am overreacting, I challenge them to consider for a moment the scope of the activity we are talking about. We are not just talking about hundreds of bounced checks totaling \$10.8 million—which is bad enough.

What we are talking about is a host of unanswered questions about what some of this money was used for—questions the committee evidently didn't investigate. If some of the millions of dollars Members overdrafted from the House bank were invested for the personal profit of Members, generating income that was not reported to the IRS, we have the possibility of serious violations of Federal tax law. If some of the money Members overdrafted from the House bank were used to subsidize their reelection campaigns, we have possible violations of Federal elections laws. Considering the number of Members and the amount of money involved, this may be the biggest scandal in the history of the Congress.

This scandal is the most convincing argument I can imagine for limiting the terms of Members of Congress.

This whole body has become so corrupted and out of touch that even possible criminal activity may be swept under the rug by means of an attempted coverup by the very institution charged with enforcing ethical conduct. The only answer is to elect some more citizen legislators and replace all the professional politicians who run this place. That is why limited terms is essential.

We are working hard in Missouri to pass limited terms. I have taken a leadership role, donating a substantial portion of my congressional pay raise—the pay raise I voted against—to the Missourians for Limited Terms. I firmly believe, if it is on the ballot, we will pass limited terms in Missouri this year. But until that happens across the Nation, the professional politicians will remain in power and the coverups will continue.

I personally resent the fact that I have been forced into the position of

defending my financial integrity because of my association with the Congress. The fact that I must reassure my constituents that I have not bounced checks because of the irresponsible acts of some of my colleagues is a personal insult. When the House bank scandal first broke, I met with a group of reporters and allowed them to review my bank statements from the House bank. I challenge other Members to do the same.

But more important than how this scandal affects me is the threat it presents to our Republic. An historian once said: "When people lose faith in their system of government, that system collapses." That is happening to us today and I do not overstate the situation.

What angers me is the thought that my grandchildren are going to grow up in a world where people their age are going to feel nothing but cynicism for the great institutions of this Republic—those institutions which are monuments to freedom itself. The coverup artists in this chamber are trying to steal from my grandchildren—and the children of this country—the same feeling of pride and patriotism I feel when, early in the morning, as the sun comes up, I walk toward this great Capitol Building.

They are replacing that precious pride with shame and disappointment. That makes me angry. That is why I am here on this floor. That is why I am speaking out. That is why I am challenging the Ethics Committee and the House leadership. Because the respect of the American people and the future of this country are worth fighting for. And with every last breath in me—I will fight.

I appeal to the members of the Ethics Committee. Do what is right. I appeal to the Members who have disgraced themselves and this institution. If you are an abuser of the House bank, do your Nation a favor—and the institution of Congress—don't run for reelection. I appeal to my colleagues. Join me in demanding this scandal be fully exposed.

I appeal to the taxpayers and voters of this country. Do not lose faith yet. Give us a chance. Some of us are trying. We are still fighting. Even with our faults, our system of Government is still the best, when compared with all others. Don't lose the faith yet.

□ 1710

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE AMERICAN BLACK BEAR PROTECTION ACT OF 1992

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. For most Americans, the black bear has come to sym-

bolize the vast, untamed wilderness areas that continue to resist the modern era. Millions of Americans have been fortunate enough to encounter the black bear in its natural habitat, in one of the numerous national parks that dot the landscape. How many of us can recall ever seeing a good old-fashioned backwoods adventure film that didn't feature at least one oversized, marauding black bear?

There was a time when the black bear could be found in virtually every wooded area of North America, but steady human encroachment and the incremental loss of natural habitat has precipitated a reduction in the domestic bear population. Nevertheless, the black bear still populates 25 States, due in large part to the establishment of Federal wildlife parks and refuges, the combination of which help to support a healthy population—estimates of which range from 200,000 to 250,000 in the lower 48 States.

However, all is not well. International commercialization of bear parts—including gallbladders—has sparked an increase in the commission of horrendous crimes within the borders of our national parks and forests. Quite simply, black bears have become a major target for ruthless poaching gangs that remove the gallbladders and paws of illegally killed bears, leaving mutilated carcasses on the forest floor. These body parts then are sold to middlemen who eventually transship them to overseas markets, most of which are found in Asia.

The existence of sophisticated criminal rings was highlighted last year when authorities in New York happened upon the scene of the first known case of a gangland-style slaying involving a trafficker in animal body parts. This incident was but one more piece in a puzzle that has, for many years, attracted the attention of State and Federal wildlife enforcement officials.

Since 1981, undercover operations conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other regional law enforcement departments have netted large numbers of bear gallbladders and paws. Operations of this nature are not infrequent, nor are they strictly limited to one region of the country. In fact, they have been conducted across the country—in California, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Montana, Virginia, Pennsylvania—the list goes on. The market exists and poachers will go to great lengths to obtain these black bear body parts, particularly the gallbladders which, in the Asian marketplace, often will command prices in excess of \$40,000 a piece.

Trade in other body parts, such as black bear paws, also is prevalent. The traditional "Bear-Paw Soup," with origins stretching back to the Ming Dynasty in China, is the preferred dish of an expanding number of well-to-do res-

restaurant patrons in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. In November for instance, the Washington Post cited \$1,400 as the going rate for bear-paw soup in Taiwan, and, according to Judy Mills, co-author of "The Asian Trade in Bears and Bear Parts," braised bear paw routinely is featured on the menu of the Seoul Hilton, selling for \$500 to \$700 a dish.

Why the high prices? In many Asian societies, the flesh of bears is considered to be highly invigorating, or refreshing in a medical sense. Similarly, the bile contained within a bear's gallbladder is thought to possess almost magical qualities. Written prescriptions for bear gallbladder first appeared in the seventh century, although some pharmacologists believe that actual use extends back some 3,000 years. Bear gallbladder is rumored to cure cancer, blood disorders, heart and liver ailments, nausea, and abdominal pain—even hemorrhoids. In addition, gallbladders are used widely as aphrodisiacs.

Wildlife officials estimate that bear products are sold, over the counter, in no less than 3,500 medicine shops—called Hanyuks, throughout South Korea. Specialists in bear research even have documented the sale of bear gallbladder products at Seoul's Kimpo International Airport. But the sale of pharmaceutical products containing bear gallbladder is not limited strictly to South Korea—they can be found in Japan, China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong as well. In Japan, for instance, a popular medicine for children—called Hiya Kiogan Silver—contains traces of bear gallbladder. In China, no less than seven pharmaceutical firms produce dozens of medicines using bear gallbladder.

Nevertheless, the bulk of available research data inevitably points to South Korea, where the appetite for bear gallbladder products is almost legendary. This has had disastrous consequences for the indigenous bear population in South Korea which steadily has been driven to the brink of extinction—with less than 2 dozen animals—most of which now reside in zoos. Unless we take immediate action here at home, I fear that the day may come when we will be visiting the last of our indigenous bears in zoos.

Interestingly, Japanese chemists have succeeded in synthetically reproducing the active ingredient in bear bile, known as UDCA—which has supposed curative properties, but this has never been substantiated by rigorous scientific analysis. Despite the widespread availability of UDCA, many still want the authentic product and will pay handsomely for it. Therein lies the problem.

Unfortunately, as the demand for authentic bear gallbladder continues to increase, the eyes of many dealers have turned toward North America where

the supply is substantial and the loopholes in the law large. This increased commercialization now has created a financial incentive to decimate our domestic wildlife.

Studies conducted by Federal wildlife specialists indicate that the black bear population reasonably can absorb 15 percent annual mortality rate—of which 5 percent can be female—without seriously threatening the reproductive capacity of the species. Regional population studies indicate that illegal killing far exceeds the excepted norm, thereby threatening the population curve. One study, conducted by the Colorado Wildlife Commission from 1979-87 revealed an astonishing 40-percent mortality rate for females alone in a number of representative study groups—due primarily to poaching.

The senseless slaughter of the black bear has been brought to the attention of the American public through a series of high visibility law enforcement actions and through television, most recently in a documentary produced by the National Geographic Society. In the spring of 1980, agents of the California Fish and Wildlife Service concluded a 23-month undercover investigation, which netted 52 violators and sizeable quantities of bear products, including: 88 bear claws, 37 gallbladders, and a lesser number of powdered gallbladders for use in capsules.

In March 1989, another undercover operation, launched in Chicago, led to the raid of four Korean herbal shops and the confiscation of 181 black bear gallbladders. The list goes on. In February 1988, Federal and State Wildlife officers concluded a 4-year undercover operation in 12 States, that included penetrating an illegal commercial network operating out of the Shenandoah National Park. Up to 100 black bears were known to have been killed, and their body parts—including gallbladders—were sold off. One undercover exchange that took place in the parking lot of a shopping mall in northern Virginia yielded several dozen gallbladders.

Given the amount of illegal poaching that is taking place, there are definite limits to what can be accomplished in the area of law enforcement with limited tools. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service fields about 200 agents nationwide, up to 12 of whom are assigned to special operations units, specifically designed to infiltrate illegal commercial networks. The Fish and Wildlife Service spends about 5 percent of its annual \$31 million law enforcement budget on these covert wildlife protection programs—limited resources that cannot be expected to make more than a dent in these sophisticated commercial networks that are operating with relative impunity inside tens-of-millions of acres of wilderness.

The legislation that I am introducing today, the "American Black Bear Pro-

tection Act of 1992" attempts to curb the trafficking in body parts by targeting the rampant commercialization. My legislation is designed to address three primary concerns.

First, in order to control the illegal poaching of black bears for their gallbladders and paws, my bill would ban the export of bear viscera (internal organs) from the United States and would set forth both civil and criminal penalties for any violation. This will provide our law enforcement agencies a much needed tool to deter and punish illegal hunting but will have no effect on legitimate sport hunting. To illustrate the validity of this approach—and I believe that sport hunting associations will agree that the same principle applies in the case of black bears—that, far from restricting the rights of legitimate hunters, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of the 1930's, actually enabled sport hunting to continue. Just ask anyone who resides on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

Second, the bill requires the Secretary of Interior to report to Congress on their computerized information system for recording and tracking illegal commercial supply networks.

Finally, the bill would direct the U.S. Trade Representative to make the international trafficking of bear gallbladder a priority issue in the ongoing discussions we are having with our Asian trading partners. Clearly, unless those countries also are willing to cooperate, illegal trafficking will continue, and our domestic bear populations will remain at risk.

Mr. Speaker, in closing let me briefly comment on actions taken yesterday at the convention on endangered species being held in Japan. An attempt was made to place severe restrictions on the trade of North American black bear body parts in order to help control the illegal killing of endangered Asian bears. Unfortunately, led by opposition from the United States, the proposal was blocked—meaning that passage of my legislation is even more important.

I hope that my colleagues will join with me in this much needed effort to protect the American black bear before it is too late.

□ 1720

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my 5 minutes that I missed a little earlier.

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

There was no objection.

#### REGULATORY RELAY

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

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, I rise today to play my part in the program of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] on regulatory relay to discuss the issue of Federal regulations.

Last week a constituent of mine who runs a medium-sized oil and gas company with 600 employees came to my office to fill me in on the Federal regulations he and his drivers of propane trucks must abide by. Now, I do not dispute that regulation of these potentially dangerous vehicles is necessary, but I think my colleagues will be astounded at the very heavy burden the Government has placed on these drivers.

I have here a driver qualification file which contains over 15 forms which must be filled out and completed before an employee is qualified to drive. These forms mandate completion of written exams, physical exams, drug testing, an extensive review of the applicant's driving record, and on and on. Most must be updated periodically. While pointing out how stringent these regulations are, my constituent handed me a single sheet of paper with six lines on it. That is a copy of the qualifications, printed in our Constitution to be President of the United States.

What a comparison.

Once a driver becomes qualified, he must periodically complete several forms in his vehicle maintenance packet. This is an inch-thick—and on the front says "simplified format"—file that contains forms to be filled out documenting maintenance and inspection checks of virtually every aspect of his vehicle. I'll read just a few lines from the form explaining how to use the maintenance packet and I quote:

If a routine safety inspection (Form 127-F-DVCR if regulated carrier) reports a defect or a breakdown or accident occurs, or a maintenance service is scheduled, a Garage Repair Order Form (Form No. 128-FS-C3) should be issued. The Garage Repair Order Form (Form No. 128-FS-C3) is used to authorize and instruct mechanics or vendors on all repairs or scheduled PM services. All work performed, all parts, parts cost, labor, labor costs and vendor costs should be recorded on this form. Three parts are provided, one for parts department or vendor, one for Vehicle Maintenance File Folder and one for shop office for labor time accountability. The Garage Repair Order Form is one of the most important forms in your maintenance program and must be completed whenever anything is done on the vehicle, whether performed by your mechanics or outside vendors. The information on the Garage Repair Order Form must be posted to Maintenance Service Stickers (Form No. 121-F) for on-vehicle records, and to Vehicle Maintenance File Folder (Form No. 103-F) for permanent historical records.

While driving his truck, a driver who has jumped through all these hoops must be sure he has a copy of each of these three handbooks: the "Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations," 408 pages; the "Emergency Response Guidebook," about 300 pages; and the "Driver's Pocket Guide to Hazardous

Materials," 290 pages. All these books must be purchased from the U.S. Department of Transportation and are packed with thousands of regulations the driver must abide by. These books cannot be stored in the glove compartment of the truck; they must always be in reach of the driver. Of course, the driver must sign a receipt stating that he understands all of these regulations. And he had better, because if he does not he will be in serious trouble if he is found in violation of any of these regulations.

Finally, each truckdriver must carry one of these "Post-Trip Vehicle Inspection" booklets. The law states that at the end of each trip the driver must conduct a detailed inspection of his vehicle. By law, he must check the service brakes including trailer brake connections, the parking brake, the steering mechanism, lighting devices and reflectors, the tires, the horn, windshield wipers, rear vision mirrors, coupling devices, wheels and rims, and all emergency equipment. The driver must prepare a written report of this daily inspection and sign it.

□ 1730

My constituent related to me an incident by which there had been a routine check of one of his trucks and they found that one of the lug bolts on the coupling for the trailer was not as taut as it should have been, but it was not loose. They had to call a mechanic to come out and tighten it. The regulations did not even allow the truckdriver the right to correct it.

These areas of regulation I am talking about are only those affecting the transportation activities which my constituent's company is involved in. He faces many more areas of regulation in his regular course of business. Not only are these regulations excessive, but many are unnecessary. This is regulation run amok. It is crazy. Crippling regulations have stunted investment and economic activity, and must cost untold numbers of jobs. Regulations have played a direct role in causing this recession and increased costs to all of our constituents and consumers.

Let us unleash American business so that we can again take our rightful place as the economic leader of the free world and put American workers back to work.

#### LEGISLATION CALLING FOR REPEAL OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PELOSI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Madam Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which calls for the repeal of the second amendment to the Constitution.

The second amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Madam Speaker, is the second amendment still necessary in 1992? And does the second amendment, the existence of it, give the right to the manufacturers of guns, the distributors of guns, the fanatics who must have automatic weapons of all kinds, does it provide a right to them?

Madam Speaker, I have been told that the second amendment does not guarantee that right, but it is because the second amendment has been distorted and is often misquoted to mislead the American people to believe that because the second amendment exists we should not and we cannot regulate the manufacture, the sale, and the distribution of guns in the United States.

As a result of the notion being promulgated that we cannot regulate the sale and distribution and manufacture of guns, we have a paralysis by legislators across the country and by the Congress. Repeatedly, public opinion polls have shown that the American people do want more gun control. They want more regulation of guns.

Of course, a No. 1 issue across the Nation is crime and solutions to the problem of crime. Madam Speaker, crimes of all kinds I abhor, but crime which results in the death of individuals is of particular concern and should be of particular concern to all of us.

The recent tragic shootings of two young persons at Thomas Jefferson High School in New York City has renewed interest in some kind of immediate, urgent action to deal with guns and the gun culture.

Madam Speaker, two young persons, one named Ian Moore and the other's name is Tyrone Sinkler, they happen to live—they happened to live in my congressional district. The tense is important here.

Thomas Jefferson School is not located in the district, but these young people resided in the 12th Congressional District.

Somehow their shooting has shocked even New York City, which has too many homicides and too many guns despite the fact that we have very tight gun control laws in both New York City and New York State. The fact is that these youngsters were murdered in cold blood in a school; the fact is that the young man who pulled out the gun and shot them has no fear of being caught and no concern about snuffing out human life and taking his punishment subsequently. In addition to the two persons being shot that day, their lives being snuffed out immediately, another young person who was a friend of theirs went home and, with a gun, committed suicide, took his own life.

□ 1740

Mr. Speaker, in the space of 5 days in New York City there were about 10 shootings. About five people were killed with guns. That is in New York City, which is highly visible. They got a lot of publicity, and all the world knows about it.

But what my colleagues do not know about is that all around the country, in both rural communities and suburban communities, young people are taking their lives and taking each other's lives in large numbers. We know about the mass murders when automatic weapons are being taken into post office buildings, and people getting revenge for various reasons have snuffed out the life of dozens of people. We know about the mass murder that took place in a cafeteria where the target seemed to be primarily women. We know about these. They get a lot of publicity. What we do not know is that the statistics will show in school district after school district across the country these incidents are taking place.

Mr. Speaker, I have been invited to serve as a moderator for a panel, a teleconference, entitled "Challenges in Choices, Violence in the Schools." This teleconference is sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals' urban services office. It is going to take place next Wednesday. The brochure that was sent to me starts as follows: It relates to incidents where young people were murdered or young people were guilty of murdering people in schools. In Pinellas County, FL, for example, an assistant high school principal was killed and another administrator and teacher at that school injured by students who were armed with stolen revolvers. In Garden, KS, two teachers and a junior high school principal were killed by a 14-year-old boy with an automatic rifle. My colleagues did not hear any headlines about this, and there are numerous other incidents that are taking place all across the country that we do not read the headlines, we do not see them on television. They are not in New York City with the media present to publicize it, but it is happening all over, the culture of the gun, the culture of violence. It has taken hold, and this generation, which we could call the Rambo generation because they are fed by films and videos that glorify violence, the Rambo generation marches on, and the shock of having two young people murdered in high school is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, it means that we are one step closer to the collapse of civilization. We are one step closer to the collapse of our society. What will happen next? We will have young people carrying guns into churches and murdering people in churches. It would be another step closer to the collapse of civilization as we know it.

What are we doing to protect our youth from senseless killing? What are we doing as adults? As parents? And, most important, those people who are most responsible for how our society works? What are we doing as legislators? What are we doing as congresspersons to protect our young people? Are we doing all we can do? Or are we wimpishly bowing to a gun lobby and not a committee, civilized actions, to be taken in order to control the manufacture, the sale, and distribution of guns? What is different? What is the difference between our society and other industrialized societies?

Japan, or Germany, or Great Britain, or France; why is it these industrialized societies have a far lower set of casualties as a result of gun play? Why is it that it goes way, way down, the comparisons with Great Britain, and Germany and Japan? It is astonishing in terms of the number of people who have been killed by guns. These societies are able and willing to control the manufacture, distribution, and sale of guns, and this society is not.

The savage, barbaric behavior of a young man who whips out a pistol and shoots dead two students in a high school is horrendous, but in responding or failing to respond the Members of Congress and any other State legislatures or city legislatures are equally as savage and equally as barbaric if they do not take steps to use their power to control the manufacture, sale, and distribution of guns.

I have offered this resolution to repeal the second amendment very seriously. I do not have any illusions about the fate of the resolution in terms of its passage. I do not have any illusions about the possibility of an amendment really taking place because, even if Congress passes it, it has to go to State legislatures.

That is not my goal. My goal is to raise the level of debate, accelerate the level of debate and discussion about the need to control the sale, manufacture, and distribution of guns in our society. The democratic process often works well in the United States. The will of the people is usually carried out sooner or later by their elected legislators and officials. If they do not act to carry out the will of the people, they are going to get removed sooner or later, but not always is it sooner. Sometimes the will of even a very large majority can be thwarted by a small group of single-issue fanatics who use money and threats to intimidate elected representatives so they fail to pass legislation that the overwhelming majority of the people want.

Polls have clearly shown that 75 to 85 percent of the people want some form of gun control, but we do not have gun control, except to a very limited extent, because a small group of intense gun fanatics have perverted the democratic process through threats and in-

timidation of any public figure who dares to speak for and vote for what the overwhelming majority of the people want. Elections never provide a clear expression of public opinion on any single issue since a vote is determined by a number of issues and also by moves and political personalities. Thus the people never send a strong, clear signal in favor of gun control because the system does not give them the opportunity. But the single issue of gun control fanatics are very clear in their message. They send a message which is very powerful in their spending big money to defeat candidates in their letter writing campaigns and their intimidation of many elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, we must give the American people as a whole an opportunity to express their opinion on control and regulation of guns, especially the concealable handguns and the semiautomatics. Let us have a public debate and discussion nationwide to find out whether the people want to turn away from violence.

The second amendment is unnecessary in 1992. The purpose of the second amendment is to assure the people's right to bear arms in a well-regulated militia. Nobody would dream of interfering with the use of guns by the National Guard, the Armed Forces Reserves, which is our well-regulated militia, the Armed Forces Reserves, or any local militia, or the police departments. We are not going to interfere with it, and the right of that kind of well-regulated militia is protected and understood without this amendment being in place.

The second amendment has a very limited purpose and intent. It is very clear the courts have interpreted that it does not mean that we cannot control and regulate guns, the sale, the manufacture, and distribution of guns. Congress can do that. We have the power. But the second amendment has been twisted. Its purpose and intent has been distorted and perverted by gun control fanatics whose view it is that guns may not be regulated or controlled in any way, and they have fooled us, hoodwinked the American people into believing that we cannot control guns. We violate the Constitution if we do so. The second amendment does not say anything like that, but they interpret it that way, and they have managed to convince very large numbers of intelligent people that any gun regulation is unconstitutional.

Are our rights as a free people jeopardized in 1992 by a waiting period for the purchase of a handgun?

□ 1750

Are our rights as a free people jeopardized in 1992 by a criminal investigation of purchases of guns? Are our rights as a free people jeopardized by

the regulation and supervision of gun dealers? Are our rights as a free people jeopardized by severe limitations on the manufacture, import, and sale of semiautomatics and machineguns?

Certainly not. But the gun fanatics tell us the Republic will be in danger if these modest measures are taken by the Congress.

The Congress has the power right now. It can do what is necessary to regulate the manufacture, sale, and distribution of guns.

Only Congress can have the necessary impact. It does no good for New York City to pass strict gun control laws as it has already done, or for New York State to pass strict gun control laws, as it has already done, if the guns are freely available in other States and can be transported across State lines, as they are.

We have only a handful of companies in this country that manufacture guns. Their greed has pushed them to make them more and more attractive. Weapons are more streamlined, more automatic. They fire more bullets, and they are more deadly than ever before. They are smaller and cheaper. So we are pushing guns the way we sell soap at this point.

Only a barbaric society would continue to push deadly weapons as if they were toys, or push deadly weapons as if they were appliances. Here in Washington we have citizens who have taken the initiative and passed an initiative which calls for liability, a gun liability law, which makes the manufacturer, the dealers, and all the people who have connections with the guns, liable when a person is injured or killed by a gun.

There are people in Congress who are fighting that legislation. We need the same legislation across the country in every State and in every city.

Madam Speaker, let me share some articles. I am not going to read them, but I would like for Members to read a series of articles that have appeared in the New York Times. The fourth article appeared today. These articles are about guns and the gun culture, the gun manufacturers, the gun salespeople, the proliferation of guns and what is behind them. This series of articles started in the New York Times on Sunday, March 8, and have appeared every day, March 8, March 9, March 10, and today, March 11. I urge Members and all others who want to take steps to end this barbaric failure to regulate guns to get background on the issue.

Madam Speaker, the CRS, the Congressional Research Service, has also put out extensive information on public opinion with respect to gun control, as well as gun control regulations. When I asked for material from CRS, I was delighted to hear that many Members of Congress have requested the same kind of information, and therefore they have the information readily available.

So I would hope that those Members who are interested and have gotten the information will join me in offering this resolution to repeal the second amendment. I hope also we will take whatever steps are necessary long before the second amendment finds its way onto the floor of Congress to end the savage and barbaric proliferation of guns in our society.

Madam Speaker, I cannot stress too much the accusation that I am making, and that is that we are behaving in a barbaric and savage fashion when we have the power to regulate guns and we refuse to use that power.

Madam Speaker, I would like to call attention to an editorial that appeared in New York Newsday as a reaction of my announcement that I would introduce a resolution to repeal the second amendment.

Madam Speaker, it is entitled "Good Instinct, Wrong Policy: Don't Touch the Bill of Rights." It read as follows: GOOD INSTINCT, WRONG POLICY—DON'T TOUCH THE BILL OF RIGHTS

U.S. Rep. Major Owens is so disturbed by the violence racking his Brooklyn district that he's drafting a resolution that would seek to repeal the Second Amendment—the section of the Bill of Rights that says: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

It's hard to blame Owens for wanting to take drastic action. Since November, three students have been shot to death in the halls of Thomas Jefferson High School in East New York. Homicides in the neighborhood's 75th Precinct, one of the city's most violent, are running ahead of last year's numbers. Still, Owens is misguided as he works to drag the Second Amendment into the cross-hairs.

To the gun lobby, it's an article of faith that the Second Amendment guarantees all Americans an absolute right to pack heat. But the gun lobby—led by the deep-pockets National Rifle Association—is wrong. In 1939, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the amendment does not prohibit the feds from controlling firearms. The court over the years has been more than willing to stick with that wisdom. What's more, says Dennis Hengian, director of the Legal Action Project for the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, the court has never found that the Second Amendment even applies to the states.

So why was the amendment written? Legal scholars say it was drafted to protect citizens from abuses by a large standing army. Before the revolution, the king's troops were sometimes quartered in civilian homes—to the distress of citizens. But because the local militias had been disarmed, citizens had no choice but to comply. The amendment was meant as a guarantee to citizens that such abuses could not happen again.

By "militia," the gun crowd insists, drafters of the Bill of Rights meant a universally armed people, not a specific group. But the Supreme Court has rejected that view. And no less a conservative than former Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger has explained: "It's the simplest thing: a well-regulated militia. If the militia—which is what we now call the National Guard, essentially—has to be well-regulated, in heaven's name why shouldn't we regulate 14-, 15-, 16-

year-old kids having handguns or hoodlums having machine guns?

If nothing else, says Owens, perhaps his resolution will start a useful discussion about the urgent need for stronger gun-control laws. Maybe so. But Congress doesn't need a constitutional amendment to act. It needs a little more backbone in the face of a strident and well-oiled lobbying machine.

Madam Speaker, I welcome the criticism of the New York Newsday editorial, because they have done exactly what I wanted to happen: They have escalated the debate and made the debate more visible. I urge all Members to follow the debate, to follow the kind of reaction which some newspapers, including the Wall Street Journal, have had to the recent outbreak of violence in New York City, and, of course, similar violence which has taken place across the country.

Madam Speaker, the Wall Street Journal had an article on gun manufacturers showing that 65 percent of the guns in the country come from two manufacturers. I think, Madam Speaker, they are based in California.

The series in the New York Times goes further and talks about the entire gun culture, including the fact that we allow films and movies to be promulgated in large numbers which glorify violence.

Congress has gotten very excited and allowed itself in many cases to be stamped on the issues of pornography. We have been quite quiet on violence. There are films which promulgate and glorify violence to no end. "Rambo" and the series of Rambo films probably represents the greatest depth to which profit-hungry Hollywood producers have gone to tap their desire for more violent films.

Our children have been raised on this on television. We have not sought to control the violence on television in any way. There are some countries in this hemisphere who will not allow American films to be shown because they are violent and because they want to control what their youths see with respect to violence.

We at this point are not the only industrialized nation that lacks gun control, but we are among the few. Most nations that are industrialized do have tight control over the manufacture, sale, and distribution of guns.

Madam Speaker, I hope that in the coming weeks and months we will reconsider our position. We have a crime bill that is being negotiated in conference now. That crime bill takes only very timid steps. If you add the Brady amendment, as I understand has been accomplished, the Brady amendment that we passed, the Brady bill that was passed in the House of Representatives, as part of the discussion in that conference, even if you add that bill it is only a timid, small step taken toward the regulation of guns.

Madam Speaker, that bill is obsessed with the death penalty. It adds many,

many Federal requirements that the death penalty be imposed for crimes totally out of step with what reality has shown.

□ 1800

The death penalty has not reduced violence or crimes at all. The States which have executed the most people since the Supreme Court allowed the renewal of punishment by death, those States have the highest crime rates, and they are escalating. The homicide rates are increasing. So the death penalty is not going to solve the problem.

Gun control is a practical way to deal with the most lethal weapon in the crime culture. If we can stop the slaughter of the innocents, we will have taken a great step forward in protecting our people. It is our duty to do that. We should stop acting barbaric. We should stop acting savage.

We should accept our responsibilities and do the civilized thing, foster and promote laws which control the sale, distribution, and manufacture of guns. We can do no more for people like Ian Moore and the other three youngsters, two youngsters who died on the same day.

There is a long list. We could recite them on the floor of this House, and maybe it would be good to recite a list of all the young people who have died in the last few years from gunshot wounds. It might bring us to our senses.

We are not protecting our children. Any civilization that cannot protect its children does not deserve to be called a civilization. I hope we will remember that.

#### DON'T UNDERCUT THE CHINESE STEPCHILDREN OF ADAM SMITH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PELOSI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Madam Speaker, in the wake of the House override of the President's veto this afternoon of the Pelosi resolution, I would like to elaborate on the reasons for my vote to uphold the President's veto.

As the premier democratic legislative body in the world, we have an obligation to reflect American values to the world. In this regard, no one in this body disagrees that the sensibilities reflected in the Pelosi bill are expressive of consensus American politics and social philosophy.

What does exist, however, is a division of opinion on how the United States can best advance its interest in China, how best we can play a constructive role in making the Chinese Government more accountable to the Chinese people, as well as respectful of the rule of law and fundamental human rights.

Here, the question advocates of the Pelosi approach must examine is one of

means, not ends, whether self-righteous congressional indignation advances or undercuts a just cause.

What is at issue is less a question of indignation than judgment. If history is a guide, it would appear that almost every effort to coerce China, whether militarily or through the threat of economic isolation, has not only failed to promote greater political openness but accentuated unpredictable xenophobic nationalism. On the other hand, almost every United States step toward a constructive dialogue has been met with a liberalized response.

Relations between states are always evolving. At issue in this legislation is Chinese external as well as internal politics. Generally speaking, government-to-government relations have the least effect on how countries structure their internal affairs, but often have substantial effect on how they structure their foreign policy. Here, this Congress must understand that in terms of the profoundest issue in international politics today—war and peace—China has generally been moving in a progressive direction.

On the tense Korean peninsula, which the President has described as the greatest threat to regional peace in Northeast Asia, China continues to play a constructive role. Beijing has quietly advised Pyongyang to peacefully accommodate itself to the new realities in international economic as well as security affairs, has objected to the North's attempted acquisition of nuclear weapons, and sought to facilitate peaceful reconciliation between the DPRK and America's ally in Seoul.

In Cambodia, where an advance U.N. team is already in place, China's support was and remains critical to the success of the settlement plan crafted by the permanent five members of the U.N. Security Council. Here I would remind Members that the PRC holds in its power the capacity to undercut this precedent-setting initiative to bring peace and national reconciliation to that tragically war-torn country.

An isolated China is emphatically not in the American national interest. Rather, the United States seeks a China more integrated into the international system—a system which promotes both economic liberalism and transparency, as well as security and stability around the globe. Thus we welcome the fact that China has joined Hong Kong and Taiwan in APEC, recently moved to establish closer ties to American allies in the Middle East, has established normal diplomatic relations with all six members of the ASEAN, as well as Vietnam, and appears moving toward diplomatic normalcy with our close friends in south Korea. We welcome the fact that China has taken a pragmatic approach to the potentially explosive Spratly Island dispute, dramatically lessened tensions with the former Soviet Union, and sub-

stantially expanded commercial ties with the dynamic economies of Taiwan and the Republic of Korea.

With regard to the war in the Persian Gulf, President Bush's magnificent multinational diplomacy hinged on Security Council cooperation. China held a "jokers" card and chose not to play it.

To be particularly poignant, China was more consistently supportive of the President of the United States in voting in the United Nations than the majority American political party was in voting in the United States Congress.

With regard to nonproliferation concerns in the Middle East and elsewhere, supporters of the Pelosi approach are correct in pointing out the destabilizing implications of past Chinese missile and nuclear sales to the region. Yet, if there is to be any hope of establishing, within the frame work of a new world order, agreements on arms restraint, China's cooperation will be vital. Hence it is of import to American diplomacy that China will apparently accede to the NPT this March, and has recently agreed in writing to observe the nonproliferation guidelines of the MTCR.

No one in this Chamber should doubt that playing games with normal trade—daring to isolate China—jeopardizes the security of the State of Israel and any hope of reasonable arms restraint in the Middle East.

As we all understand, in foreign and domestic policy there is a distinction between righteous rhetoric and rightful legislation. The rhetoric brought before the Congress today largely reflects commonsense American heritage. This high-risk legislation, however, virtually defies rational explication.

The irony that undergirds this frustration-laden legislative lodestone is that American foreign policy is on a roll.

Free enterprise, free trade, free politics, are gathering momentum in virtually every corner of the globe. The American Presidency in 1992 has never been more vindicated nor more generally acknowledge as the pinnacle of world leadership than at any time in the history of this century, save perhaps 1918 and 1945.

The current occupant of the White House, who stands uniquely as a professional diplomat as well as politician, a former resident envoy in the country to which this Congress is incredulously indicating it wants to preempt foreign policy leadership, has indicated in the strongest possible terms that passage of the legislation being contemplated today would be deeply damaging to the American national interest.

I recognize that economic sanctions are sometimes appropriate—as was the case with apartheid South Africa—and that in areas of foreign commerce the Constitution gives plenary authority

to the Congress. Yet in a world in transition, a world in which international economics and the communications revolution are ineluctably combining to erode the isolationist walls of the Asian Leninist regimes and thus accelerate their eventual demise, this Congress would be well advised to give the benefit of the doubt to the President and assist in crafting a nondivisive, bipartisan approach to Sino-American relations. After all, what is at stake is the future of our relations with a teeming one-fifth of the world's entire population.

In this context, termination of MFN for China would have the perverse effect of impacting most severely on those elements of China we most want to support: The free-wheeling provincial economics and entrepreneurs in the coastal provinces and South China who have become integrated into the world economy.

Revocation of MFN would strengthen the hand of hard-liners in Beijing who seek the reimposition of bureaucratic central controls over the flourishing, decentralized, nonstate sector of the economy and who advocate the reimposition of Marxist-Leninist-Mao Zedong orthodoxy in politics, philosophy, the arts, and science.

Revocation of MFN would seriously jeopardize the economic future of Hong Kong and impact adversely on Taiwan. In addition, to the extent revocation of MFN strains ties between Washington and Beijing, it might also possibly tempt Beijing to raise anew the status of Taiwan as a divisive issue in Sino-American relations.

From a Midwestern agricultural perspective, playing Russian roulette with China-MFN would be the equivalent of embargoing American soybean sales.

During a period in which it is crucial that America coordinate its foreign policy with allies, our action on MFN would be entirely unilateral and wholly out of step with our allies. Two years after Tiananmen, no American ally is prepared to follow our lead. Do we advance our Asian diplomacy by simultaneously straining American relations with China and Japan?

Most importantly, revocation of MFN would reverse America's historic open-door policy to China in favor of a counterproductive bolted-door approach, unilaterally ceding our progressive influence to the mercantilist influence of others or possibly moving a China in transition in a chaotic, autarchic direction.

At issue from the perspective of the Chinese people is whether their country is going to be economically brought into the 21st century ala an evolving democratic Taiwan or whether economic stagnation and collapse will lead to a replication of the chaos and disappointment that followed the October 1911 revolution. For those who want to give history a push, let me remind this

body that just 30 years ago, during the disastrous great leap forward, 2 million people starved to death in a single Chinese prefecture. Does this Congress dare suggest that it is a humanitarian policy to slam shut America's traditional open-door policy and shut down the free enterprise movement that has allowed China to feed its burgeoning population?

Let me close by quoting one of our profoundest observers of the Asian scene, Dr. Robert Scalapino, from the latest issue of *Foreign Affairs*. "Leninism in its traditional form is doomed," he writes, "with the only issue being that of the timing of demise and means of exit. An open economy and a closed policy cannot long coexist. As the socialist states turn outward, seeking capital, technology and markets from the dynamic economies around them \* \* \* the old order cannot possibly be sustained."

Two decades ago a group of French foreign journalists interviewed Chou En-Lai and asked, among other things, what he thought was the historical significance of the French Revolution, to which he responded, "It is too early to tell."

It strikes me it may be too early to tell the exact ramifications of the profound socio-economic changes occurring in China. But it is certain that the ramifications are deep, and that they involve the near total de-legitimizing of the Chinese Communist Party. Whether political liberalization will occur this week, next year, or 5 years from now, progressive change is almost certain to occur. To invoke a concept from China's long and extraordinary cultural heritage, the mandate of heaven has been removed from China's Communist rulers by those rulers.

This Congress should and must continue to vigorously speak out on behalf of freedom and democracy for China. We owe it to ourselves as well as the Chinese people. But we must also have the humility and sense of perspective to see that we cannot unilaterally bring about a rapid transition to democracy in China. To attempt to do so not only disrespects the limits of our power, but ironically strengthens the gerontocrats in Beijing by validating their hard-line propaganda against us. It puts foreign pressure by the United States at issue, not the egregious and brutal misrule of the Chinese Communist Party.

And in a geostrategic context, with the prospect of major conflict in the Asia-Pacific region at a historic low tide, this is not the time for Congress to create new tension and instability by unilaterally declaring a new cold war.

The Pelosi approach assumes that the United States, through a conditional approach to MFN, can unilaterally compel an accelerated transition to a more pluralistic and humane form of Chinese governance.

This high-risk, hubristic, unilateral policy approach not only overestimates American power, but it is heedless of the moral and cultural nuances of the last 100 years of Chinese interaction with the outside world. It puts the policies of the United States at issue, rather than the sorry performance of the Government in Beijing. It risks triggering a xenophobic counter-reaction by hard-liners in Beijing, who will denounce these conditions as a humiliating ultimatum from a hostile foreign power.

It is not without significance to this debate today that an authoritative February editorial in China's *People's Daily*—intended to signal support for bolder policies of reform and opening—was entitled "Opening Up to the Outside World and Making Use of Capitalism." The article stated that modern Chinese history shows that it "can only grow and prosper by making correct use of capitalism, not totally renouncing it, and by critically absorbing, not categorically rejecting, things in Western culture that could be useful to us."

For those who believe—as I do—that free economics drives free politics, can it possibly be rational to pass legislation today that, through miscalculation or design, undercuts the Chinese stepchildren of Adam Smith and allows a tightening of the reins of economic as well as political power by the discredited disciples of Marx, Lenin, and Mao?

The President has pursued a centrist approach, balancing competing American concerns through professional, tough-minded diplomacy.

The other body would be well advised to support the President, recognizing that House concerns for human rights are well-founded, but not well advanced by the Pelosi resolution.

□ 1810

#### FULL DISCLOSURE OF PRACTICES AT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BANK

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

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening with a rather heavy heart to discuss a subject that is certainly very much on the minds of my colleagues today, and a subject that will be the primary focus of legislative debate and action. It is the subject of the House bank.

Madam Speaker, first of all I want to say that I am extending a personal invitation to any of my colleagues who would like to debate this subject, recognizing that there will be ample time allotted for debate tomorrow and perhaps Friday for this subject, but to invite any of my colleagues who would like to discuss this subject tonight on

the Record to come down to the floor and participate in this special order, particularly my colleagues who make up the rest of the so-called Gang of Seven.

I would simply acknowledge that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] is here, and I anticipate that other Members of the Gang of Seven will arrive to participate in this special order.

Let me, if I might, dispel a few myths regarding our group, since we have come in for, I guess, our share of occasional ridicule or criticism, particularly from inside-the-beltway pundits back here, those who said initially, when this matter came to light last summer and we took up the cause of keeping the issue alive in the hopes, ultimately, of full disclosure and congressional accountability which might lead to some fundamental and long-overdue reforms that are very badly needed around this place.

When we first took up this issue last summer, one pundit described us as sitting in our high chairs banging our spoons. Just over the weekend another pundit said that we have not been in the House of Representatives long enough to know where the House Bank is.

Let me just say that is completely wrong and inaccurate. We come from, our group, different walks of life, but we all run for Congress and were elected in 1990 on platforms of congressional reform.

We are simply here this evening, and prior to this time, and certainly in the next 48 hours, trying to remain true to fundamental commitments that we made on the campaign trails to our constituents to push hard for congressional accountability and congressional reform.

Some people around this institution say that with respect to how much disclosure we ought make with respect to the House bank check cashing privileges, and those Members of Congress who routinely and frequently and very systematically abused that privilege, that we ought to remember the importance of protecting the institution. Some people go as far as to suggest that we ourselves, even as new Members of Congress, are traditionally bound to protect the institution.

I say that, to the contrary, we are duty-bound to uphold the public trust by fully revealing the names of all Members, all 355 past and present Members, and I guess it breaks down 296 current Members, 59 former Members of Congress, who at one time or the other during this 39-month period from July of 1988, though I guess that would not work, so I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] if he can reflect on that, but over the 39-month period, let us put it this way, that ended in December of last year, December 1991, those Members, those

355 Members who at one time or the other during that 39-month period bounced at least one check at the House bank.

We believe that that information must and should become a matter of public record. It should be subject to public and media scrutiny. It should be made available to the constituents of those respective Members, to the voters in their congressional districts, so that the voters can take that information into account when making their voting decisions in the spring primary elections or the general elections to come later this fall.

Believe it or not, Madam Speaker, our Gang of Seven are all under sort of a cockeyed notion that we really can trust the people. We can trust their wisdom and their good judgment to discern between those who perhaps on occasion made a human error, a simple, understandable mistake of some sort, a miscalculation in maintaining their checking account, or who in fact, as we now know, were the victims of sloppy recordkeeping or clerical errors actually committed by the staff of the House bank.

We believe that the public can discern between those individuals and those who are frankly guilty of repeated and systematic abuse of the House bank that borders on criminal conduct, those Members who have been described as gaming the system.

So it is our belief, our Gang of Seven, that a vote tomorrow, or if it is delayed until Friday, in support of the compromise crafted by the Committee on Ethics to release the names of only the 24 most serious abusers, 19 present Members, 5 former Members, will be wrong. It will be fundamentally and ethically wrong.

When this body begins to compromise on matters such as this, we frankly show a true disregard, perhaps even a contempt, for the public trust. This body must realize as a self-policing body that only we have the ability and the power within our grasp to hold one another accountable, to uphold the public trust, and to show that we understand that we must put matters of principle before politics, that there simply is, when it comes to the question of congressional ethics, no compromise.

Let me go back, for those of my fellow Americans and my constituents who might be looking in, and review a little history, because I frankly anticipate the debate coming tomorrow, and again perhaps on Friday, will become quite heated and we frankly may see a great deal of heat and smoke and not much light. So I think it is important that we, at the outset here of our special order tonight, sort of lay the factual groundwork for the debate to come over the next 48 hours.

□ 1820

Last week the House ethics committee voted by a 4-10 margin to identify

only 24 of the 66 current and former Members of Congress who wrote about, and this is a staggering figure, 20,000 bad checks totaling more than \$10.8 million. I quote from Phyllis Schlafly's column in today's Washington Times, which is really excellent, and she said, "Let's call this 'compromise' what it really is: A coverup and a whitewash."

The ethics committee compromise had four dissenting Republicans," and I want to mention them for the RECORD. Those are my colleagues, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL], and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] said on that occasion, this "compromise 'won't pass the smell test' with the American people," and he is right.

"The excuse given for hiding the names of the other 42 Members of Congress," that rather notorious group of 66 Members, according to the chairman of both the full committee and the ad hoc committee investigating the House bank scandal, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], was that the ethics committee agreed " \* \* \* to reveal only the names of those who overdrew their accounts by more than one month's pay at least eight times during the 39-month period," reviewed by the GAO audit and subsequently the Ethics Committee. That is a rather arbitrary and subjective standard, it seems to me, and it certainly begs the question in the minds of our constituents and average Americans: Would they not appreciate having this ability to go to their local bank and write a check up to their next month's salary, or next month's pay, and in the process being able to take advantage of the float from other Members' money and live consistently above their means?

This proposal is, frankly, unacceptable and, of course, it paints too many Members of this institution with the same brush.

So I want to again establish just how widespread this bad check kiting, this gaming of the system, this racket that, yes, perhaps this new Member of Congress was not aware of by virtue of the fact I had been here such a short period of time. But frankly, if anyone had ever suggested to me that this sort of routine abuse could occur at the House bank, I would have been very much taken aback, and I even then would have taken steps to investigate it on my own accord to ascertain the truth.

But again, it came out from the Ethics Committee last week that 296 current and 59 former Members of Congress were overdrawn at least once during the 39-month period under investigation. Coincidentally, that is the same time period in which the Congress raised its pay from an annual salary of \$89,500 to \$96,000 in January 1990, and to \$125,100 in January 1991.

The bad check scandal started last October when the General Accounting Office reported to the House leadership, the Democratic leadership of the House that 8,331 checks had been written on the House bank by Congressmen who had insufficient funds in their respective checking accounts to cover those checks. This information was subsequently revealed, and I can recall sitting in the back of the Chamber when Speaker FOLEY took the House floor and said, and I quote him now, "This is now a matter that is over and done with." And that is sort of akin to the Speaker standing up here in the well and I believe, and I said this the other day on the House floor that it was only the second time during this session, the second time when he concluded in very eloquent and moving terms the historic debate on the Persian Gulf resolution, so it was only the second time during this legislative session that he stood in the well and spoke, and basically what he said is that, "We haven't done anything wrong and we won't do it again."

Then our group, the group who has become known as the Gang of Seven, all freshmen who were elected on fundamentally the same platform of reform of Congress, got together and we said to ourselves this will not stand and we simply cannot allow this to be swept under the rug.

So we have before us, I guess, and coming up a very explosive political debate. I do not think anyone in this Chamber will dispute that fact. But I am hopeful that we can somehow set aside the immediate political consequences and impacts and step up and do the right thing, because frankly this matter still has a long way to go before it is completely aired out.

Let me just say one other thing. I participated in a press conference last week, and I was the one who said, and I think I have taken some criticism for saying this, and here I called into play my experience as a former law enforcement officer, having worked 6½ years in California law enforcement as a police officer, and a deputy sheriff, and having conducted criminal investigations, I said that if this kind of behavior were to occur in the public sector or the public arena it would border on criminal conduct. So when I went home to my district last week I called my local district attorney, described to him and confirmed for him the press account that he had read regarding this brewing scandal, and I said under California penal code do you think further criminal investigation, with an eye toward prosecution, would have been warranted. And he said under the criminal code section in California governing insufficient funds that yes, absolutely, a criminal investigation would have been warranted.

Furthermore, I want to point out that when the House bank paid the bad

checks up to the amount of each House Member's next monthly paycheck, that amounted to an interest-free loan, a sort of a low-cost, no-fee revolving credit line that Members of Congress did not have to qualify for using conventional loan underwriting criteria. That certainly then begs the question: Did those Congressmen report those interest-free loans as taxable income, which is exactly how the IRS views such amounts, or as gifts, with House rules to be disclosed. I daresay that is rather unlikely. The House rule on financial disclosure, House rule XLIV, requires reporting any liabilities that exceed \$10,000 at any time during the year. That is a requirement under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978. Again, reports coming from the Ethics Committee inquiry indicate that more than 50 Members wrote bad checks totaling in excess of \$100,000. So it is likely that some Members of Congress did indeed breach the \$10,000 threshold and failed to report their indebtedness, their loan liability as again required under the Ethics in Government Act as part of their annual financial disclosure.

Furthermore, the House Code of Official Conduct, House rule XLIII, states Members' conduct "shall reflect credibility on the House of Representatives." Surely that rule prohibits writing bad checks and then ordering them paid by the bank under your control.

So I do not believe that defenders of the bad check practice here at the House bank have a leg to stand on. This bank was run by House officers. It is staffed by our employees, and the combined public payroll for salaries paid to employees of the House bank amounts to about \$750,000 a year.

As Phyllis Schlafly again points out in her column today, "If you accept the argument that the overdrafts were just salary advances, that itself makes the bank an official Government institution because the employer was the U.S. Government." The bank was managed by the House Sergeant at Arms who ordered the bank to pay out an estimated 19 bad checks of his own with overdrafts totaling more than \$10,000. So the rationale coming from the majority on the Ethics Committee who have voted for this compromise, their defense, if you will, of the wrongdoers is that bad check cashing has been going on by the House bank for many, many years. That is true. That is absolutely true, ladies and gentlemen. In fact, there have been prior occasions where the House bank had to be bailed out by the taxpayers, and that is what makes this latest example all the more galling, not just to this Member of Congress, joined by my colleagues in the Gang of Seven, but I am sure more galling as again an example of an abuse of privilege to the American people.

□ 1830

So that argument, I will predict to you, ladies and gentlemen, ultimately is not going to wash. Everybody out there in America is not doing it. In fact, about the only place that I can think of a practice such as this being conducted, and in many, many cases at least tacitly condoned, is the House of Representatives with our bank, our co-operative check-cashing privilege totally within our control. It is not going to wash with the American people. They are not doing it. Only the Congress is doing it, and the American people are absolutely fed up with this sort of arrogance and abuse of privilege.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Let me first commend the gentleman for his foresight in calling this special order tonight to have an opportunity to discuss some of the concerns that many of us have expressed over the course of the last several months concerning the actions here in the House of Representatives, in particular in this situation, the House bank, although if you listened to some Members, they say it is not a bank. They say this is different than a banking institution, that this is really just a sort of a privilege of the House, and this really does not run like a bank and, as a result, it should not be treated like a bank, and we should treat this somehow differently. That has been the argument continually throughout this past several months until just the other day when one of the members of the Ethics Committee who supports this, the coverup, the 24 names, said that, well, one of the reasons that they cannot release the names is because banks do not release names of account holders and how much money is in the account. Either it is a bank or it is not a bank.

I mean, if it is a bank, when it is convenient for your excuse not to release names of account holders, and if it is not a bank if it is convenient to say that, we should not be held to the same requirements of a bank, so it sounds to me that we are just creating excuses to do things that we do not want to do, and what obviously the majority does not want to do is release the names of the people who have been abusing the House bank and fully disclose to let the American people decide.

That really brings me to the fundamental point here, and I think it is very consistent with what the majority has done consistently with their policies here in the House. When I heard of the Ethics Committee report and the majority's report when they said, well, we are going to draw the line here, we are going to decide here in Washington, here in Congress, we are going to decide for you, the American public, what an abuser is, we know best, you see, we

are in Washington, we are smart here, we understand how things work, we know best for you. In other words, we do not trust you, America, that if you are given all the information, you will be able to act responsibly with it; you will be irresponsible; you will look at someone who bounced one check and say he is an abuser as much as someone who bounced 100 checks; you cannot be trusted with this responsibility, with this information. You just cannot handle it. And, as a result, Big Brother is going to make that decision for you. We are going to make the decision as to who the abusers are, and we will punish those people, and just do not worry about the rest. It is absolutely consistent with the philosophy of the liberal Democratic leadership to say that Washington knows better, that we should take responsibility from you instead of allowing you to take responsibility for yourselves and for your actions of your own Congressmen and for our own community.

I find a very clear parallel between the philosophy of the leadership of this Congress and the philosophy that is being shown here with regard to the House banking situation.

I also wanted to express with regard to the Ethics Committee and their report. I wanted to compliment, as the gentleman did, the four minority members who put forth the minority views, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], for the fine work they have done and really well-written minority views that really get to the heart of the problem. They sort of try to cover both ends in a sense by naming abusers, saying that here are the  $x$  number of people who are obvious abusers, at least in our opinion, but this is our opinion. We will let you decide whether you agree, and we will release the rest of the names. We are going to call these people abusers, but, America, if you do not believe, you know, if you do not believe that definition, we are going to give you the opportunity to decide it. We are going to release the rest of the names. Here they are, here is in part their account activity for you to be able to make judgments, and let the chips fall where they may.

I think that was a cogently put together minority view and properly addressed the issue and tried at the same time to reach across and cover both areas where we identified abusers pursuant to the resolution and also we allow for public disclosure which I think is what the American public, the American public will demand, is demanding, and will expect, and accept nothing less than full disclosure.

The gentleman was talking about how the money, how the money could have been public funds or not public

funds, and he really talked about whether this really is a question of public funds being used, and although I think the question of public moneys and the use of money is appropriate. I mean, if you look at the way these Members, a lot of Members, were using their accounts, it is no wonder we are running huge deficits with the absolute disregard for the balancing and keeping payments level. It really is more of a question of character, that everyone knows, and I know, that you are not supposed to bounce checks. I mean, it is just against the law in most States, but, well, this really is not a bank; we were allowed to do this.

I was informed several months before this investigation, I was told that if you overdraw your account, by someone who had been around a long time, that there is no penalty involved, and, you know, this is OK. I said, "But you are not supposed to write checks in an amount that you do not have the money in there unless, of course, you have overdraft protection, or you are going to take a loan out, and you have a line of credit, and then that is perfectly acceptable." "Oh, no you do not need a line of credit. You just write the bad check, and they will just hold it until you have the money in there, and they will just pay it off."

Well, that is wrong. I mean, that is not what we should do. I mean, it is not a matter of, well, did he abuse it, did he or she do something that was clearly wrong, and that America knows that in their heart is wrong; it gets to a question of whether public funds were used, and I will get in a little discussion of that. But that is really the minor issue here.

It is the people who are running the United States of America through being here as a Representative in Congress, are these people acting in a way that shows to the children of America that they have responsible leadership, who are going to be role models for them, who are going to leave them a future, or are these people who are going to be absolutely disregarding not only their personal character but how is that going to reflect on what goes on here in the Congress? I think that is a very serious issue, and one that sometimes I think gets glossed over as to how many taxpayers' dollars or cents or whatever are used here.

With regard to that, I think that there are two issues. The gentleman mentioned several. I wanted to highlight one in particular, because I think, of all the ones, it is the most biting, and that is the ramifications with regard to the Internal Revenue Service.

I am a lawyer. I do not freely admit that. But I am a lawyer, and I practiced a little tax law in my day, and I know that if I got a loan from a family member or a friend, and they said, "Well, you know, it is just a loan; you know, you are in tough shape right

now. You know, we will lend you a few hundred dollars, whatever it is," and that if I do not have to pay interest on that loan, if that is money lent to me and I do not have to pay interest, I have to claim on my income tax form what is called imputed interest. The Internal Revenue Service sets forth how much the minimum amount you are allowed to charge or you must charge for a loan, whatever it is.

OK, in a commercial setting, an arm's-length transaction, you are required by the Internal Revenue Service to report income to the amount that you did not have to pay that person in interest, because in a sense you have kept the money that you would have normally had to pay. It is called imputed interest or imputed income.

If you have Members of Congress with thousands and thousands of dollars over long periods of time who have interest-free loans, that is clearly, clearly under any bank or nonbank, whatever you want to call it, under any circumstance, that is imputed income that must be reported to the IRS. I have no idea whether it was or not. We certainly have not looked at any of the Members' tax forms. But it is my guess that what you will find is that money probably was not, because I am not too sure it could accurately be estimated, because of the amount of activity, I mean, the amazing amount of activity in some of these checking accounts.

So what you probably have is a clear violation of the Internal Revenue Code which obviously, if you commit some violation of law as a Member of the House, serving here in the House, it is a violation of the ethics code, so you have clear ethics, legal and ethics violations plus you have taxpayers' money, because otherwise you would have been paying money into the Internal Revenue Service, into the Treasury for the money that you would have had to pay in interest.

□ 1840

So that is a very clear violation of the law, a very clear use of public funds in a sense because you are not paying the money that is owed, and a very clear violation of the ethics code.

The other thing, and this gets more to the hypothetical and this is something that will only be fully determined if it is disclosed as to the amounts of the checks written and the timing of those checks and looking if we can somewhat objectively as to when those checks were written.

There are a lot of press reports that have been circulated regarding the possibility of Members writing large checks prior to elections to finance campaigns, either last minute expenditures on campaign advertising or bills that are coming due that they need to pay off. That is clearly a violation of the Federal Elections Code. You cannot use this. You have to get the money

from either an individual and only in a certain amount or from yourself or from a qualified political action committee.

Writing checks, personal loans or other loans, have to be reported and if they were not reported, it is a violation of the Federal Election Law, another potential violation and a potential illegitimate use of public funds.

The last point I wanted to make, and those are the two points I wanted to make with regard to public funds and the use of the money, the last point I wanted to make and I think it is an important point, and that is who was running this institution and its effect on a lot of the Members out there.

One of the big fears I know that a lot of Members have who thought that they were running surpluses in their accounts, that they were not bouncing any checks and they found out, to their amazement, that they were overdrawn or had insufficient funds in a couple instances over the past few years. There are many, many Members in that position. The reason they are in that position is because the people who ran that institution, the same people, by the way, who run the House Post Office, who run the House restaurant and absolutely mismanage the institution of the Congress are the people who have to be held accountable for what goes on. What they have done is mismanaged this institution and mismanaged that bank to where many, many Members had either insufficient funds, when if you go and talk to them they clearly had, according to their records, money in that account, but for some reason or another, a deposit that was hand-delivered to the Sergeant at Arms Office never got deposited for 2 weeks, and they had checks written and no money there to cover it.

If there is any reticence on my part, it is that there are going to be Members who are going to show up with a few insufficient fund checks who in all likelihood through absolutely no fault of their own, only because of the absolute horrible way that the House bank was run.

The only people who should stand here and take the fall for that, as well as taking the fall for all the other mismanagement that is going on in this institution, is the House Democratic leadership. They appoint the Sergeant at Arms. They appoint the postmaster. They run this institution and have mismanaged this institution.

I would suspect that you would find a heck of a lot less than 355 Members of Congress on that list had they just run that banking institution like any normal credit union or bank and had the same kind of procedure and the same kind of recordkeeping.

I think it was a real disservice, if I can speak out in defense of my colleagues, it is a real disservice to many Members of Congress who honestly

tried to keep good books that the mismanagement of this institution is going to cause them embarrassment and the possibility of having to sit and explain to the people back home who are darn mad and have every right to be, to explain that, "Hey, my books show one thing. They just didn't credit my account for certain deposits."

So the other culprit in this whole thing is the leadership of this institution, the Democratic leadership of this institution who have mismanaged this institution to throw a lot of Members into the frying pan along with the people who are abusing it. That definitely should be brought out and made a point.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California for giving me time and allowing me the opportunity to share some thoughts with the gentleman. It has been a pleasure working with the gentleman and the other Members who have fought very diligently here in Washington and all over the country really to make sure that the public is made aware of this thing, that we keep the pressure on here and that the public is served and the public will be served in this institution.

Mr. RIGGS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very illuminating comments. I would certainly want his constituents and our fellow Americans looking in to know that he has been a real leader in our efforts to bring about full accountability in this situation. He has been very aggressive about this matter.

Before I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, another Member of the Gang of Seven, let me just simply echo a couple points that were made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

The gentleman mentioned the fact that ultimately the leadership of this institution has to bear some blame, some responsibility, hopefully some accountability for what has occurred, and I could not agree more.

We are a Fortune 500-sized employer in this institution. We have over 30,000 employees on Capitol Hill.

I think it was another one of our Gang of Seven, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], who made the point the other day that if in fact we were any kind of private corporation or private business entity, the leadership, the chief executive officers of this organization would have been let go, shall we say, that is putting it politely, a long time ago by the shareholders of the organization, which in this case would be the American people, the American voters.

Just again, setting the backdrop for the debate to come over the next 48 hours, the Ethics Committee—this is a very, very important point to make here—the Ethics Committee found that the abuses of the House bank, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

SANTORUM] was just suggesting, were well-known to the Democratic leadership, the House Sergeant at Arms and to the General Accounting Office, which is the investigative arm of Congress.

I might add that our group, the Gang of Seven, have now filed a formal freedom of information request with the GAO trying to compel the release, release to us, and of course we would in turn want to share it with the public at large, of the GAO audits.

But among the other committee findings were the following key facts: First the GAO detailed 10 full-time auditors to help the committee reconstruct the history of bad check writing by House Members. Facts from as yet undisclosed GAO audits show that House leaders were warned of a growing number of overdrafts every year since 1955.

In 1969, noting that the number of bad checks written by House Members had suddenly tripled, they actually had tripled over the previous 10 years, the GAO stated its concern that lawmakers' unpaid checks were being allowed to accumulate in excess of a month's future salary, but House leaders failed to act.

Over the next 7 years, rubber checks written by House Members totaled a high of 12,309 checks in 1972 and a low of 8,428 in 1976, again according to GAO audits.

From 1973 to 1976, well over half of all House Members wrote bad checks.

The Comptroller General expressed growing concern each year about the bad check problem, these same reports show, but again no corrective action was taken by the House leadership. So I wanted to point that out.

I guess I should also add that starting in 1977 when the GAO audits were first made public, there was no further criticism of the overdraft problem, no call for new or move vigorously enforced regulations to stop the problem. To the contrary, as we have now seen, the problem continued to grow and fester.

The totals of Members' yearly overdrafts were masked in report line items labeled, "due from Members," or "amount receivable from Members" that reflected overdrafts only for the last day of a 6-month audit period.

Last, according to yesterday's Washington Times, a very disturbing revelation. In April 1991, 3 months before the two GAO audits that led to the current scandal, a Riggs National Bank executive vice president advised the wife of the Speaker, who happens also to be his chief of staff, of the extent of the bad check problem, which he termed as "habitual salary advances."

□ 1850

David L. Brown, the Riggs official, told Mrs. Foley in a letter that the practice could be continued or eliminated but enforcement problems could

be expected if the overdrafts system was discontinued.

So, again, there is no way, given a situation with this sort of scope, that we can attempt on this House floor to engage in damage control. The only thing that we can do at this point in time is provide the information to the American people through the American media and allow the people, themselves, to make, again, the sort of discerning judgments that must be made to bring about accountability for the Congress collectively and individually in cases of corruption as fundamental as this.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam, Speaker, I say to the gentleman that I appreciate his putting together this special order and the fine work he has done in explaining to the public this evening the problems that we have.

You know, the question is often asked: Why is the public so upset about this? This is just the tip of a very large iceberg, and it is sort of the last straw that the public feels, I think, that something has to be done. If you look back, in the fall of 1990 Congress told the people, "Things are tough, we have got to raise taxes," and they did. They put on a very large tax increase. And as much as this body likes to talk about soaking the rich and always putting taxes on the rich, they raised the gasoline tax by over 50 percent on the American people, they put in a tax on boats and yachts that, in my district alone, closed one outboard marine plant and dropped the other two's employment by 50 percent, and that is how they soak the rich.

But they said, "Things are tough, we have got to do that, we have got to cut Medicare because things are tough." At the end of the "things are tough" speech, they said, "By the way, we are raising our salary by 38 percent."

Then people wonder why there is a loss of respect for the Congress.

In the fall of 1991 we learned of the check-kiting scandal and we learned at the same time that there were hundreds of thousands of dollars of restaurant bills for the House restaurant that went all the way back to 1986. And then we learned also recently of the House Post Office, the embezzlement at the House Post Office. It is a contract post office, it is not a post office with members of the Post Office Department; it is a House contract post office. It was also selling cocaine.

Then, of course, in the fall of 1991 Roll Call questioned, when the House check-kiting question came up, they questioned 435 members of Congress. They reported the results of that in Roll Call.

In that, 20 people said they bounced checks, 77 did not respond, and 338 said

they had not bounced checks. And now the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has released a report that says 296 current Members of Congress bounced checks.

So, I say to the gentleman from California there are 200 people in this body that the public sees as having some explaining to do.

Now, I think you can see then why the public is concerned. In the winter of this year, while we were home on winter break, we had a deficit from the last half of the 102d Congress of \$260 billion or more and we had a proposed deficit for this half of the 102d Congress of somewhere between \$300 billion and \$400 billion. In the middle of a recession, the Speaker of this body authorized the spending of tens of thousands of dollars for marble for elevators for this House.

Now, with the summation of all the things I have talked about here in just a little over 2 years we ask, "Why is the public upset at the Congress and the House of Representatives?" Yet all of the blame that the Congress gets for this need not be pointed to Congress as a body; it was done by individuals.

I did not get a chance to vote or debate whether or not we should put tens of thousands for marble in House elevators. I was not consulted, and I am sure the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] was not consulted.

I am concerned that the public now sees 200 of our Members in conflict with their statements of just 6 months ago in the check-kiting matter.

We asked for an independent counsel to be appointed to investigate the House Post Office scandal, the cocaine selling, the embezzlement there. We were told that the leadership, the Democrat leadership in the House, would take care of it; clearly a conflict, I feel, for that investigation.

Many of us asked that the violators be named in the check-kiting situation 6 months ago. We were told, no, the leadership would take care of it and there would be an investigation and it all would become apparent soon.

Nothing is happening in this way, and the public sees that nothing is happening toward reform, and that is why the public is angry.

Madam Speaker, the public is sick. My portion of the public, in my district, is sick at what is happening. They are demanding reform.

In the old days, in the Old Testament, when you had sinned, the Lord required that you rend your garment and put on ashes and sackcloth to show you were repenting, show you were changing and going another way. I do not necessarily think we have to rend our garments and put on sackcloth, but we have to send a message to the public that we are changing the direction of this House, that we are changing the arrogance and the special privileges that this House has allowed a few of its Members.

Now, we as Republicans, the seven of us as Republicans, have demanded this for 6 months. I hope tomorrow our conference will demand the same. I think full disclosure of those who have bounced checks in this body is the message, is the signal of reform that needs to be sent. And then we need to proceed with reform throughout this House in trying to regain the public confidence.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of participating with the gentleman in this matter.

Mr. RIGGS. I think the gentleman for his extremely eloquent remarks and all of his contributions in pressing forward in the face of some considerable resistance. I am sure the gentleman has encountered the same sort of feedbacks on occasion as I have; namely, the comments and suggestions by certain constituents and some of the more cynical members of the media who suggested that our efforts are certainly not going to endear us to the rest of our colleagues in this institution.

I am sure the gentleman feels, as I do, that that really is a peripheral consideration at this point in time, that we have a more fundamental duty not only to uphold the public trust but to recognize that our effectiveness, our credibility as an institution, our ability to forge farsighted policy, hopefully on a bipartisan basis where compromise is truly possible, depends on popular support. And unless we enjoy that popular support, our ability again as a deliberative legislative body is truly and dramatically hindered.

I thank the gentleman for his contributions tonight and look forward to working with him further.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who has been a true leader in our efforts here.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank the distinguished Member from California for reserving the time tonight to talk about what really is a very important issue in the minds of our constituents. It is an important issue when it comes to the future of this institution, the U.S. House of Representatives.

You know, this history of the House bank and the problem that we are seeing today is not anything new. Congressional Quarterly about a month ago outlined the 150-year history of the House bank. On at least three occasions that we know of over the course of this 150 years the taxpayers have had to come along and bail out this bank.

So, now we are here, they say at this point in time that no taxpayer funds were involved. I have no reason to doubt the word that they put out. But the fact is that over the last 3 years there have been repeated attempts by the General Accounting Office and others to bring changes to the operation of the House bank so that this problem could be eliminated.

Now, something is wrong. Over the course since early 1988, the GAO made it clear that the overdraft problem in the bank had to be addressed, something ought to be done. The leadership in the Speaker's office was notified, the House Sergeant at Arms was notified. And through all of this, on various occasions, I would say at least three or four occasions since 1988, attempts have been made by the GAO to get the House leadership to do something about the problem in the House bank. Nothing has been done.

□ 1900

Madam Speaker, we have been through all the details about what has happened in the bank over the last 6 months, but the fact is that in my hands here I have got the report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives with regard to the House bank, and I did not know that it took this many pages and this many words in order to say, "cover-up, whitewash," and the fact is that the people that live at home, our constituents and people around America, are not going to settle for us hanging 24 people, the worst 24 offenders out there, and saying that we have taken care of the problem.

Madam Speaker, there is really only one way to deal with this whole issue, and that is what has been called for, full disclosure, and I think there are three important reasons why we ought to have full disclosure:

One is that the American public sees this institution as being out of step. They see us unwilling to be accountable to the people who sent us here. They willingly really want us to be accountable, and we have an opportunity this week to take a giant step forward and showing the American public we are willing to be accountable, that we are willing to take the first step in trying to restore our credibility with the people who sent us here to represent their interests.

Second, I would say that the people at home have a right to know what their Member of Congress does when it comes to Washington. Now we are not talking about revealing someone's private bank records here because the fact is we are not talking about releasing the checks themselves, but we have got an institution called the House bank that several Supreme Courts have indicated that the money in the House bank is public money until such time as the Sergeant at Arms actually issues the money to the customer, the account holder; in other words, a Member of Congress. So, we are talking about Members using public money that they have no permission to use, and I think that the folks back home have a right to know that.

The third point I would bring up is trying to do what the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct did by

drawing the line at 24. It just is not going to do it. Drawing the line at 55; that is not going to do it. Wherever we attempt to draw the line, it is nothing more than an arbitrary line, so we really ought to, in fact, do the right things, and that is to release all of the information.

But now releasing all the information causes concern, especially for what I am going to guess is about half of the 296 Members, half the 296, the bottom half, those who may have bounced an occasional check here or there or are going to be accused of a bounced check because of the sloppy practices that we had in the House bank itself. I would say that those Members of Congress can come forward. They can come clean by laying out for their constituents just what happened. Most people have bounced a check or two during their lifetime. They understand that they have made an error in their account, and wrote a check and did not realize there were insufficient funds in there, and I think people will understand that.

So, Madam Speaker, I would say there is only one way to solve that, and that is fully disclosure. If we only take this short step to hang out 24 Members, I am going to warn this Congress that the American people are going to march on this building. The American people are not going to sit home and be satisfied with only 24 names. They want to know it all, and we ought to put it all out there.

The other issue here is that we are going to have full disclosure. It may not be this week, it may not be next week, it may not be next month. Either the media is going to leak it out because they will get their hands on it one way or another, or we will eventually in this House be forced to release it. The point I would like to make is that we can avoid all of that, and we can do the right thing by voting for full disclosure this week.

Now some of our colleagues want to say that we are bashing the institution, we are bashing our colleagues. Some of the press wants to say that. The fact is that it is not our intent to hurt any Member of Congress. It is not our intent to hurt this institution. But today I see that this institution is under indictment by the American public. They see this institution as not relevant to the problems that they have at home, the problems that we have in this country, and they see this institution as ineffective in dealing with those problems.

Well, I think that it is clear that a bipartisan group of freshmen Members of Congress really and truly want reform. We want genuine reform. Our goal is to have a U.S. Congress that the American public has confidence in and respect for, and the only way they are going to get that confidence and respect is if the U.S. Congress becomes

more credible, and we have to increase our credibility with our constituents at home.

Mr. Speaker, to get that credibility I think there are two major areas that we need to address. One would be in the area of accountability.

As my colleagues know, we need to clean up the House check-bouncing problem, the House restaurant problem. Dine and dash is pretty well cleaned up itself, but there ought to be an open and independent audit of how the \$2.3 billion that the U.S. Congress spends, there ought to be an audit so everybody can see how every dime was spent. Most people in America think we ought to balance our budget and, because we are not willing to balance the budget, it shows that we are being irresponsible and certainly not accountable, and I think they are a little sick of getting the free mail that they get from Members of Congress. Certainly they are upset because Members of Congress in this institution are not willing to live under the same laws that we expect all Americans to live under, and certainly the Freedom of Information Act that applies to all of government, except the Congress, is wrong, and we ought to be under the auspices of the FOIA, the Freedom of Information Act. I would suggest to my colleagues that, if we were subject to the Freedom of Information Act, none of the things we are talking about tonight would have occurred, none of them.

Even if we took all these steps toward accountability and, as we took each step, we would gain credibility with the American public, it is not enough.

The other major issue that we have got to deal with, if we are serious about true reform of this institution, is that we have got to begin to address the institutional structural problems that we have in the way Congress operates, and that is why my colleagues here tonight and almost 40 Members of our freshman class from both sides of the aisle have supported an effort by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], a Democrat, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], a Republican from Cincinnati, that is calling for a committee, a select committee, to study the Congress. We need to change the House rules. This board system of committees, proliferation of subcommittees, that system is broke, and it needs to be changed. So, as we do these things, we can change the way Congress operates. We can make Congress relevant in today's society.

My concern in closing, Madam Speaker, is that as this institution is under indictment, my concern is about the future of our country and the future of this institution. Yes, disclosing all of the names may hurt some people. It may hurt some innocent people, and that is not my intent or anyone else's.

But the fact of the matter is this institution is more important to the future of our country than is the career of a handful of Members, and it is out of my concern for this institution and the long-term viability of this institution and our democracy that I have been pushing for full disclosure and all of us have been pushing for real reform of this Congress.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for yielding to me, I want to congratulate him for the great job that he is doing, and we are going to keep up the work for the next few days.

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] for his comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. My good friend from California, as we come to, hopefully, the end of not only this particular debate tonight, but hopefully the end of the saga of bounced checks, I just want to say, "Thank you for your leadership and the other Members that are here, JOHN BOEHNER, RICK SANTORUM, SCOTT KLUG, JOHN DOOLITTLE, CHARLES TAYLOR, the Gang of Seven, as we've been called over time and time again."

Madam Speaker, I just want to report to my friend from California on a couple of things that have happened in the recent moments.

I have just had an opportunity to attend a press conference with the minority members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and it appears that the Republican leadership has now signed off on the minority report for full disclosure, that we have won yet another battle on the road toward full disclosure for the American people.

□ 1910

I also wanted an opportunity to share with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], as a cosponsor of this telegram, the telegram that we were able to put together here in the waning hours of the day to the three presidential candidates on the Democratic side, because the rumor is going around the House that it appears that the Democratic leadership is trying to stonewall, trying to get the Democratic Members to vote for just the partial disclosure.

I would like to read into the RECORD this telegram to Jerry Brown, Bill Clinton, and Paul Tsongas, the telegram that was sent on behalf of the Gang of Seven Members that have started this.

It says:

In the next forty-eight hours, Congress is going to have an historic vote on the House check-bouncing scandal. The Democratic leadership is asking all Democratic Members of Congress to vote to release the names of only 24 check bouncers. The Republicans are calling for complete disclosure of all 355 Members who bounced checks.

We ask you, as one of the leaders of the Democratic Party and as a possible standard bearer of your party's Presidential nomination, to immediately urge your House leaders—Speakers Foley, majority leader Gephardt, and majority whip Bonior—to publicly support and vote for full disclosure, rather than a coverup of this unprecedented scandal.

As you may know, President Bush has called for complete disclosure. We await your commitment to cleaning up the corruption in Washington.

Madam Speaker, I doubt seriously that the three Democratic candidates are watching us here this evening, but I hope that we can get a response to that.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his tremendous leadership in this area.

Madam Speaker, I will close simply by telling my fellow Americans, I actually got asked the question today by a radio interviewer, "Well, what can the average American who feels rightfully quite indignant about what has transpired here, about the possibility of limited disclosure," which we have heard tonight from my fellow Gang of Seven Members, "which is tantamount to a whitewash or coverup, what can the average American do to make his or her voice heard?"

Madam Speaker, I simply want to tell those average Americans, looking in through this wonderful forum of C-SPAN, that in fact this is a very, very important occasion for those Americans to pick up the phone and call the office of their Representative in Congress and make their views known on this matter, particularly if they feel as we here tonight on the House floor in this special order so passionately do that only full disclosure will constitute the proper course of action and uphold the public trust.

This is one situation where frankly your voice should be heard and where you can make a difference.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today through March 20, on account of business in district.

#### 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. RIDGE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. MOLINARI, for 60 minutes each day, on March 17 and 18.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, on March 12.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. EWING, for 5 minutes, on March 12.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 13.

Mr. LEACH, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO, 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. RIDGE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in two instances.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. GREEN of New York.

Mr. WOLF.

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

Mr. HERTEL.

Ms. HORN.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mrs. BOXER.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. KOLTER in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1467. An act to designate the Federal Building and the United States Courthouse located at 15 Lee Street in Montgomery, Alabama, as the "Frank M. Johnson, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

S. 1889. An act to designate the Federal Building and the United States Courthouse located at 111 South Wolcott Street in Casper, Wyoming, as the "Ewing T. Kerr Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.)

The House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 1992, at 11 a.m.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.**

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

3074. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of March 1, 1992, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(a) (H. Doc. 102-202); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3075. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report on research, development, test, and evaluation chemical-biological defense programs during fiscal year 1991, and the fiscal year 1991 report on the nonuse of human subjects for testing of chemical or biological agents, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1511; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3076. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting an addendum to the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for \$1,000,000 or more; an addendum to the listing of all Letters of Offer that were accepted, as of December 31, 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3077. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Australia (Transmittal No. 10-92), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3078. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Spain for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 92-15), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3079. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 92-16), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

**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. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 394. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3732, a bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to eliminate the division of discretionary appropriations into three categories for purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-453). Referred to the House Calendar.

**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. MORAN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 4423. A bill to protect homeowners with substantial equity interests in their mortgaged principal residences from the loss of their homes through mortgage foreclosure when forbearance can reasonably be extended by the mortgage holders, to provide for the protection of the equity interests of homeowners in cases of foreclosure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SWETT:

H.R. 4424. A bill to authorize any Member of the House of Representatives to direct that unobligated funds remaining in such Member's official mail allowance at the end of each session of Congress be paid to the State which such Member represents; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SWETT (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 4425. A bill to establish a program of research, development, and demonstration on advanced pulp and paper technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4426. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to exclude copyright protection for certain legal compilations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 4427. A bill to prohibit the export of American black bear viscera, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

H.R. 4428. A bill to enhance public land ownership, outdoor recreation, and forest land administration in the Willamette National Forest, OR; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to increase national awareness concerning high-speed motor vehicle pursuits involving law enforcement officers and the individuals pursued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 4430. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an inflation adjustment for the income thresholds applicable to the taxation of social security and tier 1 railroad retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGLIETTA (for himself, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. WELDON):

H.R. 4432. A bill to authorize the striking of a medal commemorating the 250th anni-

versary of the founding of the American Philosophical Society and the birth of Thomas Jefferson; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4433. A bill to prohibit the imposition of a fee for waiver of the passport requirement for citizens in the case of reported theft or destruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROYBAL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 4434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of paper and paper products that do not contain the minimum amount of recovered materials, to allow an income tax credit for such products that exceed such minimum, and to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require paper products to meet minimum content standards; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. CARPER, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 4435. A bill to better provide for federally assisted housing for elderly and disabled families that meets the special needs of such persons, to clarify the essential requirements for residency in such housing, and to provide within such housing for the coordination of health-related and social services needs of such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 4436. A bill to establish a loan program at the Department of Commerce to promote the development and commercialization of advanced technologies and products; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 4437. A bill to authorize funds for the implementation of the settlement agreement reached between the Pueblo de Cochiti and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the authority of Public Law 100-202; jointly, to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 4438. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 501 West Ocean Boulevard in Long Beach, CA, as the "Glenn M. Anderson Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4439. A bill to establish a program of research, development, and demonstration to provide affordable and commercially viable low emission-low energy buildings by the year 2005; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. OWENS of New York):

H.R. 4440. A bill to require the transfer of certain closed military installations to the

Department of Justice, to transfer certain aliens to such installations, to provide grants to States to assist States and units of local government in resolving certain difficulties relating to the incarceration of certain aliens, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MILLER of Ohio):

H.R. 4441. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the adjustment of levels of immigration to reflect changes in the unemployment rate of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 4442. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a urology center at the Department of Veterans Affairs satellite outpatient clinic in Youngstown, OH; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4443. A bill to amend the U.S. Institute of Peace Act to establish the Spark M. Matsunaga Scholars Program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4444. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize States to restrict the interstate transportation of municipal waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 4445. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to repeal a penalty for non-compliance by States with a program requiring the use of safety belts and motorcycle helmets; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 4446. A bill to provide for pilot programs conducted by the Federal Prison Industries to test the feasibility of meeting the need for increased employment for Federal prisoners by producing items, for the non-Federal Government market, with private U.S. firms, that would otherwise be produced by foreign labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 4447. A bill to provide for National Aeronautics and Space Administration negotiations with former Soviet republics regarding the acquisition by the United States of Soviet civil space hardware and technology for integration into United States civil space projects; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Ms. HORN, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FROST, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MANTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. FAZIO):

H.J. Res. 436. Joint resolution designating June 19, 1992, as "National Baseball Day"; to

the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution designating May 7, 1992, as "National Substitute Teachers Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.J. Res. 438. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the second amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSTAD (for himself, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. SPENCE):

H.J. Res. 439. Joint resolution designating April 6, 1992, as "TV Busters' Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol by the American Ex-Prisoners of War for a ceremony in recognition of National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution concerning bilateral relations between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. MARTINEZ introduced a bill (H.R. 4448) for the relief of Gui Di Chen and Zhe Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 23: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 123: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 200: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 431: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 643: Mr. BACCHUS.

H.R. 701: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 784: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 786: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 856: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 911: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 962: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 976: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1156: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1200: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1245: Mr. BACCHUS.

H.R. 1335: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1406: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 1472: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 1502: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. STALLINGS, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1516: Mr. EWING, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1527: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1536: Mr. HORTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1541: Mr. RITTER and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1546: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1547: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1602: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1618: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ORTON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CARR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1711: Mr. McDADE.

H.R. 1771: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PENNY, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1774: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1777: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2070: Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BROWDER, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 2149: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 2223: Mr. SWETT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2248: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 2294: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 2336: Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2390: Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 2464: Mr. DICKS, Mr. LUKE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. McDADE, and Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 2472: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 2565: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 2614: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2768: Mr. BUNNING.

H.R. 2782: Ms. NORTON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. PERKINS.

H.R. 2890: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3137: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 3164: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3250: Mr. WILSON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 3425: Mr. ATKINS and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 3473: Mr. WEISS and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 3517: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3544: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3605: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3654: Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 3748: Ms. OKAR, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3780: Mr. BACCHUS and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3801: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. RAY, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 3803: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3806: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 3927: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 3955: Mr. KOPETSKI and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 3967: Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 3981: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 4002: Mr. SWETT and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4013: Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 4028: Mr. PERKINS and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4032: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 4073: Mr. AU COIN and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4083: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

