HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, April 21, 1993*

The House met at 2 p.m.

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

We pray, almighty God, that in a world which seems to present anger and outrage, may we also see beauty and wonder and the miracle that is symbolized by the season in which we live. As the days move on comes the birth of flowers and the verdant greenery of the season. Just as we see evil in the world, so may we also embrace the joy and grace of the day and the opportunities for experiencing the marvel of life, the miracle of love and the freedom to be of service to others. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. 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.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 153, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—256

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lancaster
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—153

Allard
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McDade
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—22

Barton
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Clay
Edwards (CA)
Fields (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hefner
Henry
Hunter
Lambert
Lantos
Lowey
McDermott
Nadler
Quillen
Sisisky
Solomon
Vento
Waxman

□ 1425

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HOLDEN 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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 84

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 84.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

There was no objection.

TODAY IS TEXAS RED VENISON CHILI DAY

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today, April 21, is San Jacinto Day in Texas, the anniversary of a great battle for Texas independence.

Today, in the House of Representatives, is Texas Red Venison Chili Day, a day I have served venison chili for the last 25 or more years. It is not four-alarm chili, only two-alarm chili, because you faint-of-heart northerners could not take the full dose.

Since we did not go in until 2 o'clock today, some of the Members may have missed a chance to get a bowl of this delicious red venison chili. It is being served in the Democratic and Republican Cloakrooms now, so if you want to get ready for the debate this afternoon, go forth and help yourselves.

It is mild chili, but it will get your attention. Help yourself.

LINE-ITEM VOODOO

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, later today, we will be considering enhanced rescission legislation that President Clinton would like the American people to believe is really the line-item veto.

In reality, as Representative ISTOOK has observed, it is more like line-item voodoo.

In some back room, the Democrat leadership stirred a pot, and tried to find that perfect spell to fool the public into thinking this is real spending reform.

And they came up with this emasculated rescission bill.

Mr. Speaker, we must break the spell. Enhanced rescission is not the line-item veto. It barely even changes current law.

I urge my colleagues to vote down the rule and send a message to the Democrat voodoo doctors. We need real reform, not magic tricks.

□ 1430

ENHANCED RECESSION

(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, the legislation we are supposed to consider today has been falsely portrayed as a real tool for deficit reduction.

Unfortunately, this so-called enhanced rescission bill is more like a butter knife than a spending ax.

We need to give the President a line-item veto, so he can have the tools to take out egregious pork barrel spending.

But, in the interests of political cover, the Democratic majority gives the American people this sham of a spending reform.

As the far left of the Democratic caucus continues to dictate more spending, and as our deficit continues to skyrocket, history will judge this vote severely.

This is not really a vote for enhanced rescission. It's more of a vote for an enhanced recession.

THE $238 MILLION FOR IRAQI PRISONERS-OF-WAR? UNBELIEVABLE

(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, the Office of Refugee Resettlement wants $238 million for Iraqi prisoners of war. That works out to $7,000 each. Unbelievable.

American veterans from the Persian Gulf war can't get a job; American veterans' benefits are being cut; 47 million Americans without health insurance; record bankruptcies, and Uncle Sam wants to give $238 million to Iraqi soldiers that opposed us in the gulf.

Beam me up. I say if we have $238 million, let's take a look at Cleveland, Chicago, New York, Detroit, and use some of that money here.

I say let us give the taxpayers a break, not the Iraqi soldiers.

EXPEDITED RESCISSION FALLS SHORT

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the old saying goes that close only counts in horseshoes and hand grenades. President Clinton said that he supported a line-item veto but the Expedited Rescission Act of 1993 falls far short in its ability to reduce the spending that the American taxpayers protest.

A true line-item veto requires action by Congress to stop the rescission—allowing the American people to know who in Washington is responsible for runaway spending. Expedited rescission allows Congress to continue business as usual, because if there is no congressional action, the rescission will not take effect and the funds will be released. The result of enhanced rescission is not the heightened accountability of a true line-item veto.

This bill will not give the President power to veto individual wasteful programs, but will only allow rescission of packages. This is not the line-item veto that the President promised, but a watered-down version that will not combat runaway spending. While expedited rescission and enhanced rescission may sound much the same, let the American buyer beware. It may look and smell like a line-item veto, but in the case of the Expedited Rescission Act, close is not even close.

CLINTON STIMULUS PACKAGE HELD HOSTAGE

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, when "Nightline" began airing its show on the hostage crisis in Iran, when that was in full bloom every day, "Nightline" would announce the number: "Day 27 of American Hostages Held in Iran," "Day 57," "Day 357."

How many days is the country going to be held hostage and preclude us from getting the President's stimulus package? Mr. Speaker, the Japanese have a stimulus package now over $100 billion ready to bring their economy back to life.

We are being held hostage. The President's package is being held hostage. How many more days are we going to have to count while America's stimulus package is held hostage in the other body?

Mr. Speaker, we need to act and move the stimulus package now.

DEMOCRATS FLUNK TRUTH IN ADVERTISING TEST

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, when the Democrat leadership of this House tries to sell you a bill of goods, you had better look pretty closely at what you are buying because it ain't always what its cracked up to be.

The leadership is offering up an enhanced rescission bill that they would lead us to believe and would like the American taxpayer to believe that this legislation is a true line-item veto bill. It is not.

As our Democrat colleagues are wont to do, they have taken a Republican idea, the line-item veto, watered it down to render it virtually meaningless, and now attempt to sell it as positive change.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are playing games again. This bill gives the President weak authority to make rescissions and is crafted so that the Congress can veto any Presidential rescission by doing nothing at all.

It is business as usual, Mr. Speaker. The American people are demanding an end to pork barrel spending and the Democrats who control this Congress

are offering a token bill completely lacking in substance. Say "no" to pork barrel spending, my friends. Vote "no" on the Democrat rescission bill.

CONNECTICUT WORKERS VOTED FOR A CHANGE LAST YEAR

(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, late last week I visited the local unemployment office in my district, and I saw more than 150 workers, unemployed Connecticut workers, working people, forced to stand in unemployment lines so that they can feed their families.

I can report to you that the perspective of these Americans is quite at odds with some of the voices that I hear in this Chamber. These workers, Mr. Speaker, told me that they were concerned. They believed they had voiced support for a change last year, they believe we ought to have a change from the old politics of gridlock. They supported a mandate for leadership, a President who would offer a plan to restore economic vitality, a government that would make jobs and the personal security of working Americans a priority for a change.

They did elect a President who wants to change course. But his efforts are being thwarted by a disgruntled minority bent on putting politics above jobs, personal victory above the security of families. That is just plain wrong. It breaks faith with the American people and represents a return to the old politics that dominated this institution for the past 12 years.

"PUTTING PEOPLE FIRST," A MARVELOUS FANTASY NOVEL

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in his marvelous fantasy novel entitled "Putting People First," President Clinton wrote, "To eliminate pork-barrel spending and Government waste, we must give the President the line-item veto."

Over the past few months I have been quoting Saturday Night Live's Mr. Subliminal, who gets to the directness of things that are maybe a little confusing. We actually need to use Clinton speak, now, no longer the words of Mr. Subliminal.

To crack this code, we need to consider the other campaign promises that have been made.

For example, President Clinton's promise to cut middle-class taxes really meant increased taxes on everyone, especially the middle class. His promise to be a new kind of Democrat really meant he wanted to be a more effective taxer and spender in the finest liberal tradition.

Thus, the translation of Clinton's campaign promise on the line-item veto is, "We need political cover so we can continue to fund pork-barrel projects and continue Government waste." That is what we have with this enhanced rescission program that is supposedly going to come up before us today.

We must vote "no" on this political sham.

FORTY-THREE PEOPLE REFUSE TO LET CONGRESS ACT

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today this country was again disappointed by those obstructionists who continue to stand between the American people and the economic recovery they so desperately need.

The question of how best to revive our economy was put to the American people last November, and they answered by rejecting the failed voodoo economics, and calling for a new beginning. They ratified the new priorities of job creation, health care, and community development.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, despite the need, despite the acceptance on the part of the people, there stand just 43 people who refuse to let the Congress act; 43 people who stand between recession and recovery, and who say to the American people "No, I will not help."

Mr. Speaker, this obstructionism is a shameful abdication of congressional responsibility. Several of those who stand in the way are on record in the past as supporting just such a stimulus measure when George Bush was in the White House. And yet today, it is not the cry of the people which has their ear, but the call of their political party. I call on these people to lead, follow, or get out of the way. This country cannot wait any longer.

□ 1440

AMERICA IS AGAINST THE ABORTION PRESIDENT INCLUDING ABORTION IN HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming abundantly clear that the American people do not support the radical agenda of the abortion President, Bill Clinton.

A CBS/New York Times poll conducted in late March found that only 23 percent want abortion to be covered as part of a basic health care plan. This indicates that the inclusion of abortion in national health coverage is out of the mainstream, it is expensive, and actually jeopardizes the passage of a health care reform package.

Unlike the abortion President, Mr. Speaker, the American people realize that pregnancy is not a disease, that babies are not throw aways, they are not chattel, they are not objects. These little kids deserve better than chemical poisoning and dismemberment by either suction or other means. These kids—like their mothers—deserve our love, our compassion, our respect.

Americans know that every abortion stops a beating heart and they do not want their tax dollars being used to subsidize that kind of violent act.

Incredibly, the President claims that he wants abortions to be rare. Mr. Clinton's actions, however, expose his rhetoric to be nothing more than Orwellian double speak. Congress as a coequal branch of government has an obligation to stand up for the basic human rights of babies to live, and Mr. Speaker, to prevent taxpayers from being forced to pay for abortions.

IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to express my outrage and disgust that the Republicans in the other body may be successful in defeating the President's modest $16 billion stimulus package.

How can they say to the more than 571,000 residents of my district that their interests do not matter? I suppose one answer to that is reflected in the other body's committee of jurisdiction's voice vote yesterday that supported spending billions of new dollars for the Resolution Trust Corporation.

If the President's package fails, it will be because of the same Republicans who, for the last 12 years, cavalierly ran up multitrillion dollar deficits while the people in my district did not get a dime.

If this package fails, the people in my district will continue to feel alienated and shut out of their rightful participation in the American dream. I will tell them the Republicans defeated the President's package because hard working, decent, honest people like them have to take a back seat to greedy, unscrupulous Wall Street insiders.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAPMAN). The Chair would remind all Members not to refer to either the Members or the procedures of the other body.

THE BTU TAX WILL HURT MILLIONS OF AMERICANS WHO CAN AFFORD IT LEAST

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this morning members of the Energy and Power Subcommittee held a hearing with our distinguished Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary. While several important topics were discussed, the subject that drew the most attention by far was the administration's proposed energy tax.

Members of both parties described to Secretary O'Leary how this tax would hurt consumers, workers, and businesses in their districts and throughout America. I am concerned in central Florida it will hurt senior citizens on fixed incomes.

While Secretary O'Leary graciously answered individual questions, I left the hearing with the impression that this administration simply does not understand the negative effect the energy tax and its other tax increases will have on our economy.

A study by DRI/McGraw Hill sanctioned by the Commerce Department estimated that the energy tax alone will cost America 400,000 jobs by 1998. It also will cost consumers billions of dollars, disproportionately hurting lower income Americans, particularly the elderly and the working poor.

Over the last 12 years, we've heard a great deal about fairness. The consensus at this morning's hearing was that the energy tax may answer the question, "Who's unfairest of them all?"

PASS THE PRESIDENT'S COMPROMISE STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Miss COLLINS of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years we have listened to empty rhetoric about investing in America's future. Finally, we have a President that is willing to invest in our human capital, in our children, and in our Nation's infrastructure.

With millions of Americans unemployed, America's economic plan has to invest in the American worker. This plan does that by creating more than 400,000 jobs.

The President's plan invests in our children. It funds desperately needed programs like Head Start and WIC. It also allows for the immunization of our children so that they do not die needlessly from preventable diseases like the measles.

It invests in our Nation's infrastructure. This plan will improve our Nation's roads and bridges. It will pump life into our Nation's cities and neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we stop this senseless bickering, pass the President's investment package, and move on. President Clinton has answered the call of the American people for change. Let us support him in this mission.

CRIME HITS VULNERABLE ELDERLY, CHILDREN, AND TOURISTS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, major news events this past week across the country underscore our problems achieving law and order in our society today. The tragic events in Waco, the trials in Los Angeles, and the apparent apprehension of the District of Columbia drive-by shooter have put violence and crime center screen in public consciousness—but in almost every community across America today, crime is a daily headline occurrence. The streets are not as safe as they used to be. People are scared. Many feel this country is still protecting the rights of criminals with more fervor than we protect the rights of victims.

Even as crime becomes more random and bizarre it hits cruelly at our most vulnerable populations: The elderly, children, unsuspecting tourists. Just a few steps from the Capitol Building, businesses have been forced to stop using cash. It is check or credit card only. Cash from customers they fear will be a magnet for crime. We proposed a get-tough-on-crime bill last year but it was gutted by the liberal leadership.

Maybe now that it is too dangerous to use cash to transact legal business in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol, the liberal establishment can understand it is time for tough measures and strong legislation.

THE WACO MURDERS

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak directly to Scott and Cameron LeBleau, ages 11 and 1½.

Their father, ATF Agent Conway LeBleau, was murdered at the Koresh cult compound in February.

His actions and those of the other murdered agents were described on this floor yesterday as gestapo like.

Scott and Cameron, your dad did not belong to the gestapo.

Your dad was a brave man trying to make this country safer for children like you—and my two little girls at home.

Your dad was murdered by the followers of a demented criminal, who—despite your dad's best efforts and the overwhelming desire of the American people—was able to amass a huge arsenal of legal and illegal weapons to simply outgun the good guys, the ATF.

What happened in Waco at the start—and at the end—was murder, and David Koresh was the killer.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled when I see people who should know better fawning over Koresh's relatives and lawyers while rushing to pick, probe, accuse, and condemn the Attorney General and law enforcement—as though they had committed crimes—as though any tactical mistakes are somehow the moral equivalents of Koresh's criminality.

This is shameful and should stop here and now.

Were there any tactical mistakes made in Waco? Probably. And we should examine them to improve our ability to handle these situations in the future.

We should proceed slowly, and thoroughly. But let us not turn a criminal killer of children into a fantasyland victim.

This was a sensational and tragic crime, let us make sure our examination of it is constructive and helpful, not just sensational.

□ 1450

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO WAIVE CARGO PREFERENCE ON AID FOR RUSSIA

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, while there is a limit to what we can afford, I am generally supportive of the President's decision to aid President Yeltsin and help foster the emerging democracy and free markets in the former Soviet Union. Of note, our past four Republican Presidents also agree that this is good policy for the United States.

But if we are going to agree on this aid, then let us produce the goods.

Of the $1.6 billion Vancouver aid package, more than half is supposedly food aid, credits, and medicine. But we will deliver far short of that amount because our humanitarian cargo must be shipped at two, three, perhaps even five times the international market rate.

In other words, a major chunk of our aid to Russia will be devoured by cargo preference before it even leaves the country.

For a long time cargo preference has been bad for agriculture. Today it's bad for President Clinton and his Russian aid package.

So I urge my colleagues to join my effort to eliminate or partially waive cargo preference for the Vancouver aid package. I will be introducing three

bills, each taking a slightly different approach. Take your pick on how we go about it, but let us just do it, and help our President really produce that $1.6 billion for democracy in Russia.

CONGRESS CAN LEARN ABOUT FINANCIAL RECOVERY FROM SCHUYLKILL COUNTY, PA

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true financial success story. The credit and congratulations go to a borough in my district known as Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, PA, population 6,221. Just 5 years ago, Shenandoah was in the depths of financial despair. Its expenses exceeded its ability to pay to the point where borough leaders saw no alternative but to declare bankruptcy. But Shenandoah was not to be written off. With some help in the form of a loan from the State of Pennsylvania, Shenandoah pulled itself out of the red ink and is now well on its way to financial recovery. This is a real tribute to Shenandoah's leaders and its people. They realized what had to be done, they demonstrated the courage, and made the necessary sacrifices to get their own house in order. While Shenandoah's population is small, their shining example of fiscal responsibility is no less than monumental. We in Congress should learn from Shenandoah's bold and courageous example, and strive to follow it here in Washington. Our generation is demanding it, and our children and grandchildren deserve it.

CLINTON'S STIMULUS PLAN REJECTED

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Republicans have taken the wise course of rejecting the President's so-called stimulus plan because it increases the deficit $16.3 billion. I applaud this action and I hope that it is the beginning of true deficit reduction.

The entire Clinton package should be sent back to the drawing boards so that we can achieve real deficit reduction through spending cuts, not tax increases. For 3 months the message from my constituents has not changed—cut spending first.

Last month, the Republicans, under the leadership of JOHN KASICH, submitted a plan outlining $430 billion in spending cuts. We met the President's challenge to be specific.

Today, I am introducing legislation to cut spending $30 billion. Dozens of my colleagues have taken this same course of identifying specific spending cuts that they support; $30 billion in cuts is only a start, Mr. President, and we must continue to cut spending wherever possible. The American people have had enough of high taxes and deficit spending—it is time for budget cuts.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY MARKED BY LAYOFFS AND NEW LOW-WAGE JOBS

(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, I understand that there are Members of the Congress who believe that our economy is in a recovery and that it is not necessary for the Congress to pass legislation to create decent paying jobs. Well, you could have fooled me. In the State of Vermont there have recently been large layoffs at IBM, Digital, GE, Simmonds, and other companies, and our State's unemployment rate is rising.

Nationally, 10 million workers remain unemployed, 6 million workers remain underemployed, and there are now 1.4 million fewer jobs than before the recession began in 1990. Even more alarming, an increasing number of the new jobs being created are low-wage, part-time, with inadequate benefits.

Mr. Speaker, if this is an economic recovery, I would hate to see a recession.

I find it ironic that there are Members of Congress who are opposed to spending money now to create decent paying jobs for our workers, and to feed hungry children. Within the next 2 months, however, I suspect that many of these same Members will be voting to dump $42 billion more into the deficit in order to bail out the S&L industry. They will not be worrying about deficit spending then.

Mr. Speaker, let us get our priorities right.

THE PRESIDENT'S JOBS BILL PROMISES CREATION OF HALF A MILLION JOBS

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, last Friday's unemployment figures from the Department of Labor said it all. For the 16th consecutive month the jobless rate stayed above 7 percent.

Put another way, there are 16 million Americans who want to work, but cannot work.

Meanwhile, the Senate Republicans do not work and they do not want to work.

These Senators would rather enshrine gridlock as a permanent fixture in the Nation's Capital rather than create new jobs and put people back to work.

President Clinton has proposed a jobs bill that will create half a million jobs. The purpose of the bill is to inject jobs into the jobless recovery.

The real question comes down to this: Are the American people satisfied with a jobless recovery and business as usual?

The answer is "No."

The President and his allies in the Congress will not rest until the jobs bill has been approved and is signed into law.

The Senate Republicans want to block job creation. They would rather do nothing than put people back to work.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the economy needs a jump start and the President's jobs bill is necessary to put people back to work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAPMAN). The Chair would again remind Members not to comment on procedures or Members of the other body.

NO MORE FUNDS FOR RTC

(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, we all want to reduce the deficit. Several speakers have talked about it here today. I have a suggestion.

The RTC is asking for another $45 billion. Before we give them another dime, Mr. Speaker, the RTC needs to clean up its management practices and put an end to wasteful spending.

Why do I say this? There is good evidence that the RTC's actions have caused some banks to go down and into receivership. Instead of going after the big guys who cause the problem, they go after smalltown business people who often serve on savings and loan boards for community development purposes. On the management side, Mr. Speaker, the RTC receives bonuses for their employees, up to $30,000. RTC employees are on a different pay scale than other Federal employees and earn up to $158,000. RTC employees can receive an 18.2-percent pay differential.

No more funds to feed this bureaucracy. It should wind up its business and close a dark chapter in American banking history.

THE PRESIDENT'S STIMULUS PACKAGE IS THE LEAST THAT AMERICA DESERVES

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, when the President's stimulus came over to this House, it was smaller than many of us had hoped and certainly smaller than America deserved. It was so small that the mayors have had to indicate that they would use the money for smaller items, not for the large items on their agenda, such as roads and bridges, but for smaller items like swimming pools—the kinds that keep kids out of crime in the summer. The Republicans have used the small items demagogically to redefine the President's stimulus package while 9 million Americans sit unemployed. We were the disciplined ones. The President's package came with cuts. We bit our tongues. The House added larger cuts. We bit our tongues again.

Mr. Speaker, the most depressed parts of America deserve more. America itself deserves better. The President's package is not what we deserve. Mr. Speaker, the President's package is the least that America deserves.

COMMENDING AMBASSADOR KANTOR ON HIS CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH IN TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, this week Ambassador Mickey Kantor has been meeting with Sir Leon Brittan, European Community Commissioner for Trade, over the procurement policies of the United States and Europe.

The European Procurement Code, as embodied in article 29 of the utilities directive, blocks U.S. companies from winning bids on electrical and telecommunications government contracts in Europe. Mr. Kantor is expected to impose similar restrictions on European companies unless the provision is waived. American companies in the European market now bid on $7.8 billion while their European competitors can bid on $16.8 billion in the U.S. market.

I commend Mr. Kantor for his tenacity in dealing with the European Community and encourage him to hold firm in his position.

This situation illustrates the increased attention being given to each nation's procurement policies. Several months ago, a GATT dispute panel found that a U.S. buy American provision, requiring the purchase of a senor mapping system by the National Science Foundation, violated the GATT. We have yet to adopt the panel report. Congress must realize this case has far-reaching consequences for our Nation's domestic policies.

As the international marketplace tightens, more attention will be focused on the lucrative public sector. I urge Mr. Kantor to follow through with this constructive approach to market access in the broader multilateral context of the GATT negotiations.

□ 1500

IN MEMORY OF WALLACE STEGNER

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, last week this country lost one of its great writers, philosophers, and environmentalists.

Mr. Wallace Stegner died at the age of 84 in Santa Fe, NM.

Mr. Stegner was a resident of Los Altos, CA, which is in the district I represent and was a distinguished member of the Stanford University faculty. He was one of the first visionaries of the modern environmental movement.

In his well-known 1943 novel, "The Big Rock Candy Mountain," he reflected on the beauty and grandeur of the Western United States, and he warned of the dangers of overzealous development and environmental degradation.

Wallace Stegner received many accolades throughout his distinguished career, including the Pulitzer Prize for his 1972 novel "Angle of Repose."

He has been called the modern equivalent of Thoreau—and an important part of the environmental movement's spiritual foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the loss of this great thinker, but I am confident his vision will endure.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our condolences to his family, friends, and countless admirers.

TRIBUTE TO "BUD" MEYERHOFF, PHILANTHROPIST AND HOLOCAUST MUSEUM SUPPORTER

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the dedication of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, I rise to pay tribute to Harvey M. "Bud" Meyerhoff.

A lifelong resident of the Baltimore area, Mr. Meyerhoff has been known for many years within the State of Maryland as an energetic leader and generous philanthropist. In 1987, President Reagan, keenly aware of Mr. Meyerhoff's reputation and abilities, appointed him chairman of the Holocaust memorial Museum.

Since that time, Harvey has crisscrossed the country soliciting funds from numerous sources. These efforts have resulted in donations totalling $168 million. It should be noted that Mr. Meyerhoff did not ask for these funds without making a substantial donation himself. In typical Meyerhoff fashion, his family's gift of $6 million was the single largest endowment the museum received.

As the museum is dedicated tomorrow, many Americans of all religions and ethnicities will watch in hopes that we, as a nation, will not forget the horrors of the holocaust. Let us also not banish into oblivion the tireless devotion of Harvey Meyerhoff whose efforts brought this important project to fruition.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GENDER EQUITY IN EDUCATION ACT

(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, I was delighted to hear that Secretary Aspin said that he will very shortly release the Tailhook report. At the time that report comes out many Americans will ask, "What can we do to make sure this never happens again and to correct the sexism that is so prevalent in our society?"

Well, the congressional caucus on women's issues, under the directorship of Congresswoman MINK, has answered that today as we introduce the Gender Equity in Education Act. It is a composite of nine very important bills that tries to get on target once again treating young women equally in our schools.

The parents of girls pay exactly the same in taxes as the parents of boys, and yet we have studies that would fill this room showing that the young women do not receive the same kind of education or the same kind of treatment. Once and for all, we must get back on the track that we were on that got dismantled in the last 12 years and get this behind us.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage people to join us in our efforts so we can get this passed.

ENHANCED RESCISSION: NOT BETTER THAN NOTHING

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people want a real line-item veto. Unfortunately, many of my colleagues, especially from the Democratic side, instead support the so-called enhanced rescission bill.

They say it is better than nothing—a step in the right direction. That is simply not true. This bill is worse than nothing.

This bill is worse than nothing because it gives the appearance that we are really changing things, that we are

really giving the President a tool to cut waste. But in reality, we are not doing that.

This legislation is a sham, a weak imitation of the line-item veto. A real line-item veto is what we need to give the President and we should not be trying to fool the American people with this bogus reform.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1578, THE MODIFIED LINE-ITEM VETO BILL

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the modified line-item veto.

On April 29, 1992, candidate Bill Clinton said:

> I strongly support the line-item veto * * * we need to get federal spending under control.

Approving a line-item veto will show the American people that we hear their demands to reduce Federal spending.

We must make the tough choices to cut spending. If not this year, when? If not with a line-item veto, how?

A line-item veto will force Congress and the President to debate the merits of programs publicly.

We must give the American people a reason to believe that we are serious about debt and deficit reduction. Today, we have the opportunity to do this—I hope this chance is not lost.

While I personally support a traditional two-thirds line-item veto, I recognize the President must have a tool for cutting the fat from the budget and H.R. 1578 helps do that.

I urge my colleagues of both parties to support this bill. Let us return our Government to its rightful owners—the American people.

ENHANCED RESCISSIONS BILL NOT A GOOD SUBSTITUTE FOR LINE-ITEM VETO

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, today this House is getting a watered-down line-item veto bill called enhanced rescissions. Let me explain what a Democrat line-item veto, known as an enhanced rescission, is.

First, the President must prepare a list of budget items he feels are too large or unnecessary. Then he sends that list to both Houses of Congress. Each House must set these lists as bills and send them to the Appropriations Committee, which after deliberation, must report them to the floor. Each House must report the rescissions item by item, thereby admitting that they made a mistake in the first place and overspent.

A real line-item veto requires only a two-thirds vote to override the President's action, which is rarely accomplished. By requiring both Houses to vote to approve a Presidential item veto, that means that the veto is worthless. The enhanced rescission is not a tiny step toward fiscal responsibility; it is the end of the line for a line-item veto. It is a sizzle with no steak, and the taxpayers demand a real line-item veto.

□ 1510

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SALT LAKE LDS TEMPLE

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

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of downtown Salt Lake City, just blocks from my district office, stands the historic Mormon temple—a six spired granite structure revered worldwide for the uniqueness of its design and the history of its construction.

In the mid-19th century, Brigham Young, the Mormon prophet, arrived with his group of Latter-day Saints at the foot of the Wasatch Mountains and proclaimed "this is the place." Within days of their arrival, Brigham Young stuck his cane into the ground marking the exact site where the temple would be built and said "here is the 40 acres for the temple. The city can be laid out perfectly square, north and south, east and west."

Throughout the next 40 years, the early saints worked painstakingly on the construction of the temple. Granite rocks, weighing from 2,500 to 5,600 pounds, were transported by teams and wagons from a quarry in Little Cottonwood Canyon and then cut into blocks. A few chosen members traveled to Europe on architectural missions and returned to oversee the construction and beautification of the temple. Families donated large portions of their incomes to help finance the work, and women toiled making and laundering clothes for the men who labored.

In April 1883, an even century ago, the work was completed and the saints gathered joyfully for the dedication of their temple. To commemorate the temple's 100-year anniversary, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has orchestrated numerous activities.

The most impressive undertaking is a special exhibit at the LDS Museum of Church History and Art titled "The Mountain of the Lord's House: Construction of the Salt Lake Temple." The exhibit uses original photographs, drawings, artifacts, and diary excerpts to present an intriguing account of the 40-year construction. The church has also created a feature-length film on the subject and will make the temple centennial a major focus of the Days of '47 Parade in July.

Although Mormon temples were built both before and after the dedication of the Salt Lake Temple, 44 in all, the Salt Lake Temple is not only revered as the largest of the temples, but also serves as a symbol for the church. Hundreds of thousands of visitors, both members and nonmembers alike, flock to Temple Square each year to stand in awe and wonder of what has been both affectionately and appropriately described as "the centerpiece of Zion."

May I express my sincerest congratulations to the members of the LDS Church as they commemorate this landmark year. Above the everyday hustle and bustle of downtown Salt Lake, the Mormon temple stands as a monument to the unwavering faith and vision of those who came before.

BTU TAX A BOON TO EUROPEAN COMPETITORS

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak regarding the Btu tax. Recently I had the opportunity in Ohio to participate in a round table conversation discussion with Senator JOHN GLENN and his guests, who included Mr. Stanley Gault, the chairman and CEO of the Goodyear Tire Co. Mr. Gault had just returned from a trip to Europe where he had spoken with the heads of the European tire companies and other industrial and labor leaders in Europe.

Mr. Gault relayed to the group as he spoke that the industrial leaders and political leaders in Europe were extremely excited about our Btu tax. They were very delighted that the President had proposed it and they were very excited about the hope that it would be passing in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, why were they so excited about it? Because they knew and they know that it will make our manufacturing base less competitive, that they will have an even greater edge, and that they will be able to defeat us at the base level of manufacturing with the passage of that tax.

THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

(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, Congress should not be above the laws of the land. The laws of the land should apply to Members of Congress and to this institution as they do to every American and every other enterprise or organization in this great country.

Mr. Speaker, nothing bothers people as much, I believe, than what some

have called the imperial privilege of having laws of the land not apply to Congress. And, that is the case today. Occupational Safety and Health Act laws do not apply. Certain privacy acts and certain civil rights acts do not apply to Congress. The Americans With Disabilities Act does not apply to Congress. That would all stop with the passage of H.R. 349, which is the Congressional Accountability Act, primarily sponsored by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of the bill. I hope that some day it will pass so all the laws of the land will then apply to Congress in the same way as they apply to everyone else.

There is another opportunity through the study which will be reported by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] which could also change the way laws apply to Congress. But one way or the other, Mr. Speaker, by a statute or by an internal change, all the laws of the land should apply to Congress.

CROCODILE TEARS FLOODING THE DISTRICT

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I just heard the news: the Weather Service is predicting floods in the District of Columbia. These floods are being caused by the crocodile tears that are being shed at the White House and the other body and today on the floor of the House by my colleagues for the failure of the Senate to pass the $16 billion enhanced deficit stimulation package.

Where were these job creating stalwarts in October 1989 when this House passed the largest private sector jobs stimulator in recent years that would have created 500,000 jobs through a capital gains reduction? Fifty-seven Senators in the other body also supported that package.

Mr. Speaker, guess who stood up and objected and used the filibuster to block that package from moving forward? None other but the master of the crocodile tear, that person who is leading the charge across the country on the media, that is trying to stop the fact that we have in fact stopped the President's enhanced deficit stimulation package.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that all the Republicans of Pennsylvania today sent a letter to ARLEN SPECTER applauding him for holding tight and preventing the passage of this boondoggle. There are things in there that we want to support. Let us have the guts to stand up and pay for them and not add them to our deficit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAPMAN). The Chair will caution Members not to refer in either derogatory or complimentary ways to Members of the other body.

WAS CROMWELL CORRECT?

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

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, the past several weeks has presented a picture to the American people and the world of gridlock caused by a willful minority.

I find this especially ironic. The Government of Japan just announced a $115 billion public works program to stimulate their economy, yet a willful minority is blocking a similar jobs program one tenth the size for Americans.

Many of these same individuals in 1981 proclaimed a new era for America and successfully voted their program into law.

Their new era resulted in a quadrupling of the national debt. Now they say, "Who me?", and blame Congress even though Congress appropriated less in the aggregate almost every year than their President requested.

They proclaimed a new economic order, but their policies over the last 12 years resulted in tens of millions without health care. And they still say, "Who me?"

They proclaimed a new era of job creation, but that job creation has been in the ranks of disposable workers with lower wages than before and without adequate health care or pension benefits. And to the plight of the disposable workers they say, "Who me?"

Our new President proposes a very modest effort compared to that of Japan to provide jobs for our people, but they oppose it because of the deficits their Presidents and their party created. They cry crocodile tears for those they have put out of work or into disposable jobs, and say "Not my problem."

We see in the other body that they are the party of bankrupt ideas who do not wish to get our country moving again. They are more interested in bringing down America in the vain hope that they will win back the White House. They the party of "Who me."

Mr. Speaker, we can learn from history. Many of the ideas generated by Cromwell and others during the English Civil War evolved over the next century into provisions of the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. Cromwell's solution to gridlock did not find its way into either document. About 1653, Cromwell abolished the House of Lords.

AMERICA NEEDS TO MOVE FORWARD

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of those persons who are unemployed; I rise to speak on behalf of the youth of this Nation; I rise to speak on behalf of the communities in this Nation that need bridges and water and sewer; I rise to speak on behalf of the mayors and county commissioners who cannot find the resources to speak to the needs of their community.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say we need to move America forward. We need to provide those essential ingredients that make our community viable and give hope to people. We must vote for the stimulus. We have no alternative. If we fail to do that, then it is only our fault.

EXPEDITED RESCISSION WOULD GIVE EXECUTIVE BRANCH TOO MUCH POWER

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first African-American Members elected from the State of Florida in 129 years, I was sent to Congress to represent my constituents on every issue which is brought before the U.S. House of Representatives including those involving appropriations and the national budget.

Before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, I was a member of the Florida State House for 10 years. During my tenure, I worked with Democratic and Republican Governors who had line-item veto authority. My experience was one in which Governors did not use their power to reduce spending but instead used the line-item veto for partisan purposes.

As a result, I believe that I have an experienced perspective on H.R. 1578, the Expedited Rescission Act which is before the House for consideration. My concern is that H.R. 1578 would shift too much power to the President and the executive branch and give the White House a new tool to press Members of Congress on other matters. For example, the White House could threaten to rescind funding for a project in a particular Member's district if the Member did not support the President on another vote of importance to the White House.

This is the House of Representatives, in other words, the people's house. Let's not take power away from the people who sent us here.

As a result, I urge my House colleagues to vote against the rule for H.R. 1578, any amendments, and the bill.

□ 1520

ECONOMIC GROWTH WILL OCCUR FROM CUTTING GOVERNMENT SPENDING, NOT RAISING TAXES

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, time after time today we have heard many of our Democrat colleagues come here and say that the Republicans in the other body are stifling economic growth by not allowing this so-called jobs bill to be passed.

The media of this country, the media of this country, keeps calling this an economic stimulus package. We have, on the Republican side of the aisle, said time and time again that this is a pork-laden bill: parking garages, swimming pool renovation, renovating movie theaters. It is a pork bill, a payoff to many big city mayors and politicians who helped President Clinton be elected President. It is not a jobs bill, it is not something that is going to stimulate economic growth.

The problems we face in this country are how to get the economy moving. The way to get the economy moving is to take a meat cleaver to Government spending, not raise taxes $400-plus billion, but take a meat cleaver to Government spending.

This economic stimulus package is nothing more than a pork-barrel bill, and we should defeat it. I applaud those in the other body who are filibustering this.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAPMAN). One more time the Chair would caution Members not to refer to the other body, either in a complimentary or a derogatory fashion.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of President Clinton's jobs bill. This bill is designed to put unemployed Americans back to work, care for our children, and create a long-term plan to ensure a healthy and growing economy for years to come. The American people have spoken, repudiating 12 years of Republican policies that established weapon systems over health care, tax breaks for the rich over education for the poor, and maintaining the status quo versus a real and positive change in the priorities and direction of our country.

President Clinton has given Congress the opportunity to provide real relief to those who suffered the most during the last 12 years. His stimulus package provides job opportunities, strengthens our Nation's deteriorating infrastructure, and creates educational and summer employment opportunities for our youth. It is a disgrace that this bill that holds such promise for so many Americans is being held hostage for purely spiteful, political reasons. It is unbelievably hypocritical of the 43 Republican Senators who decry gridlock and who share responsibility for the deficit to threaten a program that offers real hope and opportunity to the victims of the Reagan/Bush era. While the GOP Senators continue their powerplay, real people, and families are being harmed each day by their inaction. In New York City alone, 12 percent of the work force is unemployed. To them, those jobs provide income, training, health benefits, and a sense of self-worth that is essential to the recovery of this Nation. It is time to put the concerns of the public above the petty politics being practiced by the minority.

NEW FIRST-CLASS STAMP SENDS A DUAL MESSAGE

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I will inform my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], just for the purpose of proper English, it is the Democratic Party, not the Democrat party.

Second, I want to call the attention of the membership to a new commemorative stamp that has been issued by the U.S. Postal Service to honor the New York Stock Exchange. The interesting thing about this stamp is, if the Members will recall, the current price of a first-class stamp is 29 cents. Brace yourselves. Here it is, a beautiful stamp, New York Stock Exchange, and right smack in the middle of it with great big figures, 29.

Does anybody remember 1929 and the stock exchange? I am thinking, "Boy, somebody was not thinking too much over there. It could have been a 12-cent stamp, it could have been a 50-cent stamp." When I saw it, I thought it was a commemorative of the Depression.

URGING THE FBI TO CLOSE THE INVESTIGATION OF THE POLICE CHIEF OF SAXONBURG, PA

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because of something that jarred a memory during the period of time I was home over the Easter recess. I walked in a local police station back home and saw a wanted poster on the wall. It took me back to December 4, 1980, in a small farming community in Butler County, PA, called Saxonburg. On that day the police chief, Greg Adams, was viciously beaten and was killed. He was left lying in the snow.

The man who was the chief suspect in that case is a man by the name of Donald Eugene Webb. Mr. Webb has been on the FBI's 10 most wanted list for far over a decade. I would like to remember the valiant efforts of Chief Adams in protecting the people of Saxonburg, PA, and I would like to urge the FBI to close this case and find Donald Eugene Webb and bring him to justice.

Many of the witnesses and much of the evidence in this case has been lost over the past 13 years, and I would like this case to be wrapped up as soon as possible.

URGING THE SENATE TO SEND BACK A LIVE AND VIABLE ECONOMIC STIMULUS INVESTMENT PACKAGE

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, in November, we had an election. People expected change. With President Clinton elected, I think we put the Bush politics of denial behind us, the Ross Perot no-sweat solutions aside and the Congress passed an economic budget resolution, a blueprint for change.

Now we are trying to work on the pieces of the budget. As a first action, the House did its part and passed the stimulus/investment measure. There was a disagreement in the House, partisan disagreements and a parochial disagreement in some instance, but we did vote and act. Then this first measure, the stimulus/investment, was sent to the U.S. Senate.

It reminds me, the group over in the Senate, of where we have taxidermist and a veterinarian in business together. Their slogan is, "Either way, you get your pet back."

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, our Senate counterparts are talking about a lot of barnyard animals, but I hope that the House will receive back a measure that is alive and viable, that we can respond to, and that will serve the needs of the people we represent. What is really needed is not more gridlock, not more hot air and rhetoric nor more filibusters but some action on the problems that affect people.

We will have differences of opinion, but I hope we can move, and move forward to address the problems of our Nation rather than seek to stymie progress; let's vote in the Senate and House and let the people's voice be heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair would caution Members to please avoid critical references to Members of the other body.

VACATION OF PROCEEDINGS IN AND RECONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 66, NATIONAL ORGAN AND TISSUE DONOR AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings whereby Senate Joint Resolution 66 passed the House yesterday, and 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. 66) to designate the weeks beginning April 18, 1993, and April 17, 1994, each as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, yesterday one of the things that we requested but was ruled out of order because the sponsor was not on the floor was that we change the name from the National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week to the Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week, in honor of Nancy Moore Thurmond, the daughter of Senator STROM THURMOND, who was, unfortunately, killed in an automobile accident a week or so ago. She served as an example of what we all ought to be doing in trying to help other human beings in this country, in that she donated her vital organs to help save other people's lives.

□ 1530

Yesterday we were ruled out of order, and today, for purposes of amending the resolution, it has been brought back to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], the primary sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and certainly have no objection. Ms. Thurmond did a noble thing, not a difficult thing, but a thing that many Americans forget to do, and that is when she secured her driver's license she did sign the donation reverse side of it. The tragic death of this young woman may have one bright side, and that is continuing life for somebody else.

I think this may be one of the few commemoratives that Congress has ever passed that will actually have an effect. This is not to pat people on the back. This is to remind people to remember not to forget how much they can give by simply signing the back of those drivers' licenses. And it is a great privilege to be able to contribute much by sacrificing little.

That is what it is about, and I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] for making this unanimous-consent request, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the reason I personally asked for this yesterday was to try to urge all Americans to sign the backs of their drivers' licenses, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] just mentioned, and also to make sure that they honor Nancy Moore Thurmond by adding her name to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 66

Whereas a new patient is added to the national patient waiting list for an organ transplant every 20 minutes;

Whereas thousands of lives are saved or significantly improved annually by organ and tissue transplantation; and

Whereas increasing the number of transplantable organs and tissues would save American taxpayers millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the weeks beginning April 18, 1993, and April 17, 1994, are each designated "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such weeks with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYNN: Page 1, lines 4-5, strike "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week" and insert "Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. WYNN: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to designate the weeks beginning April 18, 1993, and April 17, 1994, each as 'Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week'.".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, April 20, 1993, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 328, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 38, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO TAOS, NM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 328, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 328, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Boucher	Cramer
Ackerman	Brewster	Crane
Allard	Brooks	Crapo
Andrews (ME)	Browder	Danner
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (CA)	Darden
Andrews (TX)	Brown (FL)	de la Garza
Applegate	Brown (OH)	Deal
Archer	Bryant	DeFazio
Armey	Bunning	DeLauro
Bacchus (FL)	Burton	DeLay
Bachus (AL)	Buyer	Dellums
Baesler	Byrne	Derrick
Baker (CA)	Callahan	Deutsch
Baker (LA)	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Ballenger	Camp	Dickey
Barcia	Canady	Dicks
Barlow	Cantwell	Dingell
Barrett (NE)	Cardin	Dixon
Barrett (WI)	Carr	Dooley
Bartlett	Castle	Doolittle
Bateman	Chapman	Dornan
Becerra	Clayton	Dreier
Beilenson	Clement	Duncan
Bentley	Clinger	Dunn
Bereuter	Clyburn	Durbin
Berman	Coble	Edwards (CA)
Bevill	Coleman	Edwards (TX)
Bilbray	Collins (GA)	Emerson
Bilirakis	Collins (IL)	Engel
Bishop	Collins (MI)	English (AZ)
Blackwell	Combest	English (OK)
Bliley	Condit	Eshoo
Blute	Conyers	Evans
Boehlert	Cooper	Everett
Boehner	Coppersmith	Ewing
Bonilla	Costello	Fawell
Bonior	Cox	Fazio
Borski	Coyne	Fields (LA)

Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Barton
Clay
Cunningham
Fields (TX)
Hefner
Henry
Hunter
Owens
Quillen
Sisisky
Walsh

□ 1552

Messrs. GRANDY, HILLIARD, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAPMAN). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announced that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

JEMEZ NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 38, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 38, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair would remind Members of the House that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 363, nays 57, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—363

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant

Tucker	Waters	Wolf
Unsoeld	Watt	Woolsey
Upton	Waxman	Wyden
Valentine	Weldon	Wynn
Velazquez	Wheat	Yates
Vento	Whitten	Young (FL)
Visclosky	Williams	Zimmer
Volkmer	Wilson	
Washington	Wise	

NAYS—57

Allard	Hall (TX)	Myers
Baker (CA)	Hancock	Packard
Ballenger	Hastert	Penny
Bartlett	Hoekstra	Pombo
Burton	Huffington	Ramstad
Buyer	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Clement	Istook	Royce
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Kyl	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Lewis (FL)	Stearns
DeLay	Lightfoot	Stenholm
Doolittle	Lloyd	Stump
Dornan	Manzullo	Tanner
Duncan	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	Mica	Vucanovich
Everett	Michel	Walker
Gekas	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Goodling	Moorhead	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—11

Barton	Hefner	Quillen
Clay	Henry	Sisisky
Cunningham	Hunter	Walsh
Fields (TX)	Owens	

□ 1611

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with the Base Closure Commission and missed two roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 328 and "no" on H.R. 38.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-61) on the resolution (H. Res. 153) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to proceed for 1 minute that I might inquire of the acting majority leader, or caucus chairman, what the program is for the balance of the day or the balance of the week.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the distinguished minority leader yield to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are hoping still to take action tomorrow, hopefully, on the stimulus package should it move over to this body. We are hopeful that that will occur. We are also, perhaps, waiting on other legislation that might move, but at this point in time we are waiting on the stimulus package, the jobs bill, that we are hopeful will move.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion with respect to time of convening tomorrow because of the dedication of the Holocaust Museum. Has that been agreed to? I know there were intercessions made.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it would be my intention, after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] yields back, to ask for unanimous consent that we convene tomorrow at 1 o'clock. However, Mr. Speaker, that will be on the assumption that we will roll any votes, journal votes, that are requested until the end of the session. What we are hopeful that will occur and what we expect to occur is that we give Members the opportunity to attend the Holocaust Memorial dedication without having to break in, and so we would expect to have no votes before 2 o'clock, although we would like to go into session at 1 o'clock to have 1-minutes and such other business as we can carry on.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we just had a meeting in the Committee on Rules upstairs which put out a rule which will waive the two-thirds rule to bring up the stimulus package hopefully tomorrow. But we also had a colloquy concerning the expedited rescission bill which has been laying on the House floor here for some time now, and, as the gentleman knows, the bill has been pulled, the rule has been pulled, again. We did make an attempt upstairs and had a colloquy with the Members on the other side of the aisle to discuss the possibility of bringing this expedited rescission bill to the floor under an open rule process, and, Mr. Leader, making your amendment in order to the base text of the bill that deals with targeted tax provisions. I must say that the majority leadership, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], and the other Members were willing to listen to us. We did not press to have that rule made in order, but they gave us their word that they would take it under consideration and, in consultation with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and other Democrat leadership, that they would get back to us and see if we could not resolve this in some way so that we could debate this under a fair process that would allow you and other Members the right to have a fair vote on this issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to enlighten the membership, and hopefully we will be getting some word back in the very near future on it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the efforts which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has extended in our behalf on that and hope that his efforts will not come to naught.

May I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] whether or not this concludes now business for the day?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have a commemorative that will be coming up now. I do not think we expect to vote on it, but there will be additional business.

Mr. MICHEL. Is that the extent of the official business?

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

JEWISH HERITAGE WEEK

Mr. WYNN. 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. 30) to designate the weeks of April 25 through May 2, 1993, and April 10 through 17, 1994, as Jewish Heritage Week, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] who is the prime sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to advocate legislation I have sponsored commemorating Jewish Heritage

Week. House Joint Resolution 126 recognizes the rich culture, heritage, and traditions of Jewish Americans, and notes the many contributions made by Jewish Americans in this Nation. And I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] for bringing this matter to the floor at this time, and the many Members of Congress who joined my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], and me in supporting this measure.

This legislation designates April 25 through May 2, 1993, and April 10 through April 17, 1994, as Jewish Heritage Week, noting in particular the celebration of Israel's Independence Day during these periods. The months of April and May are of particular significance in the Jewish calendar, in which the ancient celebration of Passover as well as other dates of importance take place.

Tomorrow, the long awaited Holocaust Memorial Museum will be dedicated near the Mall here in Washington, DC, with President Clinton and numerous foreign dignitaries in attendance. Creation of the museum, funded entirely by the private section, has evolved over more than a decade, and construction is now complete.

Jewish Heritage Week commemorates the 50th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, in which so many valiant men and women courageously deterred the Nazi's liquidation of the Warsaw ghetto. Despite insurmountable odds, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto were able to hold off these forces of evil for several weeks. Their courage in the face of such evil is most deserving of special recognition. Indeed, the theme of Jewish Heritage Week this year is the anniversary of that uprising.

It is troubling that we continue to witness anti-Semitism and violence against foreigners in various parts of Europe. Such activities have no place in the United States. Commemoration of Jewish Heritage Week places Congress and the American people squarely on the side of tolerance, brotherhood, and intergroup understanding.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues' support of House Joint Resolution 126, and request its immediate consideration.

□ 1620

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve the right to object, I now yield to a major cosponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the spring months are traditionally of great importance to the American Jewish community. Several religious and cultural events, including the Passover, Jerusalem Day, Israel Independence Day, the anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, which commenced 50 years ago last Monday, and the Holocaust Memorial date all occurred during these months.

House Joint Resolution 126, which we have before us now, presents a unique opportunity to foster a renewed appreciation for the rich traditions, heritage, and culture of the Jewish people as well as the contributions of the American Jewish community to our Nation and our society. With this designation, Congress can continue to promote intergroup understanding and the principles of brotherhood and can join in further opposition to anti-Semitism and nazism in all forms.

This year the 50th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising is commemorated and the long-awaited Holocaust Memorial Museum will open tomorrow in a ceremony at the Mall.

Mr. Speaker, it is, therefore, entirely fitting and appropriate that we designate the weeks of April 25 through May 2, 1993, and April 10 through April 17, 1994, as Jewish Heritage Week, and I urge all my colleagues to join us in this effort.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I am proud to be a cosponsor of legislation establishing April 25 through May 2, 1993, and April 10 through April 17, 1994, as Jewish Heritage Week.

Today's action is especially timely, in view of the increased attention given recently to Jews and Jewish Americans because of the opening of the Holocaust Memorial Museum and observances surrounding the 50th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. In addition, this week has been established during the spring season to coincide with Passover, the 8-day holiday celebrating the emancipation of Jewish slaves in Pharaoh's Egypt, and Israeli Independence Day.

Jewish Americans have made outstanding contributions to American science, law, politics, music, and other activities. The people of this Nation are indebted to such outstanding citizens as Albert Einstein, Benny Goodman, Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, Hank Greenberg, and many other Jewish Americans who have had a positive impact on the development of our culture and society.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation for the observance of Jewish Heritage Week, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 30

Whereas April 26, 1993, and April 14, 1994, mark the forty-fifth and forty-sixth anniversaries of the founding of the State of Israel;

Whereas the months of April and May contain events of major significance in the Jewish calendar, including Passover, in 1993, the fiftieth anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising and the opening of the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, Holocaust Memorial Day, and Jerusalem Day;

Whereas the Congress recognizes that an understanding of the heritage of all ethnic groups in the Nation contributes to the unity of this Nation; and

Whereas understanding among ethnic groups in this Nation may be advanced further through and appreciation of the culture, history, and traditions of the Jewish community and the contributions of the Jewish people to this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the weeks of April 25 through May 2, 1993, and April 10 through 17, 1994, are designated as "Jewish Heritage Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States, departments and agencies of State and local governments, and interested organizations to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ARBOR DAY

Mr. WYNN. 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. 127) to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1993 as National Arbor Day, 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 Maryland?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority has no objection to this request, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection..

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 127

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

hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the last Friday of April 1993 as "National Arbor Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a 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. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 20, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Tuesday, April 20, 1993 at 4:18 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the fifth *special* message forwarding one proposed rescission and one deferral of budget authority for fiscal year 1993.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

PROPOSED RESCISSION AND BUDGET AUTHORITY AND REVISED DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 69)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one proposed rescission in budget authority, totaling $180.0 million, and one revised deferral of budget authority, totaling $7.3 million.

The proposed rescission affects the Board for International Broadcasting. The deferral affects the Department of Health and Human Services. The details of the proposed rescission and the revised deferral are contained in the attached reports.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1993.*

VOTE FOR JEMEZ NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will vote on H.R. 38, legislation to establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in northern New Mexico.

Efforts to pass this legislation are bipartisan. I worked in the House to get this measure passed last year before adjournment and have worked closely with Senators BINGAMAN and DOMENICI to pass a Jemez bill that has the support of the entire New Mexico delegation. This bill passed the House last year by a wide margin, and it deserves strong bipartisan support this year from the House.

The Jemez Mountains are one of the most spectacular natural, biological, cultural, and recreational areas in the Nation. It is considered one of the richest areas of biological diversity in the Southwest, providing habitat for several Federal and State listed, threatened, endangered, and sensitive species. For those who expressed concerns yesterday on the floor about this bill, I want to emphasize that H.R. 38 does not include language that will allow the Forest Service to condemn land in the Jemez—current Forest Service policy will prevail in this regard.

H.R. 38 has the support of Democrats and Republicans in New Mexico, and it deserves the support of Democrats and Republicans in the House. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 38.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 21, 1993.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are asking for your support for legislation to establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in northern New Mexico. Today, the House will vote on H.R. 38, introduced by Congressman Bill Richardson, and the Senate will shortly take up similar legislation introduced by Senators Bingaman and Domenici.

This bi-partisan effort is critical to protect the unique and valuable Jemez Mountains of New Mexico. During the 102nd Congress, both the House and Senate passed legislation to protect the Jemez. Because time ran out last year due to adjournment, we were unable to complete this legislative effort. The protection of these mountains remains one of New Mexico's top environmental priorities.

The Jemez area is now administered by the Forest Service which has testified in favor of designation of this 57,000 acre tract as a National Recreation Area. Designation of the land will emphasize its recreational qualities and allow for the protection of critical archaeological sites. The bill would also ensure that Native American religious and cultural practices are preserved. In addition, it is important to note that our efforts will still allow for traditional multiple uses of the land, including grazing, hunting, and fishing.

Passing H.R. 38 is an important step in our continuing efforts to protect this precious resource of the State. Hearings will be held before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and we ask for your support today in the House in moving our efforts forward.

Sincerely,

JEFF BINGAMAN,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
BILL RICHARDSON,
STEVE SCHIFF,
JOE SKEEN.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE C–17

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to your attention a letter sent to me by Mr. Richard Rios, the distinguished president of the Amalgamated UAW Local 148, which represents the Long Beach unit of Douglas Aircraft Co. employees. I am, of course, delighted that Secretary of Defense Aspin has recommended the building of six C–17 aircraft for fiscal year 1994, however, undoubtedly, some will want less. Mr. Rios points out that Congress must consider all the ramifications of a cancellation of the C–17 aircraft program—specifically, that some 12,900 jobs and $1.15 billion in wages and benefits spread over the States of California, Missouri, and Georgia, will be lost. Mr. Rios goes on to show that indirect job losses could total 40,775 and $1.37 billion in wages; and third tier economic impact could affect 26,840 more individuals and result in $2.91 billion in lost wages. The total combined economic impact, he says, would be 80,515 lost jobs and $5.43 billion in lost wages.

Of course, it is the duty of Congress to ensure that public funds are spent wisely, and the continuation of the C–17 will certainly do just that.

Mr. Rios' point is that even if disciplinary action might be warranted against certain individuals in the Government and the corporation, it should not be at the expense of the 110,000 plus assemblers, diemakers, machinists, aircraft mechanics, aircraft electricians and support personnel and subcontractors across America—working men and women whose only crime was to do their jobs exceedingly well, collect their pay, and pay their taxes. I commend Mr. Rios' letter to your attention.

AMALGAMATED UAW LOCAL 148,
Lakewood, CA, April 12, 1993.

Hon. STEPHEN HORN,
1023 Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSPERSON HORN: My organization joins you in your concern over what the media has called secretly advanced pay-

ments by the U.S. Air Force to McDonnell Douglas Corporation in developing the C–17 military transport aircraft. And, while disciplinary action may be warranted against high-ranking members of the Air Force and the corporation, we urge you not to penalize the thousands of hardworking Americans whose livelihoods depend upon fulfillment of the C–17 program.

If the intent behind stopping this program is to punish corporate wrong-doers, consider those who are most likely to feel the sting of your Congressional whip: the 110,000+ assemblers, die-makers, machinists, aircraft mechanics, aircraft electricians and support personnel and subcontractors across America—working men and women whose only "crime" was to do their jobs, collect their pay, and pay their taxes. The following tables represent the numbers behind the tragedy; but, for every number there is a single parent, a blue-collar couple, a rehabilitated youth, a veteran or a recent college graduate—a cross-section of America that considers itself lucky to have a decent job at all.

One final comment about these workers. More than half the jobs lost will be skilled labor in a variety of disciplines. Once lost, they are almost irretrievable. After two years, the number of skilled employees able to return if recalled is only one in twelve.

In closing, I refer you to document entitled, "Commercial Aircraft Operations Are In Decline; McDonnell Douglas Will Exit Business in the 1990's" by Loren B. Thompson, Ph.D., Head of the National Securities Studies Program at Georgetown University. Prepared in October, 1992. This study concludes that, "It seems nearly inevitable that MD will exit the commercial aircraft business in the 1990's." I asked Dr. Thompson "if the cancellation of the C–17 program would move up his doom-date and threaten the existence the parent company as well?" His answer, "Absolutely"!

Chairman Conyers, at real jeopardy may very well be the jobs of every McDonnell Douglas employee: Some 88,000 in California, Missouri, Georgia, Oklahoma, Ohio and Arkansas, not to mention the hundreds of thousands of subcontracting employees and third tier personnel whose staggering numbers are beyond my ability to calculate.

Can the national economy support this many more people on unemployment, welfare and Medicaid?

Unemployed workers cannot buy Ford, Chrysler or General Motors products nor can they buy appliances and homes. Without jobs, people cannot repair their homes nor can they pay the taxes so sorely needed to fund the infrastructure and schools of this country. Without jobs, more people will be forced into bankruptcy and the banking and S&L problems will expand instead of contract.

I urge you to consider these workers and their families by reconsidering your proposal to suspend the C–17 program.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

RICHARD RIOS,
President.

C–17 military transport

Direct job losses by State if program is canceled:	
California (Long Beach/Torrance/Huntington Beach)	5,200
Missouri (St. Louis)	1,000
Georgia (Macon)	250
Subtotal	6,450
Estimated loss of management and support jobs:[1]	
California	5,200
Missouri	1,000
Georgia	250
Subtotal	6,450
Total direct job losses, 3 States	12,900
Annual loss of direct wages by state:[2]	
California	$219,321,000
Missouri	38,640,000
Georgia	9,660,000
Subtotal	267,621,000
Estimated loss of management/support wages:[3]	
California	253,564,000
Missouri	44,673,000
Georgia	11,168,000
Subtotal	309,405,000
Total annual direct wages lost, 3 States:	577,026,000
Total annual value of benefits lost[4]	577,026,000
Total annual direct wages and benefits lost	1,150,000,000
Indirect job losses by state:[5]	
California	36,400
Missouri	3,500
Georgia	875
Total	40,775
Indirect annual wages lost by state:	
California	$1,219,400
Missouri	117,250
Georgia	29,313
3 State total	1,370,000,000
Third tier economic impact:[6]	
3 State total, additional lost jobs:	26,840
3 State total, additional lost wages	2,910,000,000

NOTE.—Total Combined Economic Impact: 80,515 lost jobs; $5,430,000,000 in lost wages.

[1] Management and support positions are estimated at 1:1 with labor.

[2] Source: 1992 Payroll data for hourly employees.

[3] Source: Above, modestly adjusted (+15%)

[4] Benefits, including Health Insurance, Dental Insurance, Life Insurance and Disability Insurance, are equal in dollar value to direct wages. The loss of these will double the economic impact on their respective communities.

[5] There are approximately 7 sub-tier contractor employees for every manufacturing employee at Douglas and there are more than 1,300 such contract firms in the country. Job losses were calculated at 50% of workforce, as Douglas is the largest customer at most of these firms.

[6] Customarily calculated at 1.5 times the total of direct and indirect payroll for value of wages and number of employees lost.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GENDER EQUITY IN EDUCATION ACT

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues of the congressional caucus for women's issues in introducing a comprehensive legislative package to address the inequities that exist for girls and women in our education system.

This bill, the Gender Equity in Education Act, is the result of a great deal of collaboration and effort on the part of many members of the caucus. As the chair of the Economic and Educational Equity Task Force of the caucus, which had the responsibility of putting this legislation together, I would like to commend and thank all the Members and their staff who worked very hard to develop the individual proposals included in this omnibus bill.

This is the first time the congressional caucus for women's issues has developed a comprehensive legislative package to address the educational inequities girls and women face in our school system. And I believe this coordinated effort on the part of the caucus will move us forward in achieving the goals and protections many of us have been working toward for over two decades.

My involvement in this issue goes back many years, and I am very excited about this renewed enthusiasm in the Congress, among education and women's groups, and in schools all across this Nation, to rid our education system of the barriers girls and women face in striving for educational, economic, and social equity.

During my previous tenure in the Congress as a member of the Education and Labor Committee I helped to write title IX of the Education Act Amendments of 1972, which prohibits sex discrimination in all federally funded education programs.

Two years later the Congress passed the Women's Educational Equity Act, legislation I authored to develop programs which would assist local school districts in complying with the title IX prohibition of discrimination against female students.

Since its enactment title IX has opened the doors of education opportunity to literally millions of girls and women across the Nation. Title IX helped tear down inequitable admissions policies, eliminate archaic dress codes, improve vocational education opportunities for women, reduce discrimination against pregnant students and teen mothers, and combat sexual harassment in our schools.

However, we still have a long way to go.

A recent study published by the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation entitled "How Schools Shortchange Girls: the AAUW Report," includes alarming data about the discrimination of females in our education system.

This report, which surveys the research that has been done in the area of educational equity for girls and women, concludes that:

Teachers pay less attention to girls than boys;

Girls lag in mathematics and science scores, and even those who do well in those subjects are not encouraged to choose math and science careers;

Sexual harassment of girls is increasing in our schools;

Some tests remain biased against girls, hurting their chances for scholarships and college admissions;

Textbooks still ignore or stereotype women;

Girls learn almost nothing in school about many of their most pressing problems like sexual abuse, discrimination and depression;

Vocational education programs continue to channel women into traditionally female-dominated jobs, which are usually low-skilled and low-paying; and

Discrimination against females in education-related sports activities is endemic.

On April 18, 1972, almost 21 years ago to the day, I first introduced the Women's Educational Equity Act to establish programs that would eliminate the kind of discrimination and inequities reported by AAUW and to educate our children from the earliest moment possible that females and males are equal in this society.

In my statement on the introduction of the bill I stated, "Among the most critical problems in America today is our outmoded attitude concerning the role of women in this society."

What deeply disturbs me is that today, over 20 years later, this statement is still true. Look at the evidence—the Tailhook scandal and the lack of immediate action by the Military Establishment to reprimand the perpetrators in this incident, the Senate Judiciary Committee's decision to ignore Professor Hill's sexual harassment allegations against Clarence Thomas, the fact that women continue to earn only 71 cents for every dollar earned by a male colleague—the examples are endless.

This is what we truly seek to eradicate from our society, the notion that somehow women are second class citizens. And that we continue to believe that the process of eliminating inequities begins in our education system.

The fact that we have not yet reached this goal is not due to the failure of title IX, but it is a reflection of the deterioration of Federal leadership in this area, the lack of title IX enforcement over the last decade, and the pervasive nature of sex discrimination in our educational institutions which has allowed inequities to continue.

The plight of Women's Educational Equity Act over the last two decades documents very well the change in Federal priorities and the failure to address the discrimination that continues to exist in our schools.

In the 1970's WEEA was an extremely successful program, initiating hundreds of projects that resulted in valuable research, curriculum development, and actual services in promoting educational equity for girls and women. In 1976, its first year of operation, WEEA was funded at $6 million. By 1980 funding levels rose to $10 million.

However, during the 1980's the Reagan and Bush administrations sought to eliminate WEEA and curtailed its productivity through severe budget cuts. In fiscal year 1991 WEEA received only $500,000 for information dissemination only, no new programs were funded.

Yet despite severe budget cuts and threats of elimination, WEEA has continued to survive. We were able to increase its appropriation for fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1993 to a modest $2 million for the continued development of model equity programs. But so much more is needed, as demonstrated in the AAUW report and in the legislative proposals that have been developed by the caucus.

The Gender Equity in Education Act, signifies a renewal of our commitment to providing girls and women with equitable opportunities at all levels of education.

I am extremely excited about the fact that this omnibus package which addresses many areas of need, begins with the revitalization of the Women's Educational Equity Act. Title I, the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1993, recaptures the original intent of WEEA through the establishment of an Office of Women's Equity, which will promote and coordinate women's equity policies and programs and in all Federal education programs and offices.

Many of the other legislative proposals within the Gender Equity in Education Act call for changes to existing programs and the establishment of new programs within the Department of Education to address the education needs of girls and women. These include initiatives to address sexual harassment in our schools, provide teacher training on equity issues, improve girls' achievement in math and science, establish programs for pregnant and parenting teens, provide coordinated social services within our schools, provide child abuse education, address inequities in athletic programs, and improve data collection.

The Office of Women's Equity will be charged with the responsibility of assisting in the development and coordination of these new initiatives within the Department of Education through technical assistance and other coordinating functions.

The Office will also maintain the current WEEA grant program to develop model programs, curricula, and materials to advance educational equity. However, the most exciting initiative in the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1993 is a new program which will actually give funds to school districts and community organizations to implement equity programs for girls and women within local schools systems. Many model equity programs have been developed over the last 15 years and now is the time to assist schools and school districts in actually integrating these programs into their educational systems.

Reform within the educational system begins at the local level. And as we seek to eliminate the discrimination, inequities and barriers that continue to prevent girls and women from achieving educational, economic, and social parity in this society, we must assure that schools all across this country implement and integrate into their curriculum, policies, goals, programs and activities, initiatives to achieve educational equity for women and girls.

The Gender Equity in Education Act will help achieve this goal. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. It will determine the future success of our daughters, granddaughters, and many generations to come.

□ 1630

VALUE ADDED TAX LOOMING ON LEGISLATIVE HORIZON

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, looming on the legislative horizon is the value added tax for consumers. We hear and read that it is under consideration by President Clinton. Is this the same President Clinton who on February 19, at a town meeting in Ohio when asked about a value added tax, said that he was not contemplating the tax and that it shouldn't be necessary in the next 10 years if at all. What a confusing signal we get now from the White House.

Has he discussed this tax with the leadership Democrats?

Do they support it?

I'll tell you this. The people in my district don't support it. We already have excessive sales taxes in California. We are taxed up to our ears and this tax will only make life harder for consumers. What is so insidious about the value added tax is the simple fact that the consumer can't determine how much the tax really is. All the consumer will see is a higher price in the products he or she purchases. People will blame business for the price. They will think the manufacturer is benefiting from the inflated costs. In truth, we are going to make every sup-

plier and manufacturer in America a tax collector. The value added tax isn't like a straightforward sales tax. The consumer knows what the sales tax costs on a product. The cost is on the sales receipt or bill of sales. This tax won't show. All the consumers will know is the product costs more. He or she will blame the manufacturer. Does the President want a scapegoat?

This is just like the energy tax bill that will come to the House. This tax will be based on Btu's. Will consumers understand the Btu tax? Bills are paid by kilowatt hours and cubic feet. There's nothing about Btu's on an electric bill or a natural gas bill or a gallon of gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, these suggested tax increases by the President are confusing and insidious. What happened to his pledge to the middle-class—the $30,000-a-year family income?

Now we are hearing about value added taxes and Btu taxes and income taxes and taxes on Social Security benefits. We are talking about deficit stimulus packages that only create summer jobs. We haven't yet seen sensible tax policies that will create real jobs in the private sector.

It is the opinion of many, Mr. Speaker, that the tax plans discussed and put forth by this administration will lead to inflation, end the economic recovery that is just beginning, and lead to higher interest rates and more unemployment. My State can't afford it.

This administration knows that taxes create new powers for government, new domination of the American people, bigger bureaucracies, bigger and bigger government.

We aren't discussing spending cuts in this body. We are hearing about new and bigger spending and new taxes to pay for the new spending proposals.

The higher the taxes—the lower the revenues. No nation on this Earth has ever taxed its way into prosperity. Hasn't history taught this administration anything?

Mr. Speaker, I hope this House will reject these tax increases and dedicate its time and efforts toward responsible action. We need to cut these bureaucracies rather than expand them, seriously reduce the deficit through sensible cuts, pass tax credit to stimulate industry and create new jobs in the private sector of our economy. This administration is steering a very dangerous course.

Isn't it about time we dedicated our efforts to do something for the American people rather than to them?

H.R. 1760, THE YOUTHSAVE ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce H.R. 1760, the Job Corps Youth Sentencing Alternative for Vocational Education and Training Act of 1993, to be better known as the Youthsave Act of 1993.

The purpose of this legislation is to establish up to 10 Job Corps Youthsave Centers around the Nation for nonviolent youth offenders who are not eligible to enter regular Job Corps Centers. These Youthsave Centers shall serve as an alternative to incarceration and other traditional sentencing options.

H.R. 1760 is designed to build on the widely recognized success of the Job Corps Program by creating separate Job Corps Youthsave Centers for youth who urgently need education, job training, counseling, and other services to help them avoid a lifetime of crime. Youthsave Centers will provide the disciplined environment associated with boot camps, while offering participants the chance to obtain the skills necessary to succeed.

H.R. 1760 utilizes the Job Corps approach because of its unparalleled record of success. Job Corps is America's oldest, largest, and most comprehensive residential training and education program for unemployed and undereducated youth ages 16 to 24. Job Corps serves an estimated 62,000 new students each year and has a 75-percent placement rate of helping graduates obtain permanent employment, return to school, or enter the armed services. With strong bi-partisan support, Job Corps has consistently returned $1.46 for every $1.00 invested.

President Clinton has made Job Corps an important part of his investment plan by providing funds in his fiscal year 1994 budget to carry out the 50–50 plan—to serve 50 percent more youth by carefully investing in existing Job Corps Centers and systematically opening 50 new Job Corps Centers over the next decade. I wholeheartedly endorse the 50–50 plan, and I congratulate the President for recognizing the potential of this vital program.

I also want to make very clear that the Youthsave Act is designed to expand on the 50–50 plan rather than take funds away from that fundamental effort. The funds my colleagues and I would seek for this measure would be in addition to the money needed to achieve the goals of the 50–50 plan. I am optimistic that the growing awareness of Job Corps' potential will make it possible to support the Youthsave Act and other efforts to utilize Job Corps' valuable concepts and resources.

Eligibility requirements of the regular Job Corps Program, however, limit the participation of youth with behavioral problems and most youth who have been convicted of crimes beyond the misdemeanor level. Without access to the kinds of services provided under Job Corps, most of these juvenile offenders get warehoused in youth detention centers or other facilities. Then, regardless of the seriousness of their crimes, most youth offenders are released at the age of 21, poorly educated, unskilled, and unprepared to enter the work force.

Research on crime prevention shows that early intervention directed at first-time offenders is very effective in helping them break away from crime. Studies have also shown that inmates who receive job training in prison are three times less likely to return to jail after being released than their counterparts who do not participate in job training.

The answer is to adapt the Job Corps approach to the needs of youth with nonviolent behavioral problems. H.R. 1760 would make that possible by establishing special Job Corps Youthsave Centers which youth offenders could, with court approval, choose to enter as an alternative to traditional sentencing options.

The Youthsave Act of 1993 would authorize $60 million in fiscal year 1994 for the design and construction of up to 10 Youthsave Centers and such sums as are necessary in fiscal years 1995–2004 to complete and operate the centers. The measure includes a 30-percent matching requirement for States where Youthsave Centers are established.

Youthsave Centers shall be separate facilities from regular Job Corps Centers, designed to provide an alternative sentencing option for youth convicted of nonviolent offenses. Job Corps Youthsave Centers will provide the comprehensive services available under the Job Corps Program and other special services that the Secretary of Labor may deem appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has already endorsed the concept of opening up Job Corps to troubled youth. Under section 433(A)(3) of the Job Training Partnership Act, the Secretary is authorized to undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have a history of behavioral problems in order to provide these youth with the education, job training, and counseling services that have proved so successful among regular Job Corps participants. The Youthsave Act of 1993 would build on that commitment.

The annual costs of incarceration range as high as $36,000 per inmate and represent one of the fastest growing expenses facing the States. Successful efforts to educate and train convicted youth could result in substantial cost savings in terms of reduced crime, incarceration, and public assistance and in higher payroll tax revenues. In addition to helping youth who are in the most urgent need, we owe it to ourselves to make this wise investment in crime and misery prevention.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined many of my colleagues in endorsing the idea of enrolling certain troubled youth who break the law in boot camps designed to discipline them and, in some cases, shock them into understanding that a lifetime of crime can be nasty, brutish, and short.

But I believe we must do more. We must provide these troubled youth with a tangible alternative to crime. The shock of boot camp inevitably wears off, supplanted by the reality of unemployment and low self-esteem. We must provide these youth with a real opportunity to change, to learn a skill, to earn a decent living, and provide for themselves and their families.

In conclusion, I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FROST, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, for joining me in introducing this bill. I also want to acknowledge the hard work of the Home Builders Institute in supporting the development of this bill.

The Youthsave Act of 1993 does not offer convicted youth a reward but, instead, a practical alternative for those who are willing to accept the challenge. We simply cannot afford to

write off young men and women who get into trouble. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

THE DECLINE OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY IN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, who is not only ranking member of the very important Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, but has tonight the hat of something that may be even more important at this time in the history of this body, and that is the chairmanship of the Republican Leadership Task Force on Deliberative Democracy. This task force has just completed a charge that has been given to us, and I yield to my good friend from New York, to deliver the results of his efforts.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, who is a member of the Rules Committee and the Deliberative Democracy Task Force, for yielding me this time.

Prior to the Easter recess, the Republican leadership appointed me to head-up this Task Force on Deliberative Democracy in the House to develop an action plan to combat abuses of Democrat Party procedures here in the House.

Obviously, the prime focus of our task force has been the string of 10 consecutive restrictive rules which have limited the amendment process on major bills in this Congress.

On Tuesday of this week, we took our action plan, and first report, to the leadership, and earlier today to the Republican Conference, both of which gave their stamp of approval. Tomorrow we will release our first report to the public and media.

Our report is entitled, appropriately enough, "The Decline of Deliberative Democracy in the People's House." The evidence that we have gathered clearly points to a higher amount of Democrat partisanship and oppression in the legislative process, than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, while our task force recognizes the right of the majority to establish rules and the legislative agenda, we conclude that this cannot be done at the expense of the rights of Members and their constituents to fully participate in the legislative process in both committees and on the House floor.

Thus far in this 103d Congress, on the 10 bills brought from other committees through the Rules Committee, only 32 amendments have been made in order out of 163 submitted. Only 21 House Members have been blessed with the opportunity to offer floor amendments and fully represent their constituents.

What that means is that the remaining 414 Members and the 248 million Americans they represent, are being shut out of their own House—what is supposedly the "People's House."

To disenfranchise 95 percent of the American people in their own House is a scandal, it's obscene, and it must end.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the majority leadership will change its ways and reopen this body to the people, as the Founders intended. I will then be happy to close down our Democracy Task Force and get on with the important business of legislating for all the people.

The report follows:

THE DECLINE OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY IN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Deliberative democracy in a state of dangerous decline in the House which, if not reversed soon, will result in the passage of ill-conceived and ill-considered legislation that will ultimately produce a further erosion of public confidence in the Congress. The electorate's mandate for change does not extend to making change for the sake of change, or to ending gridlock by putting deliberative democracy under a strong-arm hammerlock.

Committees are becoming more partisan and perfunctory in their consideration of legislation, thereby precluding efforts to fashion bipartisan, consensus bills that truly represent the House and the American people.

There has been a general breakdown in the committee system in the House due to multiple subcommittees, Members assignments, and tangled jurisdictions, necessitating such phantom legislative devices as proxy voting, one-third quorums and "rolling quorums." And such phantom legislating detracts from collective and deliberative decision-making. Congress in its committees is no longer "Congress at work," but "Congress hardly working."

On 7 out of 9 reported bills coming through the Rules Committee in this Congress, the three-day availability requirement for reports has been waived and ignored, denying Members of both parties the opportunity to be fully informed of the provisions of major bills before they vote on them.

The percentage of restrictive rules which limit amendments has increased from 15% in the 95th Congress, to 66% in the 102nd, and thus far in the 103rd Congress stands at 100%.

To date in the 103rd Congress, only 32 amendments have been made in order on the 10 bills cleared by the Rules Committee, even though 163 amendments have been submitted.

Only 21 House Members have been blessed by the Rules Committee with the opportunity to offer floor amendments, meaning the other 414 Members and the roughly 248-million people they represent have been disenfranchised during the critical amendment process in the House.

There is an increasing tendency to waive the three-day layover requirement for conference reports, again preventing informed debate and votes at the final stage of the legislative process, often to the later embarrassment of the Congress when hidden-goodies are discovered after a bill is enacted.

When Members are elected to Congress with the expectation that they will be exercising their rights as lawmakers on behalf of their constituents, only to be told they may not fully exercise those rights on the House floor, something has gone radically haywire with the constitutional scheme of things. While the majority party always has the right to establish the rules and legislative agenda for the House, it should recognize the need to place responsible limits on those powers which permit all Members to fully participate in the truly deliberative democratic process and of all the people to be fully represented in their national legislature.

THE TOP TEN DEMOCRAT DODGES AND DENIALS (AMENDMENTS BLOCKED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE FROM FLOOR CONSIDERATION)

A balanced budget constitutional amendment to the debt limit bill;

A statutory line-item veto amendment to the debt limit bill;

A freshman Democrat expedited rescission amendment to the debt limit bill;

A ban on HIV-positive immigrants from permanent admission into the U.S., to the NIH bill;

Retention of the prohibition on homosexuals in the military unless changed by law;

A mandatory removal of persons from voter registration rolls if they have not voted in 50-years, to the "motor voter" bill;

A prohibition on non-citizens from registering to vote, to the "motor voter" bill;

A requirement that economic stimulus spending not be obligated until off-setting reductions have been made;

A government-wide rescission of 747 projects worth $1.963 billion, to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill;

Deletion of the BTU energy tax revenues from the budget resolution.

THE DECLINE OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY IN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

Introduction

"It is in the Congress that the varied needs and interests of the people find expression. It is in the Congress that out of the clash of contending opinions is forged the democratic unity of a democratic people. Too many people mistake the deliberations of the Congress for its decisions. . . .

"Common consent in democratic government springs from common understanding. It is out of the airing of conflicting opinions in hearings, debates, and conferences that a people's Congress comes to decisions that command the respect of a free and democratic people.

"Not all the measures which emerge from the Congress are perfect, not by any means, but there are very few which are not improved as a result of discussion, debate, and amendment. There are very few that do not gain widespread support as a result of being subject to the scrutiny of the democratic process."—Speaker Sam Rayburn, Texas Forum of the Air, Radio Address, Nov. 1, 1942.

The above words of Democratic Speaker Sam Rayburn, during the early days of World War II, sum-up the essence of our democracy and the central role of Congress in mediating the competing opinions and interests of the people to forge a national consensus and unity.

The heart of this process is perhaps best captured by the phrase, "deliberative democracy"—the full and free airing of conflicting opinions through hearings, debates, and amendments for the purpose of developing and improving legislation deserving of the respect and support of the people.

Deliberation is nothing more than the careful consideration of alternatives before

reaching a decision. It is, as Rayburn put it, the "scrutiny of the democratic process." Without it, that process would be blind, uninformed, and driven by popular passions or political imperatives rather than by informed debate and analysis.

The Republican Leadership Task Force on Deliberative Democracy in the House was created out of a growing concern that deliberative democracy was being sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

Therefore, the first priority of the Task Force's House Democracy Project was to conduct an assessment of the state of deliberative democracy at this point in the 103rd Congress. The scope of our inquiry has been, and will continue to be, all stages of the legislative process—from subcommittee hearings to the final adoption of conference reports.

It is the conclusion of this first report that deliberative democracy is in a state of dangerous decline which, if not reversed soon, will result in the passage of ill-conceived and ill-considered legislation that will ultimately produce a further erosion of public confidence in the Congress.

We are acutely aware that the people in last year's elections voted for change and an end to gridlock. But we do not think that mandate extends to making any change for the sake of change, or to ending gridlock by putting deliberative democracy under a strong-arm, hammerlock.

If democratic processes are not preserved as we work together for necessary and realistic changes, that change will not long enjoy the public support and respect that only deliberative democracy and consensus-building can produce. In short, the people are the ultimate losers in any attempt to short-circuit the deliberative process simply to create the perception that we are quick-change artists.

The Committee System

"Congress in its committees," as Woodrow Wilson once put it, "is Congress at work." Committees are the "workshops" or "mini-legislatures" of the legislative branch where the need for legislation is developed through hearings, and the options for legislative solutions are aired through testimony, discussion and amendments. The legislative product that finally emerges from this rigorous committee process is likely to be a fairly representative and balanced piece of legislation that can survive the full scrutiny of the full House, pretty much intact.

Or, at least, that's how it is all supposed to work. However, for a variety of reasons, which have been well-documented elsewhere, the committee system no longer works that way. Some would say it barely works at all. Authorizing committees are squeezed-out by the budget and appropriations processes, and strangled by their own tangled lines of jurisdictions with other committees and subcommittees.

Moreover, with Members spread so thinly with multiple committee and subcommittee assignments, committees must resort to phantom legislative devices such as one-third quorums, proxy voting and "rolling quorums" to get any work done. If Wilson were to observe the committee system today he might conclude that, "Congress in its committees is Congress hardly working at all"—at least not well or as originally intended.

When committees are called-upon by the leadership to bring important legislation to the floor, it is often without adequate notice, preparation, or deliberation, and the final product often reflects the haste with which such legislation is processed. It is little wonder, then, that committee chairmen more and more frequently want to protect their bills from the heat of debate or the critical light of amendments when they reach the House floor. They would not likely survive the battering of sustained deliberation.

The Task Force is troubled by early reports from some committees that markup sessions are more perfunctory and partisan and less deliberative than in previous Congresses. Amendments offered by minority members tend to be dismissed out of hand and voted down along party-lines without serious debate or attempts at compromise.

While this disturbing new attitude may be due in part to the fact that many bills being considered in the early part of the session are retreads from the previous Congress, and are supported in their existing form by the new President, this does not relieve the Congress either of its responsibility to the 110 new Members to reopen debate and inform and educate, or of its responsibility to itself to preserve its independent status as a co-equal branch and its deliberative process that guarantees that status.

The Task Force does take strong exception to the way in which the so-called "expedited rescission" bill was handled, or mishandled, at the committee level. The Government Operations Committee is to be commended on holding a hearing on this and other alternatives earlier this year.

But, when the time came to markup the bill, the committee waited until two days before it was scheduled for floor consideration to tentatively schedule a markup. However, when the chairman was informed that the minority would exercise its rights under House Rules to offer amendments and file minority views, the chairman decided to call-off the markup and allow his committee to be discharged by the Rules Committee.

And, what was ultimately made in order by the Rules Committee was a bill that had not been previously referred to the Government Operations Committee plus a majority substitute that hadn't been testified to at the Rules Committee hearing. The substitute was simply plopped on the Rules Committee's doorstep following a full day of hearings, shortly before the rule was to be reported.

The lack of proper committee deliberation and reporting may explain in part why the rule was initially withdrawn, after nearly an hour of debate, for lack of support.

The Task Force hopes that such committee bypasses are an aberration and not a new pattern to avoid critical committee deliberations, including minority amendments and views, that are such an essential part of the legislative process in the House.

The Three-Day Layover Requirement

One of the most important House Rules in terms of guaranteeing deliberative debate by the House on reported bills is the so-called three-day layover requirement. It states quite simply that the House cannot consider a bill until the committee report on it has been available to House Members for three-days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays).

When this requirement was made a part of House Rules by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that drafted the rule explained the need for it in its 1965 final report as follows:

"Finally, there must be time for the report to be studied. A bill that cannot survive a 3-day scrutiny of its provisions is a bill that should not be enacted. Proper consideration must be given to important legislation, even in the closing days of a session. The world's most powerful legislature cannot in good conscience deprive its membership of a brief study of a committee report prior to final action. (p. 13)

Nevertheless, there is an increasingly disturbing tendency of the leadership to schedule floor action on bills only a day or two after the report is filed—meaning the same day the report is first available to Members, or the very next day.

Thus far in the 103rd Congress, waiving the three-day layover requirement has been more the rule than the exception. Of the bills reported from committees that have come through the Rules Committee, seven have been taken up in the House prior to the third day of report availability:

Family and Medical Leave (H.R. 1): reported, Feb. 2, 1993; passed House, Feb. 3, 1993;

National Voter Registration (H.R. 2): reported, Feb. 2, 1993; passed House, Feb. 4, 1993;

Unemployment Compensation (H.R. 920): reported, Feb. 23, 1993; passed House, Feb. 24, 1993;

Hatch Act Amendments (H.R. 20): reported, Feb. 22, 1993; considered on Feb. 23rd, and failed under suspension of rules, Feb. 24th; later passed under a rule, March 3, 1993;

NIH Revitalization Act (H.R. 4): reported, March 9, 1993; considered, March 10, 1993; passed, March 11, 1993.

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations (H.R. 1335): reported, March 15, 1993; considered by House, March 17, 1993; passed House, March 19, 1993;

Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 64): reported, March 15; considered by House, March 17, 1993; passed House, March 18, 1993.

In short, the House has ignored its three-day report availability requirement 77% of the time on reported bills coming through the Rules Committee. The previous high was in the 101st Congress when the three-day layover requirement was waived on 23 occasions comprising 16% of all rules (see Table 1 in the Appendix to this report.)

The Task Force strongly urges the majority leadership to reverse this trend and enforce the three-day layover requirement so as to enable Members to better understand what it is they are being asked to vote on.

Restrictive Rules

The most serious encroachment on the deliberative process in the House has been the limitation on House floor amendments through special rules or order of business resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules.

As can be seen from Table 2 in the Appendix to this report, the trend from open to restrictive rules has been growing gradually over the years. Whereas in the 95th Congress (1977–78) only 15% of the special rules limited House floor amendments, in the 102nd Congress the percentage had risen to 66%, and, thus far in the 103rd Congress it is 100%.

To emphasize just how important special rules are, one must keep in mind that most minor, non-controversial legislation is considered under other procedures—either unanimous consent or suspension of the rules. Special rules are used only for major, controversial bills and involve substantive policy issues and differences.

The fact that the majority leadership has brought every major bill to the floor under a restrictive amendment process in this Congress is clear evidence of its disdain not only for the rights of the minority and individual members, but for deliberative democracy and

the rights of all the people it is designed to represent.

Efforts to portray complaints about restrictive rules as mere partisan, procedural whining and bickering ignore the larger institutional and constitutional issues at stake, not to mention the partisan taint such procedural constraints self-inflict on the legislative products of such a process.

As Table 3 shows, two major bills have been completely closed to any amendments—the unemployment compensation and debt limit bills. And two other bills, the motor voter and emergency supplemental appropriations bills, allowed for only one amendment each.

And, in the latter instance, the only amendment made in order to the supplemental was not one of the 37 submitted to the Rules Committee. Instead, it was an unfiled amendment by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that was never offered on the House floor. See Table 4 for a comparison of restrictive amendment processes on supplemental appropriations from the 95th through 102nd Congresses. Of the 11 restrictive instances, five were under a suspension of the rules (requiring a two-thirds vote for passage), and six were under special rules. Of the six under special rules, only two supplementals were completely closed to amendment.

The Task Force is especially outraged by any attempts to limit amendments to appropriations bills since this directly undermines the House's constitutional authority over the purse strings of government. To prohibit even amendments to cut or eliminate spending in an appropriations bill is a subversion and derogation of that authority and cannot be allowed to continue.

Had the House been able to make some reasonable changes in the supplemental appropriations bill initially, it might not have reached the impasse it did in the other body for so many weeks. Moreover, the Administration's initial take-it-or-leave it, all-or-nothing-at-all approach to this $16.2 billion spending bill is a direct slap at the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress.

While it is not the purpose of this Task Force report to rehash all the specifics of the special rules fights that have marked and marred floor debates in this 103rd Congress from its inception, it should be evident that something is dreadfully wrong with the deliberative process in the House when only 32 amendments have been made in order to the 10 bills considered out of 163 amendments submitted (see the final section of the Appendix for a listing of amendments not made in order by the Rules Committee in this Congress). That comes to an average of 3.2 amendments made in order per bill. Only 21 individual House Members have been blessed by the Rules Committee with the opportunity to offer floor amendments. That means that the other 414 House Members and the roughly 248-million Americans they represent have been disenfranchised during one of the most critical stages of the legislative process.

Among the 131 amendments denied by the Rules Committee, the following ten are perhaps the most egregious examples of "Democrat Dodges and Denials:"

A balanced budget constitutional amendment to the debt limit bill;

A statutory line-item veto amendment to the debt limit bill;

A freshman Democrat expedited rescission amendment to the debt limit bill;

A ban on HIV-positive immigrants from permanent admission into the U.S., to the NIH bill;

Retention on the prohibition on homosexuals in the military unless changed by law;

A mandatory removal of persons from voter registration rolls if they have not voted in 50-years, to the "motor voter" bill;

A prohibition on non-citizens from registering to vote, to the "motor voter" bill;

A requirement that economic stimulus spending not be obligated until off-setting reductions have been made;

A government-wide rescission of 747 projects worth $1.963 billion, to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill; and

Deletion of the BTU energy tax revenues from the budget resolution.

This trend in denying Members the right to offer floor amendments bespeaks the extent to which deliberative democracy is in decline in this new Congress. Whereas an open amendment process served the House well for two centuries in ensuring that the best possible legislation was hammered out in the fires of free and open debate, the restrictive amendment process today is designed purely to ensure that the committee-reported bill will survive intact, regardless of its quality or need.

Even when amendments are made in order, they are usually characterized in partisan terms and offered for an up-or-down vote rather than the free give-and-take that occurs under an open amendment process. Not only does this stiffen the lines of debate, but it hardens the walls of the legislation against any chance for improvement and compromise.

The abuse and overuse of restrictive rules is not a mere partisan complaint by the minority party. Congressional scholars Norm Ornstein of AEI and Tom Mann of Brookings testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress on February 16th of this year that "restrictive special rules should not become the norm" and "should be used only when absolutely necessary." And they went on to characterize the frequency of the use of restrictive rules as "a disturbing trend which should be rolled back."

While "the majority has developed various rationalizations for their actions," Ornstein and Mann went on. "Taken together, they constitute a disregard for minority rights, the rights of individual members, and a dismissal of the constructive role which the minority or other dissenters can sometimes play in offering alternatives and pointing out the flaws in a pending measure." That is what deliberative democracy should be about.

While this attitude of the majority today that there is no need to compromise with the minority, in the long-run it will find that it cannot deny the rights of individual legislators because they are backed by the legitimate concerns, interests and opinions of millions of people they represent. The walls of the House are permeable to the voice of the people, and eventually that volume will build and seep through.

Other Concerns

The Task Force takes note in passing of two other items that pose further threats to deliberative democracy in the House and which will be subject to further monitoring and comment in our next report.

First is the tendency to waive the three-day layover requirement for conference reports, or, in the alternative, to accept Senate amendments without further debate or amendment in order to avoid going to conference. In the case of the Family and Medical Leave Act (H.R. 1), the House took this one step further by adopting a special rule that, upon its adoption self-executed the adoption of the Senate amendment to the House bill—in other words, sent the Senate bill on to the President without a separate debate on, or amendment to, the substance of the matter by the House.

The House and Senate have been repeatedly embarrassed over the years by conference reports on voluminous pieces of legislation which have been voted on before even properly printed or distributed, let alone understood. Only after their enactment have some of the provisions come back to haunt the Congress.

Deliberative democracy is just as important at the end of the legislative process as it is at the formative subcommittee stages or the amendatory floor stage. In fact, the case can be made that it is even more important that Congress be fully informed and deliberate on that final product since that is the version that will become law.

The second item of concern the Task Force wishes to raise in this section is the threat to curtail or terminate so-called "special order" periods of debate at the end of each day when Members may speak on any subject they wish.

While objections have been raised against such special orders on grounds of cost and utility, the Task Force takes issue with such attempts to place a price tag on free speech or to devalue the content of that speech. It is especially important to the minority that such periods be preserved because it does not set the legislative agenda and therefore is otherwise often precluded from discussing subjects of interest to it—including bills which may be bottled-up in committees.

But, it should also be pointed out that special orders are not solely for the use or benefit of the minority. Individual Members of the majority party are also frequent users of this free speech period and their rights are just as important as those of the minority.

While special orders may not be preceived as having a direct bearing on the deliberative process tied to passing bills, they nevertheless can be considered as part of the deliberative process to the extent that they are concerned with discussing broader national issues or unreported legislation for which there may be growing public support.

Conclusions

The Task Force on Deliberative Democracy in the House finds that deliberative democracy is in a state of serious decline in this 103rd Congress for a variety of reasons. These include the breakdown in the authorizing committee system, the number of Member committee and subcommittee assignments that militate against conscientious legislating, tangled committee jurisdictions and multiple bill referrals, and a hardening of partisan lines at the committee and floor levels that make deliberation and compromise difficult if not impossible.

While many of the above factors have been present in varying degrees in previous Congresses and reflect underlying structural and procedural defects that must be addressed by current reform efforts, there is a disturbing acceleration of the decline in this Congress due to the majority's strong desire to demonstrate it has broken gridlock, no matter what the costs or results. Unfortunately, the cost has already been the decline of deliberative democracy, and the natural result will likely be the decline in the quality of our laws and public support for them.

The drastic curtailment of House floor amendments is but one piece of the overall picture, though certainly the most dramatic and distressing element in the decline of de-

liberative democracy. When Members are elected to Congress with the expectation that they will be exercising their rights as lawmakers on behalf of their constituents, only to be told that they may not exercise those rights on the House floor, something has gone radically haywire with the constitutional scheme of things.

While the majority party in the House has always had, and should always have, the right to establish the rules and the legislative agenda for the Congress, it should at the same time recognize the need to place responsible limits on the exercise of those powers—limits which clearly recognize the right of all Members to fully participate in a truly deliberative democratic process and of all the people to be fully represented in their national legislature.

TABLE 1.—WAIVERS OF THREE-DAY LAYOVER REQUIREMENT FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS ON LEGISLATION

	Total rules granted [1]	3-day layover waivers [2]	Waivers as percent of total
Congress (years):			
96th (1979–80)	244	19	8
97th (1981–82)	145	9	6
98th (1983–84)	184	10	5
99th (1985–86)	142	13	9
100th (1987–88)	147	16	11
101st (1989–90)	140	23	16
102d (1991–92)	127	18	14

[1] This figure includes all order of business resolutions providing for the original consideration of measures by the House. It does not include rules for conference reports.

[2] This figure covers all rules in which clause 2(L)(6) of House Rules XI is specifically waived against a measure. It does not include blanket waivers which may also cover violations of the three-day layover requirement for committee reports.

Sources: "Survey of Activities of the House Committee on Rules," 96th–101st Congresses; "Notices of Action Taken," House Committee on Rules, 102d Congress.

TABLE 2.—OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES, 95TH–103D CONGRESSES

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	10	0	0	10	100

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Congresses; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Congress, through Apr. 19, 1993.

TABLE 3.—OPEN FIFTH RESTRICTIVE RULES, 103D CONGRESS

Rule number and date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58—Feb. 2, 1993	MC	HR 1: Family and medical leave	30	3	PQ: 246–176; A: 259–164 (Feb. 3, 1993.
H. Res. 59—Feb. 3, 1993	MC	HR 2: National Voter Registration Act	19	1	PQ: 248–171; A: 249–170 (2/4/93).
H. Res. 103—Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7	0	PQ: 243–172; A: 237–178 (2/24/93).
H. Res. 106—Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9	3	PQ: 248–166; A: 249–163 (3/3/93).
H. Res. 119—Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13	8	PQ: 247–170; A: 248–170 (3/10/93).
H. Res. 132—Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental approps	37	1 (not submitted).	A: 240–185; (3/18/93).
H. Res. 133—Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Cong. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14	4 (1 not submitted).	PQ: 250–172; A: 251–172 (3/18/93).
H. Res. 138—Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20	9	PQ: 252–164; A: 247–169 (3/24/93).
H. Res. 147—Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase public debt limit	6	0	PQ: 244–168; A: 242–170 (4/1/93).
H. Res. 149—Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578; Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8	3	

Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ-Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

TABLE 4.—COMPARATIVE TABLE ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 95TH–102D CONG.

Congress	Number of supplemental	Open amendment processes		Restrictive amendment processes	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
95th	13	13	100	0	0
96th	6	5	83	1	17
97th	11	10	91	1	9
98th	9	6	67	3	33
99th	7	6	86	1	14
100th	4	2	50	2	50
101st	4	3	75	1	25
102d	7	5	71	2	29
Total	61	50	82	11	18

Compiled by minority staff, House Committee on Rules.

Notes.—When no rule was granted, it is assumed the Appropriations Committee called the supplementals up as privileged and they were considered in the Committee of the Whole under an open amendment process as required by the Rules of the House. Of the 11 restrictive amendment processes, five were under a suspension of the rules and six were under special rules. Of the latter, only two were completely closed amendment processes.

Sources: House Calendars, Rules Committee Calendars, and bound copies of "Rules Granted," Committee on Rules.

Amendments Not Made in Order by the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress

H.R. 1 Family and Medical Leave:

Traficant #1 Adds a "buy American requirement" for all procurements made by the Commission in title III.

Hoekstra #2 Extends deadline for issuance of DOL regulations from 60 to 120 days.

Fawell #3 Extends to employees of the House of Representatives the same rights

and protections as to employees in the private sector.

Gunderson #4 Reduces from 12 months to 6 months after the date of enactment, the effective date for businesses that have collective bargaining agreements in place.

Gunderson #5 Changes the amount of leave provided to the levels provided under the 1988 Wisconsin state law.

Grandy/Orton #6 Substitute bill which provides a tax incentive for employers who offer family and medical leave.

Penny #7 Substitute to H.R. 1—includes: up to 12 weeks for birth or adoption, up to 6 weeks for the care of a seriously ill relative, requires doctor certification for medical leave.

Penny #8 Provides 12 weeks of leave for the birth or adoption of a child but limits to 6 weeks all other types of leave in the bill.

Penny #9 Overturns a recent DOL regulation regarding "salaried" employee status by providing that employers who allow salaried employees to use partial-day unpaid leave are not considered hourly employees as defined under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Weldon #10 Sense of Congress that the federal government covers the cost of state and local governments for compliance with H.R. 1.

Zimmer #11 Provides that if an employer implements a reduction in the workforce during the time that an employee is taking leave then the employee is not entitled to reinstatement.

Boehner #12 Expands the definition of a serious health condition to include an inability to participate in regular daily activities.

Boehner #13 Exempts from eligibility employees who fail in a "material" way to meet his or her obligations as set forth in the bill.

Boehner #14 Adds requirement for advance notice of an employee's return to job.

Bilirakis #15 Substitute to H.R. 1 which includes: (1) eligibility requirement increase to 2000 hours of continuous employment for 14 months (2) provides employer with tax deductions for expenses incurred due to employee leave.

Ballenger #16 Exempts from coverage under this act any employee who is entitled to at least 6 weeks paid leave for the purposes listed in this act.

Goodling #18 Deletes all references to a "reduced leave schedule".

Petri #21 Similar to Penny #9 which would overturn a DOL regulation and would allow employers to provide salaried employees with unpaid leave on a partial day basis.

Solomon #22 Would require that the Department of Defense policy prohibiting homosexuals in the military be retained unless changed by law.

Houghton #23 Raises the employee exemption from 50 to 100 and the required number of hours worked from 1250 to 1500.

Roukema #24 Requires any health care providers—other than a licensed doctor of medicine or osteopathy—to be licensed by the state; eliminates the authority of the Sec. of Labor to designate other health care providers.

Roukema #25 Requires any health care provider designated by the Sec. of Labor as a "health care provider" to be licensed by the state in which the provider performs services.

Myers #26 Reduces the number of workweeks of unpaid leave for civil servants from 12 to 6.

Myers #27 Reduces the number of workweeks of unpaid leave from 12 to 6 regarding general requirements for leave.

Walker/Solomon #28 Defines the term "spouse" as meaning a husband or wife under the law of any state.

Mica #29 Strikes all titles except title III, which establishes a Commission on Leave to study existing and proposed leave policies, the potential costs, benefits, and impact on the productivity of employees.

Carr #30 Substitute to H.R. 1 requires all employers to submit to the DOL, for issuance of a report to Congress, a description of that organization's policy regarding family and medical leave.

H.R. 2 National Voter Registration Act:

Rohrabacher #1 States that no person other than citizens of the U.S. may be registered to vote. (Same as Roberts #14).

Rohrabacher #2 Requires the chief state election official to submit to the Attorney General voter registration information contained in voter registration forms for the purpose of enforcing immigration laws.

Packard #3 Makes compliance by the States voluntary until the costs of implementing the provisions of the bill are fully funded by the federal government. (Same as Condit #11).

Livingston #4 Strikes section which requires the states to provide voter registration by mail.

Livingston #5 Strikes section relating to voter registration agencies.

Livingston #6 Strikes provision that exempts states from complying with the act if the states allow all voters to register at the polling place at the time of voting.

Livingston #7 Changes the procedure for registering to vote while applying for a driver's license or public assistance to require positive action in order to register.

Livingston #8 Allows states to remove the name of a person from the official list of registered voters if the person has not voted during the previous 4 years.

Livingston #9 Allows states to remove the name of a person from the official list of registered voters if the person has not voted during the previous 10 years.

Livingston #10 Allows states to remove the name of a person from the official list of registered voters if the person has not voted during the previous 50 years.

Condit #11 Makes compliance by the states voluntary until the costs of implementing the provisions of the bill are fully funded by the federal government. (Same as Packard #3).

McCollum #12 States that no person other than citizens of the U.S. may be registered to vote. Requires that with respect to the states the act shall not take effect until the Attorney General submits to Congress a report stating that sufficient procedures exist in that state to prevent voter registration by persons who are not citizens.

Roberts #13 Provides that in the case of conflict between the provisions of this act and state civil and criminal law, the state law shall prevail if the state law is more stringent in suppression of voter fraud.

Roberts #14 States that no person other than citizens of the U.S. may be registered to vote. (Same as Rohrabacher #1)

Royce #15 Requires that voter registration forms under this act include the applicant's Social Security number.

Pombo #16 Provides for the simultaneous application for voter registration with the filing of state income tax returns.

Thomas (Ca) #17 Strikes the provision which requires the FEC to prescribe regulations for carrying out the act.

Thomas (Ca) #18 Substitute for section 8 of the bill including provisions relating to the updating of registrant lists and limiting changes to the registration list immediately before the election.

Thomas (Ca) #19 Substitute for section 7 of the bill which provides for a broader list of locations which may be used for voter registration purposes.

H.R. 920 Unemployment Compensation:

Shaw—Provides an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to unemployed people in a federally declared natural disaster area.

Gunderson—Provides that states accepting federal payment for emergency compensation must require that eligible recipients participate in re-training or job search programs.

Johnson (Ct)/Grandy—Excludes any state with a total unemployment rate below 6.5% from benefits under the bill.

Johnson (Ct)—Requires states with positive unemployment compensation balances to abide by the most recent unemployment reform bill until those accounts are depleted.

Johnson (CT)—Requires the bill to be paid for by reducing meal and entertainment expense deduction.

Traficant—Sense of Congress language that Congress should act on job creating legislation.

Mink/Meek—To provide additional unemployment compensation benefits to unemployed people in an area impacted by a natural disaster.

H.R. 20 Hatch Act Amendments:

Wolf #A—Retain Hatch Act for law enforcement, intelligence and senior executive service personnel.

Wolf #B—Retain Hatch Act for Federal Election Commission, Merit Systems Protection Board and Office of Special Counsel.

Wolf #C—Strike provisions in the bill which allow for exemptions.

Wolf #D—Give broad protection to federal employees. One employee could not solicit another to participate in campaign activities.

Foglietta—Retain Hatch Act for law enforcement personnel.

Upton—Federal employees could not run for office in a partisan election.

H.R. 4 NIH Revitalization Act of 1993:

Stearns #2 Requires the Secretary, in carrying out duties under the Immigration and Nationality Act, to consider infection with the HIV virus to be a communicable disease of public health significance. (Identical to Solomon/McCollum/Roukema/Smith (TX) #5)

Solomon/McCollum #4 Prohibits permanent admission into the U.S. of immigrants who are infected with the HIV virus. (Identical to the amendment adopted in the Senate bill, S. 1)

Solomon/McCollum/Roukema/Smith (TX) #5 Requires the Secretary, in carrying out duties under the Immigration and Nationality Act, to consider infection with the HIV virus to be a communicable disease of public health significance. (Identical to Stearns #2)

Smith (NJ) #10 Perfecting amendment to Bliley amendment #7 requiring that a physician make a determination that the human fetus is dead before obtaining fetal tissue for the purposes of research.

Waxman #11 Perfecting amendments if any amendment is made in order relating to the admission of immigrants who are infected with the HIV virus.

H.R. 1335 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations:

Packard #1 Prohibits obligation of any new spending except for $4 billion provided to Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund, until legislation is enacted to offset the cost.

Walsh #2 Strikes the $28 million payment to the District of Columbia.

Solomon #3 Provides enhanced rescission authority to the President on FY 1994 and FY 1995 appropriations bills.

Traficant #4 Prohibits use of funds unless the entity expending funds agrees to comply with the Buy American Act.

Gallo #5 Requires head of each federal agency receiving funds to report quarterly on the number and type of full-time permanent new jobs created as a direct result of the funding.

Grams #6 Strikes $1.409 million for National Park Service, National Recreation and Preservation account. The money was appropriated for 28 projects in 23 states to produce measured drawings of significant structures and engineering achievements.

Gilchrest #7 Prohibits use of funds unless Labor Secretary certifies that GNP in the first quarter of 1993 grew at a rate of less than 2.5%.

Stenholm #8 Replaces emergency designation in the bill (section 202) with an emergency designation to permit adjustment of FY 1993 caps only.

Stenholm #9 Replaces emergency designation in the bill (section 202) with an emergency designation that applies only to funds spent out in FY 1993.

Orton #10 Rescinds $400 million of unobligated appropriations for HOPE (Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere) grants—combined from FY 1992 and FY 1993 funds; transfers an additional $75 million from the same account to the HOME investment partnerships program.

Goodling #11 Prohibits use of "Summer of Service" funds for a closing summit conference described in the March 8, 1993 Federal Register.

Hefley #12 Reduces by $1.455 million the amount provided for Fish and Wildlife Service, which would be available for fisheries research.

Grandy #13 Strikes emergency spending designation in the bill.

Kolbe/Packard #14 Requires new budget authority in the bill to be obligated only after equal offsetting reductions are made.

Kolbe #15 Strikes emergency spending designation in the bill.

Collins (Ga) #16 Provides that none of the funds designated by this bill may be used for any individual who is not a citizen or a lawfully admitted alien of the U.S.

Johnson (Tx) #17 Strikes $4.696 million for additional salaries and expenses for the National Science Foundation.

Johnson (Tx) #18 Strikes $2.5 billion from the Community Planning and Development—Community Development Grants.

Johnson (Tx) #19 Strikes $187 million for National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

Johnson (Tx) #20 Strikes $4.7 million for retrofitting equipment for energy efficiency in Federal buildings.

Johnson (Tx) #21 Strikes $20.663 million for EPA for abatement, control, and compliance to encourage business conversion to more energy efficient equipment.

Johnson (Tx) #22 Strikes $37.8 million for items relating to "Forest Service—Construction".

Talent #23 Substitute—Economic Growth and Job Creation Act of 1993. Title I—Neutral Cost Recovery. Title II—lowers the maximum capital gains rate to 15 percent for taxpayers in the upper tax brackets and 7.5 percent for those in the lower tax brackets. Indexes capital gains to compensate for inflation. Title III—creates IRA plus accounts. Title IV—provides a $600 tax credit for families with children age 18 and under.

Lazio #24 Provides $10 million for a National Flood Insurance Program that permits FEMA to purchase flood-damaged property and relocate flood-insured homeowners to areas not prone to flooding. The funds would be available for the remainder of FY 1993 and FY 1994.

Bentley #25 Requires federal agency heads to certify that funds spent under this act are used to purchase American produced materials and labor.

McHugh #26 Deletes $800 thousand for design and preliminary planning of the Ocoee River Olympic Venue for whitewater canoeing during the 1996 Olympics.

Gingrich #27 Strikes $1 billion for the summer youth employment program.

Baker #28 Strikes $4.7 million for undertaking energy efficiencies in federal buildings by retrofitting equipment.

Fawell #29 Adds a new title which contains a government-wide rescission list of 747 federally funded projects.

Boehner #30 Strikes activities that are not authorized in law as appropriate uses of Chapter I funds.

Cox #31 Strikes $148 million for IRS tax systems modernization.

Skeen #32 Strikes the phrase "unless expressly so provided herein" which has the effect of making all funds appropriated in the bill lapse after September 30, 1993 unless obligated by that date.

Boehner #33 Strikes $9.4 million for the National Institute of Health/National Library of Medicine.

DeLauro #34 Upon effective date, a state shall have the flexibility to transfer its FY 1993 apportionments from the Interstate Construction Program or the Interstate Substitution Program among the National Highway Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, Surface Transportation Program, Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program and Interstate Maintenance Program, provided that the transfer shall not exceed 100 percent of a state's FY 1993 apportionment for that specific category.

DeLauro #35 Upon effective date, a state shall have the flexibility to transfer its FY 1993 apportionments among the Interstate Construction Program, the National Highway Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, Surface Transportation Program, Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program and Interstate Maintenance Program, provided that the transfer shall not exceed 100 percent of a state's FY 1993 apportionment for that specific category.

Barrett #36 Adds rehabilitation and construction of schools to the list of projects eligible for funding under the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG).

Barrett #37 Federal Aid Highway—Requires that the State of Wisconsin allocate funding to the largest metropolitan area which is proportional to the percentage of the state's population which resides in that area.

H. Con. Res. 64 Budget Resolution:

Sanders #1 Reduces defense budget authority and outlays by $15 billion over fiscal years 1994–1998. Transfers $9 billion of that to Income Security and $6 billion to Education, Training.

Walker #2 Directs Ways and Means to recommend changes in law to allow taxpayers to designate up to 10% of their tax liability to retire the public debt. Directs Government Operations to recommend changes in law to sequester each year an amount equal to the amount taxpayers designate for reducing the public debt.

Barton #3 Directs engrossing clerk to send to the Senate a joint resolution proposing a tax limitation/balanced budget constitutional amendment but only if the House adopts the conference report on the budget resolution by a two-thirds vote.

Herger #4 Reduces amount of total tax increases in each fiscal year by the amount assumed for increased taxes on Social Security benefits. Reduces spending in five functions (general science, energy, commerce and housing, transportation, and general government).

Everett #5 Expresses sense of the House that Members may not increase pay if budget deficit has occurred in previous Congress; Members should have pay reduced if deficit was not reduced by previous Congress.

Burton #7 Reduces the deficit by $850 billion over 5 years by limiting the annual growth in overall federal spending to no more than 2%.

Michel #8 Establishes a point of order against extraneous matter in any reconciliation legislation considered at the direction of the FY 1994 budget resolution.

Bentley #9 Caps the FY 1994–1998 budget aggregates and the allocations for each function at the preceding year's amounts, plus two percentage points. Directs the Committee of the Whole to report, by May 14, 1993, a reconciliation bill to reduce expenditures by not less than $17.1 billion.

Allard #11 Decreases total new budget authority for FY 1994 by $1.673 billion. Specifies reductions by budget function, targeting those areas which traditionally have had earmarking or individual projects.

Allard #12 Decreases revenue levels in an amount equal to that which is estimated to result from a BTU tax. Reduces new spending in slightly larger amounts than what would be necessary to offset the lost revenues.

Smith (Mi) #13 Limits outlay expenditures in FY 1994 to either (1) the outlay level of the Kasich substitute or (2) a limited freeze for FY 1994. The freeze would limit the increase in Medicare and Medicaid expenditures to one half the CBO estimate (approximately 6.5% above the FY 1993 outlays) and permit an increase in Social Security to reflect the additional number of retirees projected. After 1994, the amendment would limit outlay expenditures to either (1) the outlay level of the Kasich substitute or (2) a 1% increase in each budget function, including Social Security (which would be adjusted to reflect the increased number of retirees). The amendment assumes the Social Security retirement age would be extended by one month per year for 36 years.

H.R. 670 Family Planning Amendments:

Solomon #5 Requires the Secretary, in carrying out duties under the Immigration and Nationality Act, to consider infection with AIDS to be a communicable disease of pubic health significance.

Dornan #6 Requires a specific means test to establish "low income family" under section 1006 of the Pubilc Health Service Act. This would include counseling services on contraception as well as pregnancy management options. Also, specifies that, for minors, the determination of income will be made without maintaining confidentiality between the minor and the minor's family.

Smith (NJ) #8 Codifies that a Title X project must be kept separate and distinct, financially and physically, from any abortion-related activities.

Solomon #9 Prohibits the permanent admission into the U.S. of immigrants who are infected with the HIV virus (identical to Senate-passed language on NIH Authorization).

Johnson (Tx) #10 Freezes the FY 1994 and 1995 authorization levels at the FY 1993 level.

Baesler #11 Second degree amendment to the Bliley amendment. Provides a judicial bypass in the federal statute.

Baesler #12 Second degree amendment to the Bliley amendment. Permits exceptions for states which have laws in effect requiring parental notification or consent before an abortion is performed on a minor.

Kolbe #13 Reduces authorization levels to those provided in the FY 1993 conference report.

Johnson (Tx) #14 Freezes the authorization level in FY 1994 and FY 1995 to the level appropriated for the previous year.

Waxman #16 Second degree amendment to the Smith (NJ) amendment. Requires that grantees maintain sufficient records to demonstrate that no federal funds were used to provide abortion services.

Waxman #19 Second degree amendment to the Dornan amendment. Defines the target population of the family planning program to be individuals at 185% of the offical poverty line and those whose economic status might otherwise prevent their participation.

H.R. 1430 Increase Public Debt Limit:

Castle-Solomon—A legislative line-item veto for fiscal years 1994–1995, subject to reversal by enactment of a disapproval bill.

Barton—A balanced budget constitutional amendment plus procedures to spin it off into a separate joint resolution for two thirds vote after final passage of debt limit bill.

Michel—Providing that targeted tax provisions be subject to line item veto.

Gekas—Sets fixed deficit targets that would reduce the deficit to zero by fiscal year 2000.

Horn—Establishes spending caps for fiscal years 1994–98 and provides for across the board sequestration (with exceptions) to enforce ceilings.

Minge-Deal-Inslee—The first year Democrat modified line item veto, expedites rescission amendment.

H.R. 1578 Expedited Rescission Act of 1993:

Michel amendment to Spratt substitute—Adding rescission authority for targeted tax provisions to Spratt's expedited rescission approach.

Clinger—To Spratt bill, removes two year sunset provision.

Duncan—Identical to Castle-Solomon except it amends the Budget Act and makes the veto permanent (i.e., no two-year sunset provision).

□ 1640

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for that report.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that other colleagues in the Chamber have, in fact, participated: The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who is at other official duties with the Joint Committee on Organization of Congress, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE], and, of course, our leader and our whip, have all participated in this.

I guess I overlooked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and, of course, he is never overlooked by the other side of the aisle or our side of the aisle either. And the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], who, regrettably, is unable to be with us this evening because of some health complications but is here in spirit and has participated in spirit in this report.

We are going to deal more with this report under some additional time we have under the time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

H.R. 1448, THE CHECK CASHING ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WATT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill that I believe will help many working people across the country hold on to more of their wages. The bill is called the Check Cashing Act of 1993. Many low-income people who work very hard for low wages do not do business with financial institutions; rather, they frequent check cashing outlets. According to the Economic Review, these outlets charge anywhere from 1 to 20 percent to cash a check—20 percent. That means someone with a check for $300 is being charged $60 simply for access to that hard-earned cash. That's $60 less for food, rent, transportation, clothing, and other expenses necessary to maintain a household. People do not enjoy giving away that much money, but many of them simply must have their cash right away. They're living paycheck to paycheck and can't afford to maintain the minimum balance required by most banks to open savings or checking accounts. They can't afford to wait for financial institutions to clear checks, so they rely on the convenience of check cashing outlets. And this reliance has created a problem in the household budgets of many people already living at or below the poverty level. The check cashing industry began in the 1930's as a response to banking problems during the depression. The industry has grown tremendously in the last decade. Statistics from the Economic Review indicate that between 1988 and 1991, check cashing outlets grew by 85 percent in Florida, 87 percent in Washington, 96 percent in Missouri, 195 percent in Georgia, and 293 percent in North Carolina—rapid growth but virtually no regulation to make sure consumers are receiving fair service. My bill seeks to remedy that situation by doing the following: Requiring check cashing outlets to charge a maximum of 50 cents or .85 percent of the face value of the check; requiring operators of check cashing outlets to have a license issued by the Federal Trade Commission; requiring depository institutions to cash Federal and State government checks if the payee is the presenter of the check and the payee presents proper identification. It is my goal to help people who use check cashing outlets retain more of their money, while making it easier for people to use financial institutions. Please help working people all across this country by supporting H.R. 1448, the Check Cashing Act of 1993.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO EXTEND GSP TO THE FORMER SOVIET UNION, CONDITIONED ON ACCEDING TO THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that makes Republics of the former Soviet Union eligible for generalized systems of preferences trade status, but after they have fulfilled their nuclear nonproliferation commitments.

My bill would remove the statutory prohibition on the former Soviet Union receiving GSP. But certain of these newly independent States, namely Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine, could only receive GSP after they have acceded to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT]. Once these countries have acceded to the NPT, the President could waive all other conditions and extend GSP to them immediately.

At this time, it is not clear whether or not the GSP program will be extended this year. I hope it will be because this legislation I am introducing today will help accomplish two important foreign policy goals in the former U.S.S.R. It will help promote reform and provide incentives for nonproliferation.

The former Soviet Republics need trade at least as much as aid. GSP status would increase export opportunities for the former Soviet Republics, allowing them to earn much needed hard currency and help their emerging private sector. And, unlike the multibillion aid packages, it won't cost U.S. taxpayers. As a New York Times editorial recently observed, it's hypocritical and masochistic to fork over billions of dollars of aid, but not provide real export opportunities to Russia and the other Republics.

Last year, in the Revenue Act of 1992, H.R. 11, Congress removed the statutory prohibition on the former U.S.S.R. receiving GSP, but this bill was vetoed by President Bush.

The bill will also create additional incentives for the non-Russian Republics to give up the nuclear weapons on their soil. After the Soviet breakup in 1991, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine each emerged with substantial nuclear arsenals on their territory. At Lisbon last May, these three Republics signed the protocols to the START I arms reduction treaty and pledged to give up their nuclear weapons and accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the shortest possible time.

But so far, only Belarus has followed through on this commitment. The main holdout appears to be Ukraine. Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk continues to assure the United States that Ukraine will ratify START I and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT].

But some members of the Ukrainian Parliament have argued against giving up their nuclear status.

The stakes for the United States are enormous. If Ukraine retains the nuclear weapons on its soil, then the START I will not go into force, leaving the United States and Russia with nuclear arsenals far larger than are necessary and costing United States taxpayers billions of additional dollars. A nuclear-armed Ukraine would also put in jeopardy the future of the NPT, which comes up for extension in 1995. Some of our European allies may rethink their nonnuclear status if they see additional nuclear powers to the east. If Ukraine fails to join the NPT, it would increase the chances of nuclear smuggling, raise the possibility of a regional nuclear war, and set a terrible precedent for other countries which want an A-bomb capability. Last month, North Korea announced it was dropping out of the NPT. If Ukraine doesn't follow through on its nonproliferation commitment, it could provide further justification for other countries to build the bomb.

This legislation would allow Ukraine to receive GSP status only after they have joined the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Then, once Kiev has joined, the President could waive any other restrictions. Belarus, which has ratified the NPT, could receive GSP immediately. President Clinton recently announced a new $65 million aid package to Belarus as a reward for carrying through on its NPT promise. Once again, trade is at least as important as aid. The President should support this legislation.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP ACT

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of Earth Day I come before this body as a former businessman who has traveled throughout the world participating in international trade and business. The appalling manner in which foreign industries are destroying our global environment is of grave concern to me.

What is truly disturbing is that the United States financially supports these practices. Both directly and indirectly America provides financial aid and foreign assistance to countries that are destroying our planet. In many instances we underwrite projects which contribute to the environmental destruction of the Earth.

Each year, U.S. businesses spend billions of dollars on pollution control equipment to comply with environmental laws and meet environmental standards. Meanwhile, our foriegn competitors—whom we finance—ignore even basic protection of the environment.

This lack of environmental pollution controls in foreign countries provides foreign manufacturers and agricultural producers with an unfair competitive advantage in the global marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am introducing the Global Environmental Cleanup Act. This bill requires foreign countries to meet environmental standards and follow environmental laws in order to be eligible for U.S. foreign aid or financial support. This bill requires that a portion of any U.S. funds or aid to polluting nations be reserved for environmental cleanup.

Mr. Speaker, on the eve of another Earth Day, I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me in support of this measure. Cosponsor this bill and let us begin together to rescue our fragile planet.

When countries damage local environments with their industrial practices, and do not diligently and constructively enforce environmental laws, the Global Environmental Cleanup Act will withhold U.S. bilateral and multilateral foreign assistance.

This bill requires that the State Department establish an annual report on each country. This report will evaluate the environmental laws, policies and practices of each country. For the first time we will make environmental cleanup a criteria for receiving U.S. financial support and aid.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should no longer financially support countries which destroy the environment through their industrial practices. We cannot afford these practices, the world cannot afford these practices and the abused Earth can no longer afford these practices. This bill establishes international environmental cleanup as a clear U.S. foreign policy priority.

Our Nation's lack of a global cleanup policy can no longer be tolerated. When we create an unfair advantage in favor of foreign countries that adversely impacts our workers and our industries we help destroy our economy and our global environment.

The record of what we are doing to the Earth astounds me. Listen for a moment to what we do with financial aid from the United States.

In 1991, the last year for which figures are available, the United States gave over $2.2 billion in economic and military aid to Egypt. Egypt's environmental atrocities are a worldwide scandal.

United States taxpayers gave over $20 million to Mexico, where severe pollution gags Mexico City nearly all year-round. That pollution can be traced to 36,000 factories and 3 million motor vehicles that spew some 5.5 million metric tons of contaminants into the air every week.

United States taxpayers gave over $14 million to Chile, where industrial pollution from mining, smelting, fossil fuel emissions and paper processing have gone largely unregulated.

United States taxpayers gave over $3 million to Brazil which is renowned for its destruction of the rain forest in the Amazon Basin.

Over the last 30 years United States taxpayers have given almost $3 billion to South Korea, and over $300 million to Taiwan in spite of legendary environmental abuse in both countries, especially in the last decade.

These are just some of the most flagrant examples of blatant environmental abuse in countries to which we send billions of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason the United States should continue to subsidize industries in foreign countries that do not meet our own environmental standards, and then allow those foreign industries to compete with our industries.

Mr. Speaker, the inequity is clear. We must take action now. It would be hypocritical for us to commemorate Earth Day on the one hand, while turning a blind eye to environmental abuse around the world on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, on Earth Day 1993 I urge my colleagues to take one small step to establish a global environmental policy. Join me in support of the Global Environmental Cleanup Act. Stop countries from profiting at the expense of our global environment. Stop countries from polluting with our financial blessings and assistance.

The time has come for the United States to take the world leadership role that this situation demands. If we continue to aid and assist in financing the destruction of our Earth I cannot be a participant. If we continue to spend American tax dollars to finance polluting foreign industries I cannot be a participant.

If we ignore what foreign nations are doing to pollute the planet with our financial support, I cannot participate.

□ 1700

COMMEMORATING THE 78TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, April 24, marks the 78th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. The purpose of this special order is to pay tribute to those men and women who were brutally murdered in one of the most heinous crimes ever committed. In hopes of raising the consciousness of

atrocities of the past, we are trying to prevent them in the future. I am here today because I am committed to the truth about the Armenian Genocide.

On the evening of April 24, 1915, more than 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Istanbul were arrested, exiled from the capital city, and executed. In a single night's sweep the voice of the representatives of the Armenian nation in Turkey was silenced. This tragic event was only the beginning of an unfolding, systematic policy of deportation and extermination being implemented by the Young Turk government. Consequently, the 24th of April represents for Armenia the symbolic beginning date of the Armenian Genocide.

The Armenians were targeted for extermination by the Ottoman Empire in which more than 1½ million women, children, and men were tortured and killed during the Armenian Genocide of 1915–23. Before 1914, over 2 million Armenians lived in Turkey. By the end of 1923, the entire Armenian population of Anatolia had been either killed or deported. I believe that it is of vital importance that we take the time to remember those Armenians who were brutally murdered.

The horror of the Armenian Genocide is made worse by the refusal of the current Government of the Republic of Turkey to acknowledge that it ever happened. The Turks attempt to account for the vast decrease in the number of Armenians in Turkey as a consequence of war. Do the Turks expect the Armenians to forget the trauma of war and grim reminders of the atrocity simply because they have succeeded in tampering with history and denying the obvious facts?

The truth about the genocide was clearly evident to Henry Morganthau, former Ambassador to Turkey between 1913 and 1916 when he reported back to officials in Washington that, after visiting the Armenian territories he stated:

> I am confident the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

The Ambassador went on to state that the Armenian Genocide was the "most colossal crime of all ages."

Perhaps if more people had known about the genocide of the Armenians, Adolf Hitler would not have rallied his troops for the invasion of Poland in August 1939. Hitler was heard to have asked, "Who remembers the Armenians?" To that, 1986 Nobel Peace Prize recipient and Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel responded, "He was right. No one remembered them."

Today this region is engulfed in another brutal struggle.

Recently Turkey has indicated that it is under "very heavy pressure" from its own people to get involved in the ethnic war in Azerbaijan. There is growing support in Turkey to send weapons and troops to help the Azerbaijanis. Undoubtedly, the involvement of Turkey in this volatile conflict would only contribute to the lack of stability in the region. I believe Turkey's Prime Minister Demirel when he says that Turkey seeks peace and stability. I am confident of his sincerity, but I am very dismayed at the blockade of essential necessities of life that is strangling Armenia today and denying basic decency to people in that country, refugees and civilians.

I am hopeful that today's special order commemorating those killed during the Armenian genocide will demonstrate America's concern for Armenians all over the world. The 24th of April is a day of remembrance for all of us who care about human values and for all of us who care about the truth. A world that forgets these tragedies is a world that will see them repeated. Such denial sends the message that genocide is an acceptable form of behavior that will be tolerated by the world community.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues that will be participating with me today to help communicate that the genocide will not go unacknowledged and unmourned. The historical record is clear and irrefutable: it is our moral responsibility to acknowledge the Armenian genocide.

PREFACE

On 19 May 1985, a full page advertisement was placed in the *New York Times*, the *Washington Times*, and the *Washington Post* contesting the veracity of the Armenian Genocide of World War I. This advertisement alleged that there was no archival basis to the Armenian Genocide thesis, and that the World War I disappearance of Ottoman Armenians should not be considered a consequence of a genocidal policy on the part of the Ottoman Government. Yet, none of the scholars who signed this advertisement had a demonstrated familiarity with pertinent archival materials on the subject of the Armenian Genocide.

This episode assumed a further twist when the prime minister of Turkey entered this debate, and declared the imminent opening of the Ottoman archives on this subject, to settle the matter once and for all. The foreign minister of Turkey announced that copies of these Ottoman materials would even be made available outside of Turkey, for the scrutiny of scholars. He said the Library of Congress would be one such depository of materials.

Almost a decade later, the Ottoman archives have not produced the promised collections, and even materials that were ostensibly available have remained inaccessible to critical scholars. Needless to say, no Ottoman materials on the World War I period were made available in Washington, D.C.

Since the very existence of any archival collection on the Genocide has been brought into question, this publication seeks to engage this "archival debate" and to make a material contribution to the debate with an exposition of some American consular and diplomatic documents on the Armenian Genocide.

DOCUMENT NO. 6

(Enclosure No. 1 with despatch No. 256 to Department of State.)

AMERICAN CONSULATE,
Aleppo, Syria, May 12, 1915.

Subject: Deportation of Armenians, (From J.B. Jackson, Aleppo, Syria.)

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU,
American Ambassador Extraordinary & Plenipotentiary, Constantinople, Turkey.

SIR: I have the honor to report as follows in reference to the attitude of the Turkish Government towards the Christians (Armenians) in Zeitoun and Marash and the surrounding towns and villages, and supplementary to my despatch No. 269 of April 21, 1915:

Between 4,300 and 4,500 families, about 28,000 persons, are being removed by order of the Government from the districts of Zeitoun and Marash to distant places where they are unknown, and in distinctly non-Christian communities. Thousands have already been sent to the northwest into the provinces of Konia, Cesaria, Castamouni, etc., while others have been taken southeasterly as far as Deir-el-Zor, and reports say to the vicinity of Bagdad. The misery these people are suffering is terrible to imagine. To go into the details would be a useless waste of time, for all the sufferings that a great community would be subject to in such circumstances are being experienced. Their property they are unable to sell as they are given but a few hours to prepare for the journey, and the Government is installing Mohammedan families in their homes, and who take possession of everything as soon as the Armenians have departed. Rich and poor alike, Protestant, Gregorian Orthodox, and Catholic, are all subject to the same order. The local pastors and priests and their flocks without distinction. The old, middle aged, young, the strong and the sick, being driven in herds to the four points of the compass to a fate of which none can predict. Few are permitted the opportunity of riding except occasionally on an ox or a donkey, the sick drop by the wayside, women in critical condition giving birth to children that, according to reports, many mothers strangle or drown because of lack of means to care for. Fathers exiled in one direction, mothers in another, the young girls and small children in still another. According to reports from reliable sources the accompanying gendarmes are told that they may do as they wish with the women and girls. The writer has personally seen several parties of the men that passed through Aleppo, and who were in a most deplorable plight, and wonders what must have been the condition of the others that naturally were much less able to resist such treatment.

In Marash alone there are 6 Gregorian Orthodox Armenian churches, 1 Armenian Congregational, 1 Armenian Catholic, and 1 Latin Catholic church, about 12 Armenian schools, 1 American, 1 German school, 1 American girls' orphanage, 1 German orphanage and a German hospital, practically all of which will be left without congregations or attendance.

About 300 persons, heads of prominent families, have been imprisoned in Marash, of which some 50 are from Zeitoun and about 50 from Osmanic. From Zeitoun about 350 families, or about 2,000 persons have been sent to Marash and from there to Aintab, and are expected to arrive in Aleppo about May 15, to be sent to Meskené, while about 250 or more families are expected to follow before May 20 to report to the Governor of Aleppo. These latter are more fortunate than the first men-

tioned, as there is a different opinion prevailing in the competent official circles of this city. Seventy-one families were sent to Konia about April 25. A traveller coming from Constantinople said that he met about 4,500 of these unfortunates on the way that were bound for Konia, and his description of their condition was appalling. The Armenians themselves say that they would by far have preferred a massacre, which would have been less disastrous to them.

Copy hereof is being transmitted to the Department of State, in duplicate.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J.B. JACKSON,
American Consul, July 10, 1915.

DOCUMENT NO. 9

AMERICAN CONSULATE,
Aleppo, Syria, June 5, 1915.

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU,
American Ambassador,
Constantinople.

SIR: With reference to my despatch No. 276 of May 12, last, relative to the action of the Ottoman Government in sending the Armenians from their homes in various parts of Northern Syria and Southwestern Asia Minor and scattering them over the adjacent country, I have the honor to report as follows:

There is a living stream of Armenians pouring into Aleppo from the surrounding towns and villages, the principal ones being Marash, Zeitoun, Hassanbeyli, Osmania, Baghtche, Adana, Dortyol, Hadjin, etc. they all come under a heavy armed escort, usually from 300 to 500 at a time, and consist of old men, women and children; all the middle aged and young men having been taken for military service. No animals are provided by the Government, and those that are not fortunate enough to have means of transport are forced to make the journey on foot. They are taken away from their homes and with only the clothes they wear and such scattered belongings as they carry with them.

Several expeditions have arrived here and have been taken care of locally by the sympathizing Armenian population of this city. A few days rest in the churches and schools, where they fill all rooms, courts, balconies and even cover the roofs; then they are forced to continue the journey to some out of the way place where there is neither shelter, food nor means of possible existence. Travellers report meeting thousands in such localities as Anah on the Eurphrates River, five of six days journey from Bagdad, where they are being scattered over the desert to starve or die of disease in the burning heat, accustomed as they were to the higher altitudes.

I am reliably informed that there are at present more than 2,600 of such people in Aleppo, and know that more than that number have been taken out from here and scattered in various directions. According to reports more than 25,000 people have already been taken from their homes and are at the mercy of strangers of antagonistic religious beliefs who martyrize and torture them in various ways. This much has been accomplished in the vicinity of Aleppo.

Trustworthy persons report that in the interior a perfect reign of terror exists, especially at Dairbekir. The same parties report that 300 prominent Christians at that place have been imprisoned in the course of the search for arms and proofs of disloyalty toward the Government, while other reports place the number of victims as high as 1,000. It is also stated that 22 have been beaten to death in the efforts to make them divulge information they did not possess. Some cases of bastingdoing have been treated by physicians, the injured feet having to be operated on to prevent amputation. It is believed that great numbers have been beaten to death. Such has been the condition there since about April 25 last; this is also true of the villages and towns in the country surrounding that city.

One person states that:—

"Christians have been drafted to work on the new barracks of the Army there. These men receive 2 piastes (9 cents) a day for their work; men sent to work on roads at a distance do not receive enough to live on and are compelled to draw upon those at home for money and food."

"These men are not allowed to remain in their homes at night, like most of the inhabitants of the city, but are held as prisoners less they desert; their quarters are vile and filthy, with no accommodations whatsoever in the way of toilet rooms. The men are not permitted to leave their quarters even temporarily."

"The sick are unattended, and unless there are friends the hungry go unfed."

"Gendarmes and recruits worry, annoy and persecute the people of the cities and villages unmercifully. Blackmail is collected generally by the gendarmes."

"A few villages in the Moush plain Keizan, Modgan and Garjgan (Van Vilayet) seem to have been destroyed by government orders because the inhabitants tried to protect themselves."

Hundreds of individual cases of persecution such as blackmailing, beating, imprisoning, etc., could be stated but which would lend no further weight to the general statement of outrages that are being practiced daily upon a defenseless and inoffensive people that demand nothing more than to be given a chance to eke out at the best a miserable existence.

The Government has been appealed to by various prominent people and even by those in authority to put an end to these conditions, under the representations that it can only lead to the greatest blame and reproach, but all to no avail. It is without doubt a carefully planned scheme to thoroughly extinguish the Armenian race.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J.B. JACKSON,
Consul.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], who has been very active on this issue for many years. We appreciate his presentation here today.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, and wish to thank and commend my colleague, Mr. LEHMAN, for arranging this special order to pay tribute to the Armenian martyrs, who were victims of one of the worst genocides of this century. On April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled, and eventually murdered in remote places. In the following years, from 1915 to 1923, a million and a half men, women, and children were murdered in an attempted genocide of the Armenian people by the Government of the Ottoman Empire. We must never forget this tragic crime against humanity.

A strong, resilient people, the Armenians survived these cruelties as they have survived persecution for centuries. Their durability comes from their love of and intense faith in God, dating back to the fourth century, when Armenia became the first nation to embrace Christianity.

In spite of the crimes committed against them, today Armenians flourish as prominent and successful citizens of our great Nation. Many of these citizens live in my hometown of Glendale, CA, and I know how important this tribute is to them. This weekend, the three largest Armenian political organizations in southern California will join together at the monument in Montebello to commemorate the April 24 anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Thousands of Armenians from all over California will participate in this event to pay tribute to their ancestors who lost their lives in this massacre.

We commemorate this date so as not to forget the suffering and pain endured by the Armenian world community. By remembering the Armenian genocide, we are speaking out against the persecution of all peoples.

History is a cruel teacher and has shown us that gross inhumanities have not perished from the Earth. Conditions in Yerevan today are like those in the besieged Leningrad of 1942. A blockade by Azerbaijan on the east, sabotage of fuel lines through Georgia on the northwest and complicity in these actions by Turkey on the southwest have placed Yerevan in a position as desperate as that of Sarajevo.

The brutality against Armenians continues today. We must call attention to the terrible suffering of the people of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh caused by Azerbaijan's continuing blockade and ongoing aggression. I will continue to urge that an immediate U.N. peacekeeping force is put in place to end this blockage and to enforce Karabakh's same right to independence as recognized by other surrounding provinces affected by the breakup of the Soviet Union.

We live in a humane and civilized world and cannot continue to allow another reign of terror against the Armenian people. Violence is not the solution to this crisis. The aggression being inflicted by both sides will only lead to more deaths, greater suffering, continued hatred and instability in the region. If the international community does not intervene immediately, the ongoing war and destruction will continue to escalate until it reaches the same levels as in the former Yugoslavia.

History must not forget that Armenians were systematically uprooted

from their homeland of 3,000 years ago and eliminated through massacres or exile. As leaders of a free and democratic nation, we have a moral obligation to acknowledge and deplore the events surrounding the Armenian genocide, and we must ensure that such atrocities do not continue. We can only do this by condemning the blockade as a violation of international law and demanding the opening of the Nagorno-Karabakh corridor to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid to Armenia.

□ 1700

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the gentleman for his thoughtful comments.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California, [Ms. ESHOO.]

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I would like to thank Mr. LEHMAN and all my other colleagues including my freshman colleague KEN CALVERT, for helping to raise the awareness of the Armenian genocide and memoralize the Armenians who were exterminated at the beginning of this century.

While this was the greatest tragedy to befall the Armenian people, it certainly is not the only one.

The genocide is one of many events that has shaken the Armenian people.

But despite the genocide, despite the earthquake in 1988, and the recent tragedy that has been unfolding in Armenia and Nogorno-Karabakh, the Armenians have remained a strong people, united by their enduring faith and character.

The Aremenian people have a powerful sense of family, and they know how to take care of one another.

I know this well, for these are my people. And as the only Member of Congress of Armenian descent, I am committed to ensure that their suffering does not go unnoticed.

The Armenian genocide is considered the first genocide of the 20th century. Between the years 1915 and 1923, millions of Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of 3,000 years and eliminated through massacres and exile.

This was a premeditated act carried out for political gain.

And it is significant that we take the time to recognize this tragedy the same week that the world is remembering the Holocaust, which occurred 50 years ago.

It has been said that, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Although this quotation has been repeated often, its meaning cannot be lost or trivialized.

Because the Armenian genocide should have been a lesson to the world.

But instead, this tragedy was forgotten or denied.

Like the Holocaust and the Cambodian genocide, it serves to remind us of the dangers inherent in hatred and intolerance.

Especially today, when acts of hate seem to be prolifering all over the world, we need to remember.

And for those who are falling victim to ethnic cleansing today, I offer them the example of my people, the Armenians.

I pray that they keep the faith and the strength that my people have.

And I pray that they maintain their sense of family.

For it is these values which maintain the Armenians' resilience, despite the many calamities that have threatened their very existence.

Again, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. LEHMAN, and my other colleagues that have joined us here today to remember this tragedy.

For we must do all that we can to prevent tragic history from repeating itself.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to congratulate my colleague for raising this very important issue and to share in the comments that have been made by my California colleagues about this very important event which is being marked. On April 24, we marked the anniversary of one of the greatest genocides in the history of the world, and it seems to me that as we look at this tragedy it is very important for the U.S. Congress to underscore the fact that it cannot be forgotten.

There is controversy that surrounds this, but no one, no one, can deny the fact that many Armenians were rounded up and in fact killed and tortured at that time. And, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that as we look at this very tragic event, marking this again as we have over the past several years here in the Congress is very important. I would like to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by my California colleagues, especially those of Mr. MOORHEAD. He does a superb job in representing many Armenians in the Glendale-Burbank area of southern California, and I know he will join us this Saturday in marking the genocide by an event that will take place in Montebello. And I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I have many statements here from other Members of the House who are unable to be here today but wanted to be included in the RECORD on this issue. Among them are the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a line from the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], which I think is very poignant at this point in time when we celebrate the opening of the Holocaust Museum here in Washington, and also acknowledge the 50th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising of the Jews in Poland. Mr. WAXMAN writes in his statement:

> The line from Armenia to Auschwitz is direct. Undoubtedly the Holocaust which took the lives of 6 million Jews and millions of other innocent people was inspired by the murder of a million and a half Armenians.

I would point out that in the historical record as we have gone back and studied genocide in this century, it is interesting to note first that the very term "genocide" was first used in 1939 by a Polish Jew. But he was not using it to describe events that were about to take place in Europe, nor was he using it to describe anything that had to do with the Jewish people at that time. He was studying what had happened in Europe, in Armenia in the earlier part of the century, and the only word that he could come up with to describe what was done to the Armenian people was the word genocide, or to kill to the Armenians.

□ 1710

So in fact the word "genocide" itself comes from the experience of the Armenian people in the beginning of this century which was invented by a Polish Jew to describe what happened to them, and the irony is that subsequent to that, it happened to the Jewish people as well. The two events are undeniably linked historically which gives us another reason that I think it is so important that we remember this day.

At this point I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle and all regions of our Nation to mark a somber, troubling historical event: the massacre of 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children by the Turkish Ottoman Empire. The mind recoils at the horror. The heart is sickened by the very thought that the ongoing methodical premeditated destruction of so many human lives could have happened. But as the historical record proves conclusively, this slaughter did happen. Those of us who have the privilege to serve as elected Representatives in the world's greatest democracy have a special obligation to raise our voices to counter the propaganda and outright lies of those who claim that the genocide of the Armenian people did not happen.

Mr. Speaker, the proud community of Armenian-Americans, whose members have contributed to virtually every facet of life in our country, is largely descended from the survivors of this atrocity, men and women who were

driven from their ancestral homelands with whatever few possessions they could carry. These survivors, their children and their grandchildren, have made it their solemn duty to remind the world of this brutal attempt to wipe out the descendants of one of the world's oldest nations. One this occasion, people of decency and conscience should honor the memory of those who perished, as well as pay tribute to the courage and valor of those who survived.

While it is unfortunate to have to dignify the claims that the Armenian genocide did not occur with a response, let us be absolutely clear on this point: the Armenians are not the only historical witnesses to this crime against humanity. The Ottoman policy of deportation, enslavement, and murder was immediately recognized for what it was from the earliest weeks and months. Newspaper accounts from that period paint a clear picture of a pattern of horror for which no word then existed, but which we today call genocide. The United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire Henry Morgenthau, spoke out against the program of "race extermination under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion." He said that "I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this," and noted that Turkish officials "made no particular effort to conceal" the goal of the deportations of Armenians, namely, in Morgenthau's words, "the death warrant to a whole race." Protests were organized, while United States and international relief agencies tried to provide comfort and relief to some of victims. Armenian orphans were taken in as foster children. The United States Archives—hardly a source of fictional accounts of history—contain voluminous documentation of this event. In 1920, the United States Senate declared the truth of the claims of "massacres and other atrocities from which the Armenian people have suffered." Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan, and Carter have all spoken forcefully about the horror of the genocide, and America's resolve never to forget.

We commemorate the Armenian genocide by marking the date, April 24, 1915, when hundreds of Armenians religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled and eventually murdered in remote areas of Anatolia. Soon, the Ottoman wrath was loosed upon even those Armenian men who had served in the Ottoman Army during World War I, thus disarming and depriving the population of many of its young able-bodied men, rendering the population vulnerable. Throughout Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia, the innocent, peaceful Armenians were forced into death marches. The men and older boys were usually executed, while the women, children, and elderly were marched for weeks in the desert, subject to rape, torture, mutilation, starvation, disease, and massacres. Approximately 500,000 Armenians escaped into Russia, the Arab countries, Europe, and America. One and a half million perished. By the time the genocide finally subsided in 1923, the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire was essentially eliminated—by a government executed plan.

Today, the Government of the Republic of Turkey—the recipient of large amount of United States aid—maintains that the Armenian genocide is simply a fiction, or an exaggeration. Turkish leaders say that whatever Armenians perished during this time were simply the victims of a general pattern of chaos and murder that attended the fall of the Ottoman Empire. The historical record frankly debunks these claims. Such claims are not only a distortion of the historical record, but a profound insult to the haunted memories of the survivors and their descendants. As Americans interested in close ties with all nations, we say to the leaders of Turkey: come clean, admit the historical reality, open your historical archives, achieve peace with Armenian people and redemption for yourselves. With a new leader preparing to assume the reins of power in Turkey after the death of President Ozal, now would be a perfect time to begin the healing process.

For the people of Armenia, tragedy is not only a thing of the past. Today, the Armenian people are suffering under a cruel and illegal blockade imposed on them by their neighbor Azerbaijan. While the collapse of the Soviet Union has allowed the Armenian nation to proclaim itself to the world, the borders drawn in the region by Joseph Stalin have laid the groundwork for bloody disputes in the Caucasus Mountain region. I repeat my longstanding call to our State Department, through our partnership with, and influence over, Russia and Turkey, to make the lifting of the Azeri blockade a top priority. Meanwhile, as the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh, a predominantly Armenian enclave claimed by the Azeris as their territory, fight to protect their homes in their isolated region, Armenia is unfairly and inaccurately branded in media accounts today as the aggressor. Perhaps unintentionally, the media is playing into the hands of the enemies of Armenia, who are seeking to use the current fighting as a pretext to discredit the Armenian nation and people. But we must not forget the true horror that the great Armenian nation and people are suffering under the Azeri blockade, while neighboring Turkey stands by and allows Armenia to be slowly strangled. This is the reality of aggression and victimization in the Armenian-Azeri struggle today. If we do not stand up on behalf of the suffering of the Armenian people in 1993, our words of remembrance about 1915 are but hollow phrases.

Mr. Speaker, this week, America dedicates a new museum to keep alive the memory of the Nazi Holocaust. The lessons of the Holocaust are "Never Again" and "Never Forget." Tragically, as we have seen most recently in Bosnia, in Somalia and, indeed, in Armenia itself, under the Azeri blockade, the threat of genocide persists even to this day. Every night on our television screens the sad sight of history repeating itself is before our eyes. We cannot ignore the suffering of our fellow human beings, and we must never forget the victims.

I urge all people of conscience to confront, again and again, the memory of the Armenian genocide at the beginning of this century as a warning about what can happen if we ignore or accept violence and oppression.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for taking the lead on this commemoration today and also for all of his work, particularly when he most recently visited Armenia.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] who also recently returned from Armenia.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] for the leadership he has shown on the issue of speaking out on the concerns of the Armenian people here in the United States as well as throughout the world, and I want to just say how indebted so many of my constituents are to the leadership that he has shown because of his concerns about the quality of life in Armenia and the necessity for the United States to address itself to the concerns.

I think the first action that I saw when I came to the United States Congress with regard to Armenia was the issue that we tried so hard to get recognized was simply the idea that the world, and particularly the Congress of the United States, would recognize the Armenian genocide on April 24, 1915, the beginning of a terrible genocide which took place in what is now known as Armenia.

At that time literally tens of thousands of people were killed simply because of the country of their origin, and it just seems to me that to have the U.S. Congress not be willing to take it upon itself to recognize that genocide was one of the most difficult moments that I have been through since I entered the Congress of the United States. I know that we understand that in this House of Representatives. We have heard the testimony that suggests that not only Tolstoy but Winston Churchill himself bore witness

to the Armenian genocide and, in fact, the word "genocide" was coined as a result of what took place in 1915.

But what is, I think, perhaps the most important development is not that the Congress of the United States kowtowed to an Ottoman regime of a bygone era, but rather the tremendous spirit that the Armenian people have shown in the years following 1915. We have seen this people here, come here to the United States, establish communities, work very, very hard and diligently, establish their own schools and culture, partake in the American culture, but maintain their own roots, maintain their own language, maintain their own churches, go to their own dances, and at the same time contribute so tremendously to the life and culture of the people here in the United States.

I do not think there is any group of ethnic people here that have emigrated to the United States for a more fundamental political purpose who have kept their hope of their people alive here in the United States by taking the time to pass along the basic elements of their culture generation after generation to make certain that the Armenian national psyche, that the Armenian national character continued to exist here in the United States.

That, I think, could not have been demonstrated more clearly than when just a few years ago a terrible earthquake did great damage to that small yet important region of this world known as Armenia. That country suffered tremendously. Up to 30,000 people were killed in an instant as a result of that earthquake, and yet the Armenian people here in the United States responded phenomenally, providing all sorts of medicines, providing all sorts of economic aid, involving themselves in the political affairs not only of the United States but of nations throughout the world to make certain the world's resources were mobilized to provide help and assistance to the suffering Armenian nation.

Subsequent to that as we have seen, Armenia, blockaded on the north through the war-torn region of Soviet Georgia, to the east, and the difficulties that are being faced in Azerbaijan, to the south with the problems of Iran, and to the west with the isolation of Turkey.

□ 1720

And as a result of that isolation, we have now seen terrible devastation that has been placed upon the backs and souls of the Armenian people.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to visit Armenia in the dead of winter. We arrived late at night, in the middle of the night, at Yerevan Airport. It was snowing badly.

We went in by van to the middle of downtown Yerevan, and at that time it was snowing so hard and there was not a light in the place, so that we could not even tell we were in the middle of a city. What we found was that there was no heat, no electricity, no running water, no telephones, no ability to communicate, and yet the spirit of the Armenian people continued to provide a bright light.

I visited orphanages where the little babies are lying in the cold, cold rooms, where the suffering that they endured as a result of having to stay in the same clothing after they in fact urinate in those clothes because there is no place to not only wash the clothes, there is no place to dry the clothes that would have gotten wet.

I visited senior citizens stuck in hospitals who have lived through the Armenian genocide, who lived through the earthquake, who are now forced to suffer and, yes, to die in a climate inside of a hospital room where the temperature never rises above 15 to 20 degrees.

Mr. Speaker, it was one of the most devastating few days of my life, to see the kind of human suffering that takes place. But it reestablished my own personal commitment to stand strong for the people of Armenia, to stand strong with people like RICK LEHMAN and JIM MORAN and so many others on the other side of the aisle who feel deep in their heart that this is a nation that has inspired freedom-loving people throughout the world, who have maintained their culture, who have maintained their roots, and above all, maintained their human dignity despite the onslaught of so many nations, of so many people who have been hell-bent on destroying and eliminating the Armenian people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] for his efforts this evening, and I want to thank the Congress of the United States for recognizing the necessity of having the world's focus and light shine on the Armenian people and the suffering that they have gone through. I once again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], who just finished a trip to Armenia with me.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] for yielding to me and for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, the massacre of 1.5 million Armenians during and immediately after World War I must be considered alongside the Nazi Holocaust against Jewish people as one of the most unbelievable, vicious examples of man's inhumanity against man.

On April 24, 1915, Turkey began a program of collecting Armenian religious, intellectual, and political leaders, and deporting them to Anatolia where they were systematically executed. Deprived of leadership, the Armenian people including women, seniors, and children were subjected to rape, torture, and mutilation as they were exiled from their homeland. The men and older boys were separated from the groups, never again to be seen, and those remaining were forced on death marches into the desert of Syria. In all, over 1.5 million Armenians were massacred during the 7 years of genocide and more than 500,000 expelled from their homes in the Ottoman Empire.

Many letters of protest, from United States and European diplomats at the time of the Armenian genocide, document this tragedy in stark detail. One letter written by J.B. Jackson, the American consul in Syria at the time, described survivors witnessing "numberless corpses along the roadside, or bodies in all sorts of positions where the victims fell in the last gasps of typhoid, fever, and other diseases." This is just one of many observations of the brutal and inhumane treatment suffered by the Armenian people. I will submit for the RECORD a copy of this letter drawn from the U.S. National Archives.

History tells us that those who do not study the past are doomed to repeat its mistakes. Nowhere in modern history is this lesson more poignant than in the case of the Armenian genocide. While we closed our eyes and let the painful memory of this atrocity slip from our collective memory, Adolf Hitler remembered the effectiveness of this systematic destruction of the Armenian people and rested secure in the belief that the Western powers would not intervene in this Holocaust.

Let us not again forget the atrocities of the past.

DOCUMENT NO. 53

AMERICAN CONSULATE,
Aleppo, Syria, September 29, 1915.

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU,
American Ambassador,
Constantinople, Turkey.

SIR: I have the honor to report as follows regarding the deportation of Armenians, supplementary to my dispatch to the Embassy No. 546 of August 19 last:

The deportation of Armenians from their homes by the Turkish Government has continued with a persistence and perfection of plan that it is impossible to conceive in those directly carrying it out, as indicated by the accompanying tables of "Movement by Railway", showing the number arriving by rail from interior stations up to and including August 31 last to be 32,751. In addition thereto it is estimated that at least 100,000 others have arrived afoot. And such a condition as these unfortunates are in, especially those coming afoot, many having left their homes before Easter, deprived of all of their worldly possessions, without money and all sparsely clad and some naked from the treatment by their escorts and the despoiling depopulation en route. It is extremely rare to find a family intact that has come any considerable distance, invariably all having lost members from disease and fa-

tigue, young girls and boys carried off by hostile tribesmen, and about all the men having been separated from the families and suffered fates that had best be left unmentioned, many being done away with in atrocious manners before the eyes of their relatives and friends. So severe has been the treatment that careful estimates place the number of survivors at only 15 percent of those originally deported. On this basis the number of those surviving even this far being less than 150,000 up to September 21, there seems to have been about 1,000,000 persons lost up to this date.

There came persistent reports of the selection of great numbers of the most prominent men from nearly every city town and village, of their removal to outside places and their final disappearance by means of which we are not positively informed but which the imagination can more or less accurately establish, as months have passed and no news has come of their existence. The heinous treatment of thoroughly exhausted women and children in the open streets of Aleppo by the armed escorts, who relentlessly beat and kicked their helpless charges along when illness and fatigue prevented further effort, is evidence of what must have happened along the roads of the interior further removed from civilization.

The exhausted condition of the victims is further proven by the death of a hundred or more daily of those arriving in this city. Travellers report having seen numberless corpses along the roadside in the adjacent territory, or bodies in all sorts of positions where the victims fell in the last gasps of typhoid, fever and other diseases, and of the dogs fighting over the bodies of children. Many of the harrowing tales related by the survivors, but time and space prevent the recital thereof.

The movement continues with the arrival of hundreds daily and the problem is what can be done for their relief when they are rapidly pushed on to Hama, Homs, Damascus, etc., and on to Amman, the railway station furthest south to which Christians have been heretofore permitted to travel. Nearly everything necessary for existence is lacking at most of these places, and at Amman it is reported there is neither food nor drink.

Up to the present the residents of Aleppo have not been molested, but fear the time is approaching when they will follow those now en route before them.

In order to provide the barest existence for these people a most considerable sum is necessary, say $150,000 a month. This would be at the rate of only a dollar a head, which would hardly furnish bread, to say nothing of clothing, shelter, medical treatment, etc. Each religious community has a relief committee to care for its own, but means at hand are altogether inadequate.

Enclosed are tables showing the "Movement by Railway", "List of Gregorians or Orthodox", list of "Protestants", and list of "Catholics", all of which have been compiled from information gathered from obvious sources, showing the number of each sect effected, their whereabouts and needs.

This report is forwarded in sextuplicate, that copies thereof may be forwarded to the Governments of Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy, respectively, if found convenient, the interests of which in this district have been entrusted to this Consulate. Copy is also being sent to the Department of State.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J.R. JACKSON

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague from California [Mr. LEHMAN], in commemoration of one of the saddest and most tragic events of human history: The genocide of the Armenian people during the latter half of the 19th century.

In joining my colleague, I also want to heartily commend him once again for taking this time that we may speak about this very disturbing chapter in world history. It is a story that is widely known, however, there is little mention of it in our history books. For while it may be painful to review these events, as long as this is the case—as long as we experience this discomfort and pain—there is hope for humanity.

Unfortunately, the plight of the Armenians and the attempted genocide of 1915, by the Ottoman Turks, is an event that the U.S. Government has still not recognized. In a time where human rights are in the forefront of all of our minds, we must recognize the struggles that the Armenians have gone through in 1915, as well as 1993, with the Azerbaijan blockade.

The Holocaust Museum opening here in Washington, DC, will remind all of us of the unspeakable horrors that the Jewish people of Nazi Germany had undergone. I believe that this museum will send a very important and powerful message reminding all of us, that human rights violations can take place at any time, and any place, to any group of people and that this cannot be tolerated anywhere.

Indeed, in few other instances has man's inhumanity to man been demonstrated so starkly than in the persecution of the Armenians by the Ottoman Empire. And while some 1,500,000 Armenian people died and another 500,000 were exiled between 1915 and 1923, this was but the brutal culmination of events stretching back to 1894.

In that year, 300,000 Armenians were massacred, and in 1909, a further 21,000 perished—all before what is generally considered to be the true genocide beginning 6 years later.

As an American of Greek descent, I always have felt a special tie to the Armenian people, because the land of my ancestors also suffered at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. My colleagues may know that every March, I sponsor a special order in this Chamber to commemorate Greek Independence Day on March 25.

That date marks the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence from more than 400 years of domination by the Ottoman Empire. It was on that day that the Greek people began a series of uprisings against their Turkish oppressors, uprising which soon turned into a revolution.

Greece was more fortunate than Armenia. It did not suffer the dark events that we commemorate today: whole villages exterminated, thousands and thousands rounded up and literally worked to death. However, Greeks, too, know what it means to labor under oppression.

The Greek struggle for independence and the Armenian genocide are two events that erupted in the same region of the world and that fit neatly together to form a message.

It is a message that rings down through the ages and must never be ignored. The message is this: We must continue to speak out, to raise our voices in protest of the mistreatment of our fellow human beings. This is a simple matter of right versus wrong.

It is our duty to call attention to human rights abuses on any scale until the world is united in revulsion for these atrocities; until those yearning only to live free are allowed to do so.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in rising to commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. The extermination of 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children by the Ottoman government, between 1915 and 1923, has left an indelible mark on the consciousness of mankind.

In preparing for the final solution, which would consume the lives of 6 million Jews, Adolf Hitler said, "Who remembers the Armenians?" Mr. Speaker, the American people remember the terrible fate of the Armenians under Ottoman rule. We remember, along with the Armenian diaspora, the brutal deportations, forced marches, mass starvations, wholesale executions, and systemic massacres that claimed the lives of 1½ million Armenians.

We bear testimony today so that future generations of Americans will know what happened to the Armenian people during the last years of the Ottoman Empire. We commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide to mourn these fallen, silent victims. We observe this solemn anniversary to remind all democratic nations that we must be ever vigilant and stand united against the violent forces of national, racial, religious, and ethnic intolerance.

The premeditated and systematic extermination of the Armenian people must never, never be allowed to disappear in the dark recesses of history. We must never forget the conflagration that engulfed the lives of so many defenseless people. We must never forget the first bloody campaign of the 20th century to annihilate a whole race of people.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special order to commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. I thank the gentleman and gentlewoman from California for sponsoring this important effort.

We rise today to call attention to the tremendous injustice brought about by the Ottoman Turk Empire from 1915 to 1923. This is not a story that is widely known. There is little mention of it in our history books. It is not taught to our children in school. And it is not commemorated on the kind of scale it deserves. I join today with the Armenian-American community in Chicagoland and around the Nation in acknowledging this tragedy and its lessons for our lives.

In the early years of this century, the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire were an increasingly nationalistic minority which longed for freedom from religious persecution. The ruling Ottoman Turks wanted none of this Armenian nationalism and began a campaign of genocide in 1915 that did not end until 1923.

Armenian men of military age were rounded up and shot. The women, children, and elderly were forced to leave their homes and move to relocation centers in the Syrian Desert. Thousands died during the long march. Many were murdered and some survivors were subjected to rape. It is estimated that 1½ million Arme-

nians had been killed through deportations and massacres. By 1923 the Turks had successfully erased nearly all remnants of the Armenian culture which had existed in their homeland for 3,000 years.

At the beginning of World War I, there were more than 2½ million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. Today, fewer than 80,000 Armenians remain in Turkey. In 1915, approximately half a million Armenian refugees were able to escape death and relocate in Russia, the Arab countries, Europe, and America.

I stand here today to say the genocide did happen. Nobody can erase the painful memories of the Armenian community. Nobody can deny the photos and historical references. Nobody can deny that few Armenians live where millions lived 80 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we stand here today to recall a tragedy in the history of civilization. This is not a time to place blame. Rather, I believe that this horrible episode must serve as a lesson. We have seen the horrors that people can commit against one another. We must ensure that they never happen again.

Tomorrow morning we will join with survivors of another genocide to dedicate the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. The lessons of the First World War were not heeded by the world when it came to dealing with the ethnic cleansing campaigns of Adolf Hitler and the Nazis. The deteriorating situation in Bosnia merits our attention. I pray that we will not forget the lessons of the Armenian genocide.

We must also honor the victims who perished so brutally. We cannot right the terrible injustice inflicted upon the Armenian community and we can never heal the wounds. But by properly commemorating this tragedy, Armenians will at least know the world has not forgotten the misery of those years. Only then will Armenians begin to receive the justice they deserve.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, once again my good friend and colleague from California, Mr. LEHMAN, has brought us together to hold a remembrance for the victims of what has been characterized as the first genocide of the 20th century: the Armenian genocide.

We commemorate this tragic event for specific reasons: First, we pay tribute to the hundreds of thousands of Armenian victims; second, we bear witness to the occurrence of this horror, and finally, by remembering this infamy we voice our commitment to never forget this blot against humanity and to urge our troubled world to find means of resolving issues of differences with greater humanity and compassion.

I have come before this body many times to speak out against the violence which has been done to the Armenian people. I am here again today, once again respectfully urging your contemplation of the injustices suffered over so many years by the people of Armenia; injustices and violence which they continue to shoulder.

Some would claim that our remembrance today fans the flames of atavistic hatred and that the issues of the Ottoman government's efforts to destroy the Armenian people is a matter best left to scholars and historians. I do not agree. For whatever ambiguities may be invoked in the historic record of these events, one fact remains undeniable: The death and suffering of Armenians on a massive scale happened, and is deserving of recognition and remembrance.

The facts speak their own truth: From 1915 to 1923 approximately 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children died, directly or indirectly at the hands of agents of the Ottoman Empire. In May 1915, the Young Turks issued a general order to kill or deport to the southern lowlands, and to the Caucasus, the entire Armenian population of Asia Minor. Soldiers were to carry out the mission. Instructions required Turkish officials to confine their consciences or lose their jobs.

The overall administration of the Young Turk's general order was analogous to the Nazi action against the Jewish people a generation later. Now, I realize that there are some who feel troubled by this statement, I would urge you to be the judge.

As a result of the Young Turk's general order, able-bodied and professional Armenian men were asked to serve on road gangs. Once marched out of the cities, they were attacked and murdered by soldiers and nomads. The remaining Armenian men, women, and children were herded together and sent, without property or adequate provisions, across the Anatolian Mountains and Plains. Along these routes, Armenian women were abused or seized as wives. Robbery and torture was common along the routes. At Trabzon, the genocide became reality when about 10,000 Armenians were loaded onto ships and transported out into the Black Sea where they were forced overboard to their deaths.

The deliberate effort to deport or kill all Armenians from Asia Minor is the basis for the charges of genocide which we commemorate today. We retell the stories of this blot against human civility so that we will not sink into ignorance of our capacities to taint human progress and achievements with acts of mass murder.

We do not have the capacity to right past wrongs, but we can do everything in our power to prevent such atrocities from occurring again. To do this, we educate about these horrible incidents, comfort the survivors, and keep alive the memories of those who have died.

To this end, I encourage everyone to use this moment to think about the terrible loss of precious human lives that resulted from these massacres. It is critical that we recommit ourselves to the spirit of human understanding, to patience and compassion. For these alone are the tools for overcoming our tragic human weakness for resolving our problems by acts of violence.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observance of the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide by the Ottoman Turks and thank my colleagues from California, Mr. LEHMAN and Ms. ESHOO, for calling this special order.

The 8-year Armenian genocide was a deliberate, premeditated campaign by the Ottoman Empire which resulted in the death of 1½ million men, women, and children and the exile of more than 500,000 Armenians from their homeland of over 3,000 years. The Ottoman attempt at race extermination virtually destroyed the peaceful Armenian population.

Descendants of the relatively few Armenians who escaped the butchery and made their new home in the United States have become valuable contributing members of our society. The State of California enjoys an active Armenian-American population. In my district of San Francisco, Armenian-Americans have played a significant role in our multicultural community. This week, bay area Armenians will hold a commemorative program, including a requiem service, cultural performances, and a series of speakers at the Armenian Community Center in San Francisco. We join the Armenian people in our country, and all over the world, in observing the anniversary of the first genocide of the 20th century.

Though historical revisionists attempt to erase the facts of the past, today we will remember once again the brutal and devastating acts committed against the Armenian people from 1915 to 1923. This tragedy should not go unheeded. Twenty years after the Armenian genocide, as he planned his holocaust, Hitler asked, "Who remembers the Armenians?" We must learn from history, however belated the lesson, and not allow such a disaster to occur again.

Today, 78 years after the start of the Armenian genocide, we pause to remember all victims of genocide, and especially to memorialize the Armenians who died during the senseless killing rampage of the Ottoman government from 1915 to 1923.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in rising to commemorate the Armenians who perished in this century's first genocide.

Anyone who has studied or discussed the tragic events that befell the Armenian community 78 years ago—not to mention the preposterous historical revisionism that still exists to this day—can fully understand how important this tribute is to the Armenian community and to the memory of those who lost their lives in the slaughter. I would like to take this opportunity to commend my distinguished colleagues from California, Mr. LEHMAN and Ms. ESHOO, for arranging this special order.

Each year, this day serves as an expression of our commitment to historical truth and to the universal principles of human rights. Each genocide provides a foundation for subsequent horrors. Each historical misrepresentation of efforts to exterminate a particular ethnic group increases the likelihood that such efforts will be undertaken again in another time and place.

The line from Armenia to Auschwitz is direct. Undoubtedly, the Holocaust, which took the lives of 6 million Jews and millions of other innocent people, was inspired by the murder of a million and a half Armenians. Hitler, during an early meeting to map out the extermination of the Jewish people, was asked whether world opinion would not prevent such a plan from being carried out. Hitler laughed. "World opinion. A joke. Who ever cared about the Armenians?"

By holding this special order, we in the House vow that genocide will not go unacknowledged and unmourned. Only by acknowledging this day, year after year after year, can we ensure that genocide remains what it has always been—an unspeakable evil.

The Armenian people, like the Jewish people, although scattered all over the globe,

have remarkably kept their culture, language, and religion intact. On this day of remembrance, I salute their tenacity and spirit.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues once again in remembrance of the Armenian genocide.

The timing of this day of remembrance is indeed appropriate, as we commemorate this week the opening of the Jewish Holocaust Museum. In commemorating one human tragedy, it is important to remember other tragedies that had such devastating effects on an entire people. The Armenian genocide is certainly one of those tragedies.

One and one-half million Armenian people were massacred by the Ottoman Turkish Empire between 1915 and 1923. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from a homeland that their ancestors had occupied for more than 3,000 years. A race of people was nearly eliminated.

However great the loss of life and home that occurred during this genocide, a greater tragedy would be to forget that it ever happened. Adolf Hitler, in justifying his genocide plans for the Jews, predicted that no one would remember the atrocities he was about to unleash. After all, he claimed, "Who remembers the Armenians?" Our statements today are intended to preserve the memory of the Armenian loss, and to remind the world that the Turkish Government to this day refuses to acknowledge this genocide.

The marking of this 78th anniversary also brings to mind the current suffering of the Armenian people, who are still mired in tragedy and violence. Unrest between Armenia and Azerbaijan continues in Nagorno-Karabakh. Thousands of innocent people already have perished in this dispute and still many more have been displaced and are homeless. Frustrating the situation is the continual destruction of fuel lines and a blockade of supply routes into Armenia through neighboring Georgia and Turkey.

In the face of this difficult situation comes on opportunity for reconciliation. Now is the time for Armenia and its neighbors, including Turkey, to come together, to work toward a sustaining peace and to rebuild relationships between countries. The first step in this process should be the ending of blockades that are hampering the recovery of Armenia.

Meanwhile, in America the Armenian-American community continues to thrive and to provide assistance and solidarity to its countrymen abroad. Now numbering nearly 1 million, the Armenian-Americans are a community bound together by strong family ties, a hard-work ethic and a proud sense of ethnic heritage. Today we recall the tragedy of their past, not out of a need to place blame, but out of the desire to answer the question, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

We do.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue which still haunts us today. That issue is genocide. Between 1915 and 1923, 1.5 million Armenians were killed in a conflict with the Turkish Ottoman Empire. During World War II, 6 million Jews were killed by the Nazis in Europe. As I stand here today, hideous crimes against humanity are being committed in the former Yugoslavia.

If the international community is serious about preventing crimes against humanity, our first step is to recognize that they occurred. This recognition must start with the Armenian genocide, which remains in the hearts and minds of so many of us today.

During the second half of the 19th century, the Armenian population became the target of increasing persecution by the Government of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. During this period, millions of Armenians were displaced from their homeland and hundreds of thousands of innocent people were killed in the name of politics.

But this hardship was neither the beginning nor the end of the suffering for the Armenian people. On April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled and then murdered by the Ottoman Empire. This was the beginning of the Armenian genocide. During the next 8 years, the Empire conducted a systematic campaign of deportation against Armenian men, marching them out of their homes. Like their leaders before them, most of these men were then executed.

The woman and children, left unprotected after the massive deportation and execution campaign, were then subjected to many of the brutal crimes against humanity which we now see taking place in the former Yugoslavia. The rape, torture, and starvation suffered by these innocent civilians is almost unthinkable. Unfortunately, unlike World War II, there were no Nuremberg trials for these crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize the terrible human suffering which the people of Armenia experienced during this dark period of history.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, between the years 1915 and 1918, thousands of Armenians were uprooted and deported from Turkish Armenia where they died of starvation, disease, and massacres. This tragic event, known as the Armenian genocide, will forever mark the memories of all Armenians and their children.

On May 28, 1918, Armenia declared its independence from the Ottoman Empire. In doing so, they were victorious in their struggle against a hostile government and began to work to overcome the effects of the deplorable genocide of 1915 through 1918. Their independence was short-lived however, and in 1921 the Soviet Red Army swept into Armenia and crushed the nationalist government. For more than 80 years, the Armenian people labored against oppression, working to maintain their language, culture, and religious beliefs.

The Hay Tahd—Armenian Cause—is a national creed which along with the 1990 independence declaration seeks international recognition of the national genocide. Although there are some factions within the Armenian Government that believe that Turkey should acknowledge its guilt and let Armenia recover its lost lands, President Ter-Petrosyan calls for good relations with all neighbors, including Turkey.

It is not the purpose of the Armenian Government and its people to demean the Turkish people for past events. However, it is their goal to have the international community recognize the national tragedy that occurred. The Armenian aspiration is to have this tragedy recognized on the same level as, for example, the Holocaust during World War II. This claim for legitimacy and recognition has unified Armenians throughout the decades, and would signify a great moral victory for its people.

Because of Armenia's strong unification as a people, they were able to choose independence from the Soviet Union in 1991. This nearly unanimous vote, which saw an approximately 95 percent voter turnout, marked a great turning point in Armenian history. Because of this, the United States was able to recognize Armenia as an independent, sovereign nation.

Nagorno-Karabakh has historically been a part of Armenia, but in March 1921, Joseph Stalin arbitrarily transferred the area to Azerbaijan. In the wake of this move, thousands of Armenians were forcefully deported. However, over 140,000 Armenians remain in the area, separated from Armenia by a narrow corridor of Azeri territory. In 1988, the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] Soviet called for its transfer to Armenia based upon the right to self-determination. Azerbaijan disregarded this edict, and the continued blockade of the region by the Azeri Government is a traversty. The Azeri edict of direct rule, abolishing NKAO autonomy, is contrary to international standards of self-determination and human rights, and is a deplorable and capricious decision.

I am distressed by the continued repression of Armenians in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan. This is why I cosigned a letter to President Clinton asking for the United States to intervene in this crisis and to lead the way toward an international aid effort. Armenia has a unique Western view uncommon in the region. Except for the Baltic Republics, Armenia is the most Westward-headed nation of the former Soviet Union. With over 3,000 years of history as a nation, Armenia has a solid foundation in democratic principles and a drive to establish a solid economy. It is in our best interest that Armenia should not be allowed to disintegrate, not only for their well being, but for its value as a natural ally and a strong trading partner. Let the past be a reference point for the future. I hope that both sides have gained from the 1915 Armenian genocide, and by having the international community recognize the atrocities that took place, we can all prepare and prevent for another reoccurrence of history.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague from California, RICHARD LEHMAN, for providing this further opportunity to express our commitment to the Armenian people's ongoing struggle for self-preservation. Today, tens of thousands of men, women, and children are suffering in the blockaded Republic of Armenia; decades ago, their forefathers suffered a great tragedy that we in Congress need to recall, year after year.

We are obliged because there are those who dismiss the systematic persecution of the Armenian population during the reign of the Ottoman Empire. They discredit that the April 24, 1915, execution of 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders was the beginning of a campaign of terror resulting in the death of 1.5 million Armenians, and the deportation of more than 500,000.

This April 24, on the 78th anniversary of what has become known as the Armenian genocide of 1915–1923, survivors will bear

witness to this very real tragedy of humankind. They will never forget the profound pain, and we solemnly pledge to carry on that memory.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues again this year to pay tribute to the innocent victims and their families, to proclaim the horrible truth, and to appeal urgently to nations, both young and old, to honor the rights of all ethnic minorities.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the years between 1915 and 1923 are ones to be remembered forever. Within these 8 years, 1½ million Armenians were tortured and killed in a mass genocide performed by Ottoman Turkey. This is probably one of the most tragic incidents of the 20th century.

April 24, 1915, marks the beginning of the massacres. On this day, hundreds of Armenian leaders were exiled and murdered. Shortly after this, thousands of Armenians were deported from their homeland and placed in Turkish and Kurdish homes and harems. They were sent on marches through the Syrian Desert, where they were severely mistreated. Surviving refugees escaped to different countries, which separated families and scattered them all over the globe.

Some would want to forget this tragedy; it would be much easier to bury it in the past. We cannot ignore what the Armenians went through. This part of history needs to be remembered with profound sorrow and horror at such a shocking example of the brutality of man.

On this 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, I wish to join in with the Armenian people in a day of remembrance. On this day, let us think of those people who needlessly lost their lives. This incident should serve to remind each of us of the tragic consequences that can result when ethnic, racial, or religious intolerance spreads unchecked. As events in the world unfold, particularly in Bosnia, let us keep in mind the fate that befell the Armenians, and hope that we do not watch such action occur again.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I solemnly rise today to join my colleagues in marking the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. As this Nation and the world commemorate the opening of the Holocaust Memorial, we must also recall the events of the years 1915–23 so that the cruelty of this period instills in us, and future generations, a revulsion of such actions. I want to commend my colleague and friend, RICHARD LEHMAN of California, for organizing this special order. Since I entered the Congress, I have known him to be a staunch defender of human rights. I also want to thank one of my new colleagues, ANNA ESHOO, also of California, for joining in this worthy effort.

While the tragic events leading to the deaths of over 1.5 million Armenians occurred over 75 years ago, their impact on the psyche of the Armenian people, and indeed the entire world are still apparent. The effects of such atrocities on a people are never overcome. Many can still testify to the deportations and massacres of family members and friends. Others can read or view pictures of the abominations, and all Armenians, young and old, live with the knowledge that their people's existence was seriously jeopardized during the last years of the Ottoman Empire.

Mr. Speaker, the world must be reminded over and over of the brutal crimes perpetrated against the Armenian people. Unfortunately, history's lessons are not easily learned and put into practice, for despite the world's knowledge of this heinous episode, a holocaust of ghastly dimensions occurred only two decades later. Indeed, man's inhumanity has been since evidenced in such places as Cambodia and Iraq, and despite the efforts of many, I am sorry to say that even more acts of mass cruelty are occurring as we speak in the former Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that each of us work to ensure that our generation and future generations never again have to bear witness to such inhuman behavior and feel the pain and suffering of an entire people. The crime of genocide must never again be allowed to mar the history of humankind, and today we stand with our Armenian brothers and sisters, not only to remember and share in their grief for those who died, but to celebrate those who are living.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marks the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, a tragic event that marked the loss of 1.5 million Armenians. I am here today in remembrance of these victims—to declare that their sacrifice will not be forgotten.

The Armenian massacre was a tragedy of monumental proportions, marking the first genocide of the 20th century. Before World War I, more than 2.5 million Armenians lived in the Ottoman Empire. Within 8 years, 1.5 million of these people were exiled or exterminated by the Ottoman Turks because of their ethnic descent. Armenian intellectuals, politicians, and spiritual leaders—Armenian elderly, women, and children—all were tortured, starved, mutilated, raped, or killed.

During this devastating episode, Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, stated "the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915." However, these words fell on deaf ears—for within two short decades, the atrocities of the Armenian genocide were forgotten and history repeated itself.

Today, we cannot repeat the mistake of silence. Instead, we must all reflect on the tragedy of the Armenian genocide. For it is in remembering and reacting to this horrible event that we can stop the Hitlers, the Pol Pots, the Milosevics of the world. The world must not be paralyzed in the face of ethnic extermination and must show that genocide anywhere will not be tolerated.

As I rise for the anniversary of the Armenian genocide, I would also like to reflect upon the welfare of the Armenian people today—for the suffering of the Armenian people continues and it cannot be forgotten. For nearly 5 years, ethnic Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh have waged an armed struggle against the government of Azerbaijan for the right to self-determination. Together, Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh and the Armenia have endured a crippling blockade imposed by Azerbaijan.

We cannot forget that this bloody conflict in the Caucasus continues and must be resolved. I call on my congressional colleagues and the world community to respond to the needs of the Armenian people and work to find an expeditious resolution to this tragic struggle. It is time for the suffering of the Armenian people to end.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, as we come together this week with world leaders, distinguished dignitaries, and noble survivors to dedicate the Holocaust Museum in Washington, let us, too, remember the genocide that preceded the Holocaust—the genocide in Armenia—and the lives lost in this horrific act of aggression.

Sadly, in the ignorance of the world community to the devastation brought upon the Armenians, Hitler found validation. Let us right this wrong of history by highlighting the suffering of Armenia, the deaths of more than one and a half million of her people, and the fortitude and resilience her people have shown in the face of this evil. In doing so, we shall learn much and be better able to forestall the tides of ethnic hatred.

Here, in America, our diversity is our greatest strength and the source of tremendous pride. The Rodney King trial and its aftermath questioned the stability of that foundation. When we note the horrors of history and remember the scars Armenians continue to bear, we recognize the fragility of the American experiment and renew our dedication to its success.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Mr. LEHMAN, on calling this special order, so as to recall the atrocities inflicted upon the Armenian population between 1915 and 1923 and to utilize its lessons to reestablish our national and international commitment to ethnic unity.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to participate in this special order commemorating the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide of 1915—the first genocide of the 20th century.

On April 24, 1915—the date that symbolizes the beginning of this atrocity—over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community were arrested, exiled, and murdered. Armenian representation in Turkey was eliminated. In a single night, the voice of the Armenian nation in Turkey was silenced. During the years that followed, the world witnessed one of history's most egregious examples of man's inhumanity against man—the Ottoman Empire's deliberate attempt to systematically exterminate the Armenian people.

Persecution of Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire began toward the end of the 19th century and increased through the beginning of the 20th century. From 1915 until 1923, 1.5 million Armenians died from the Ottoman Empire's attempts to eliminate the Armenian people. Armenian citizens were either massacred outright, or they were deported and subjected to various kinds of inhumane treatment, including rape, torture, and mutilation. According to Henry Morgenthau, Sr., the United States Ambassador to Turkey at that time, the Armenian genocide was "the most thoroughly organized and effective massacre this country has ever seen." Even the one-half million Armenians who were fortunate enough to have escaped were brutally evicted from the country that they had called home for more than 3,000 years. Most of those who were deported died of starvation, disease, or exposure.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. LEHMAN, for again this year calling this special order and focusing our attention on this horrible blight on our history. I appreciate the opportunity to honor both the victims and the survivors of the Armenian genocide, and to pay my respects to their families.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today for this Special Order commemorating the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Sadly, recent world events have once again thrust genocide onto the center of the international stage. The conflict in the war-torn former Yugoslavia is a vivid reminder to the community of nations that prejudice and intolerance of the most pernicious nature dwell yet within the hearts of mankind. Clearly, the malignant, seething hatred born of racial bigotry is more persistent than the historical revelation that the most important role of nations and governments is to guarantee the fundamental right of the individual to be secure in his person.

We, as Americans, cannot fail to recognize the basic human appetite for freedom. The efforts of the Armenian people to attain some measure of autonomy and sovereignty over their own affairs as a distinct political and cultural entity was for too long repeatedly dashed by inhumanity and brutality. Unfortunately, widespread apathy characterized the world's response to the atrocities of the Ottoman Turks, and it was this practiced indifference that ultimately doomed future generations to learn the hardest lessons of history again and again. The world's failure to acknowledge the reprehensible crimes committed during the Armenian genocide left the door open for future dictators and criminals to continue the persecution of ethnic minorities all over the world.

The United States, as the standard bearer of democracy and freedom, must make it clear that there is no place within the emerging worldwide coalition of peace-loving nations for governments that oppress their own citizens and undertake acts of aggression against their neighbors.

Armenians have found homes in our country, but their very presence in our Nation is a constant reminder of man's continuing inhumanity to man. This week, as we commemorate the Armenian genocide and as we dedicate the Holocaust Memorial Museum documenting Nazi atrocities during World War II, let us not forget the suffering of those who have gone before us, and let us rededicate ourselves to the notion that every person in every nation is entitled to respect for his or her human rights.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague from California, Congressman RICHARD LEHMAN, in commemorating the tragedy of the Armenian genocide.

Between 1915 and 1923, a systematic and deliberate campaign of mass genocide by the Ottoman Turkish Empire resulted in the deaths of over 1.5 million Armenians and the exile of a nation from its homeland of 3,000 years.

Our purpose today is twofold. First, we want to pay our respects to the millions of Armenians who were killed or driven into exile simply because they shared a common ethnic heritage. Second, we want to educate future generations to the reality of what occurred from 1915 to 1923.

Silence in the face of genocide only encourages those who would commit such atrocities. "Nothing," it has been said, "is more distressing than to see history repeat itself."

I feel it is especially important for Congress to commemorate the Armenian genocide this year as the Armenian people are once again caught in a struggle for their very survival. The current situation in Armenia is so desperate that even the flame burning atop the monument to the Armenian genocide in the capital of Yerevan has died for lack of fuel.

Mr. Speaker, the world must never forget the events surrounding the Armenian genocide. It is our responsibility to do everything in our power to prevent such a tragedy from ever occurring in the future.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my colleagues to reflect upon and commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. On April 24, 1915, over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Istanbul were executed. Indeed, between 1915 and 1923, over half of the world's Armenian population—an estimated 1.5 million men, women, and children—were killed. While this anniversary may evoke painful memories, it would be worse if we did not remember these terrible atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people so that such an event is never repeated.

The Armenians are an ancient and proud people. In the fourth century, they became the first nation to embrace Christianity. In 1915, Christian Russia invaded the Moslem Ottoman Empire, which was allied with Germany in World War I. Amid fighting in the Ottoman Empire's eastern Anatolian provinces, the historic heartland of the Christian Armenians, Ottoman authorities ordered the deportation of all Armenians in the region. By the end of 1923, virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had been either killed or deported.

Today, it is important to remember this horrible fact of history to comfort the survivors, as well as remain vigilant to prevent future calamities. Only a fraction of the Armenian population escaped this calculated attempt to destroy them and their culture. Approximately 500,000 Armenian refugees fled north across the Russian border, south into Arab countries, or to Europe and the United States. Currently, it is estimated that fewer than 100,000 declared Armenians remain in present-day Turkey.

I am proud to say that a strong and vibrant Armenian-American community is flourishing in northwest Indiana. In fact, my predecessor in the House of Representatives, the late Adam Benjamin, was of Armenian heritage.

The Armenian genocide is a well-documented fact. The U.S. National Archives contain numerous reports detailing the process by which the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire was systematically decimated. However, there is an unsettling tendency among both individuals and governments to forget or blot out past atrocities.

Less than 20 years after the Armenian genocide, Adolf Hitler embarked upon a similar extermination of European Jews. While the Holocaust is certainly as terrible an event as the Armenian genocide, the Jewish people have had the catharsis of the world's recognition of what happened to their people. Next Monday marks the opening of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum here in our Nation's capital. This museum is a concrete reminder of the real horrors endured by the Jews of World War II. Yet, Armenians in search of a similar affirmation of their families and ancestors suffering between 1915 and 1923, too often hear that their claims of genocide are lies or exaggerations.

With the dawn of the post-cold-war era, and the emergence of newly independent nations, it is more important than ever for the United States to directly convey its rich tradition of respect for fundamental human rights. It is not only important for us to commemorate the Armenian genocide, but to encourage worldwide recognition of this tragic event in history. An acknowledgement of the Armenian genocide by Turkey would, in addition to serving the interest of truth, help to secure regional stability by increasing the level of trust in an extremely sensitive area of the world.

In closing, I would like to commend my colleague from California, Mr. LEHMAN, for organizing this special order to commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. It is my sincere hope that this remembrance will not only console the survivors and their families, but may also serve to avert future atrocities.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only in commemoration of the Armenian genocide as many of my colleagues do, but also to bring your attention to the extremely tragic and brutal situation in Armenia. The 4-year blockade the Azerbaijanis have imposed on the landlocked Armenians has been so effective that the people of Armenia have been freezing and starving to death as a result. There are estimates that tens of thousands of Armenians have died so far as a result of the blockade. In short, the situation is grim and tragic for the Armenians.

While this Congress has properly recognized the atrocities taking place in Bosnia and Herzegovina and has condemned the tactics of "ethnic cleansing," we must stop to recognize that those same activities against humanity are taking place in Armenia and must be addressed. The ethnic Armenians are facing a slow strangulation of their vital supplies as the grip of the Azeri blockade tightens. The United Nations has made an appeal for humanitarian need. We must act to loosen the grip.

I support the fine efforts of the antiblockade committee to seek the issuance of regulations under the provisions of 50 App. U.S.C. 2407 to bar participation in any boycott activities directed against Armenia as well as discrimination by American companies directed against Americans of Armenian descent.

To avoid the atrocities of the past we must take part in commemorations such as this one commemorating what is said to be one of the first genocides of this century, the Armenian genocide between the years 1915 and 1923. Clearly, as world events today show, lessons of the past are often forgotten or ignored. Let us not allow the tragic lesson at the beginning of this century to happen again at the end of this century.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the 78th Armenian genocide.

From 1915 to 1923, it is estimated that over 1.5 million Armenians were murdered at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. The fruition of this travesty occurred under the guise of moving Armenian citizens from war zones and out of harm's way of the ensuing Russian Army. Forcibly removed from their native lands, the Armenians were deported by the thousands by the Turkish Government. Along their sojourn of death, men and teenage boys customarily, were removed from the caravans and led to their inevitable demise by being shot or butchered. Continuing on foot, the women and children were robbed, raped, and murdered. Those who survived the killings died of starvation, disease, or exposure. Newspaper reports of that period were filled with stories of the plight of Armenians who were reduced to eating grass. Before 1914, over 2 million Armenians lived in Turkey. By the end of 1923, the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had either been killed or deported. The calculated policy of deportation and extermination implemented by the Ottoman Turks resulted in this tragic example of man's inhumanity to man. We pause today in remembrance of the injustices and atrocities that were suffered by the Armenian people. It is incumbent upon all peace-loving people to remember this and similar events in hopes of avoiding future atrocities like those currently occurring in Bosnia.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, April 24, will mark the 78th anniversary of a crime against humanity which should be remembered and condemned by decent people everywhere. On April 24, 1915, the Armenian leadership in Istanbul and other Armenian centers was executed; the male population, already conscripted into the Ottoman Army, was disarmed, placed in work battalions, and gradually executed. The surviving women, children, and elderly were sent on death marches through the desert. This was the beginning of an 8-year campaign of genocide by the Ottoman Turkish Government which resulted in the deaths of over 1½ million Armenians and the exile of a nation from its historic homeland.

Perhaps it is fitting that we remember and condemn this atrocity in the same week that the Holocaust Museum is opening here in our Nation's capital, for Adolph Hitler actually cited the extermination of the Armenians as a precedent for the holocaust of the Jews. We must recognize all crimes against humanity if we are to prevent other crimes like them. Silence in the face of genocide effectively encourages those who would commit such atrocities in the future.

On this 78th anniversary of the massacres, I wish to join Armenians everywhere—and people of good will everywhere—in observing tomorrow as a day of remembrance for the more than 1 million Armenian people who perished in the terrible massacres in 1915–23.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. On April 24, 1915, the Government of the Ottoman Empire rounded up approximately 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders. These leaders were subsequently either arrested, exiled, or murdered. For the next 8 years, this regime was responsible for the deaths of over 1½ million Armenians. Those who survived were exiled from their homeland of 3,000 years.

The Armenians are an ancient and a proud people. Tragically, this vibrant culture, its history and all of its accomplishments were brought to the brink of extinction. By 1923, virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had been either killed or deported. The Ottoman Empire's attempt to eliminate a culture, a language, and an entire face of people from the face of the Earth set a tragic precedent for Hitler's persecution of European Jews.

The horror of the Armenian genocide is made worse by the refusal of the current Government of the Republic of Turkey to acknowledge that this tragedy ever happened. We must not deny the massacre. If we are to avoid a repetition of past mistakes, the United States must expose the truth.

Today, over 500,000 Armenian-Americans contribute to the richness of American culture and the diversity of our Nation.

I join the Armenian-Americans of Rhode Island, and throughout the Nation, in observance of this anniversary to keep the memory and truth of the Armenian genocide alive.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California, RICHARD LEHMAN, for arranging this special order today.

Genocide is the most brutal form of violence ever used by states, nations, or other groups. Under this ugly doctrine of evil, persecutors seek out men, women, and children of a certain race, ethnic group, or cultural background, and bring about their isolation and death under conditions of tremendous suffering.

Mr. Speaker, as horrible as genocide is—as inhuman as it is—still it has been carried out on several occasions in the 20th century. It was carried out by the former Nazi Government of Germany against Jews and other ethnic groups in Europe during World War II, by the former Soviet Government of Russia against Ukrainians in the 1930's, and, as we gather here today to remember, by the former Ottoman Empire of Turkey during World War I.

The use of death camps, starvation pits, and death marches in those genocide campaigns are a frightening reminder of man's inhumanity to man. If we want to combat such atrocities in the future, we must not forget.

We stand here today to remember the genocide against Armenians that began in 1915. Anywhere from one-half million to 1½ million Armenians are estimated to have died in the genocidal campaign conducted by the former Ottoman Empire. Not only were many Armenians directly executed by the Ottoman Army, but even more Armenians were force marched into the desert without adequate provisions, and left to die.

The tragedy, loss, and suffering inflicted on the victims of this death campaign, and that endured by their survivors, cannot be erased. By commemorating the victims of this tragic event, however, we hope that we can find in their deaths a powerful reminder of the ever-present threat of genocide in our age.

By acknowledging this Armenian tragedy of almost 80 years ago, perhaps we can also better understand the fears and concerns of ethnic Armenians today living in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan. And we certainly all hope for an end to the violence now taking place there.

As we commemorate the Armenian genocide, let us all join in calling for a peaceful resolution of the struggle in Nagorno-Karabakh, and for peace throughout the Caucasus region.

Mr. Speaker, again, my thanks to the gentleman from California for holding this special order today.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian genocide between 1915 and 1923 was the first of many that the 20th century has witnessed. History repeats itself in this tragedy, the Jewish Holocaust, the killings orchestrated by Cambodia's Pol Pot, and now, the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The Turkish persecution established a cold and ruthless precedent. Intellectual, political, and religious leaders—those who gave voice to the masses—were hunted and cut down in a single night. Next, the government targeted able-bodied Armenian men and plundered the countryside to eliminate the people's means of living. Women and children were rounded up for deportation, and many told tales of sexual abuse that sound eerily familiar today.

Those who used this systematic annihilation as a model remember these events well, but they also remember that the world did not even blink. According to Elie Wiesel, Hitler asked, "Who remembers the Armenians?" as he planned the final solution for Jews.

I would urge us to take this moment of remembrance to consider that the United States, as the world's only superpower and dominant moral force, has a responsibility to stop such atrocities. The weak and vulnerable turn to this country for help, and we must always stand against oppression, persecution, and the taking of innocent life.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today President Clinton inaugurates the Holocaust Memorial here in the Capital in observance of that ghastly episode of inhumanity.

I take this opportunity to ask my colleagues and the American people that as we prepare to solemnly commemorate the opening of this hallowed museum, we also hold sacred the memory of the attempted Armenian genocide of 1915. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with Armenians everywhere.

The despicable Serbian campaign of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina already has claimed the lives of more than 20,000 people. The images we see daily of the atrocities disturb us profoundly.

But in 1915, when the Ottoman Turks began their bloody genocide campaign against the Armenian people, we did not see any images. For 7 long and hopeless years, silence was the response that the Armenians got from the West to their protests and cries.

Fortunately, we did receive irrefutable eyewitness accounts—including from American diplomats—of the brutal Ottoman Turkish campaign. No one can deny the horrors that occurred. In all 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were exterminated or died as a result of famine or disease brought on by the Ottoman campaign between 1915 and 1923.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have repeated

time and again that human rights and democracy are universal values. The United States must demonstrate with words and deeds our solidarity with the Armenian people. As we commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, let us all commit ourselves to never forgetting neither the Jewish Holocaust nor the Armenian genocide.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. A systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide between 1915 and 1923 resulted in the deaths of over 1½ million Armenians and the exile of a nation from its historic homeland.

On April 24, 1915, the day the 1915 genocide began, over 200 intellectual, religious, and political leaders of the Armenian community in Istanbul were arrested, exiled from that city, and executed. This date now symbolizes not only the beginning of the Armenian genocide, but also a tragic history of persecution for the Armenian people.

Numerous Armenian citizens, who now reside in my congressional district in southwestern Illinois, have contacted me about the anguish they feel about the events of the past and of the present situation in Armenia. Because they have not forgotten the fate of their Armenian ancestors, I firmly believe the Congress should also remember their past.

The Congress holds a remembrance ceremony for the victims of the Armenian genocide every April. It is absolutely imperative that we, as a Nation, voice our commitment to Armenia and to remembering the tragic crimes against humanity. It is critical for the Congress to stand firm in its resolve to oppose violence and repression against humanity. These crimes must be recognized and remembered to prevent their future occurrence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the tragedy of the Armenian genocide and in renewing our commitment to human rights.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today in commemoration of the Armenians who suffered and died during the genocide of 1915 to 1923. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] for once again bringing this important issue before the Congress.

April 24 is a day that will forever live in the minds of all Armenians. For it was on this day in 1915 that the Ottoman rulers, fearing defeat by the advancing Russian Army, launched an effort to forcefully deport the entire Armenian population from the Ottoman Empire, resulting in the deaths of tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children.

Officials of the Ottoman government rounded up Armenians, placed them in internment camps, and then forcefully marched them out of Turkey, some to Syria and Lebanon, others east to Armenia. This campaign, lasting from 1915 to 1923, resulted in the deaths of 1.5 million Armenians. The surviving Armenians fled to Europe, the Middle East, and the United States.

Let us never forget the horrible genocide of Armenians which occurred in 1915, and let us ensure that nothing like it ever occurs again.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 78th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, which took place from 1915 to 1923.

Every April, we pause and reflect upon the events surrounding the 8-year period when over a million Armenians lost their lives at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. What makes this year so special is that, just recently, I, along with many of my colleagues, took part in the dedication ceremonies at the Holocaust Museum, here in Washington. We heard again of the atrocities committed by the Nazis and of the unforgettable accounts of a tragedy that claimed the lives of over six million Jews. What many of us fail to recognize, however, is that Hitler used the Armenian genocide as a blueprint for the Jewish Holocaust.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian genocide is often referred to as the "first" genocide of the 20th century. That reference is indeed tragic, for if we had recognized this sentiment earlier, we may have been able to spare thousands of Armenians and Jews from the peril of oppressive and blood-thirsty rulers.

We owe to the memory of those who perished the guarantee that genocide must never happen again. Sadly, however, the daily reports from Bosnia exhibit that genocide is not a passing fad, that totalitarian regimes are once again leaving their ugly mark on the world. I call upon my colleagues to recognize this and demand strong leadership from the President and European leaders and put an end to the bloodshed in the former Yugoslavia. The decision not to act sends a message to the million Armenians who perished in the genocide that we have forgotten, that we do not remember their sacrifice.

Let us not be remembered as the world leaders who permitted yet another genocide to take place. Instead, we must recognize these crimes of man's inhumanity to man if we are ever again to prevent them. Silence in the face of genocide does nothing but encourage those who commit such atrocities in the future.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned several times on the floor today, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mr. BILBRAY recently traveled with me to this region, and we went to Azerbaijan and visited with President Elcibey. We went to Armenia and visited with the President Ter-Petrosyan and Armenian citizens and other members of the Government. We went to Turkey from there and visited with the Prime Minister Demirel.

In a week or so we will be finished with a complete report of our visit for the House, and at that time we will present our findings here in a special order.

But at this time I want to really express my gratitude to the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. MORAN], the gentleman from Nevada, [Mr. BILBRAY], and the gentleman from California, [Mr. MCCANDLESS], for the tremendous efforts that they put forward on our trip, which was truly an eye opener.

I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], hit it right on the head when he said that though the lights were out physically in Yerevan, the light in the souls of the Armenian people was burning very, very brightly and is burning very bright today as we remember the victims of this terrible tragedy at the beginning of this century. Many of us know people who survived that suffering and who have lost so many people during it. And there are personal witnesses today to the atrocities which took place.

Today, as we open the Holocaust Museum and remember the victims of other genocides, the world must never forget what happened to the Armenians.

LEGISLATIVE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BURTON, will be recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am very privileged at this time to yield to the great spokesman from the great State of California, the gentleman from California, Mr. DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my dear friend from Indianapolis for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues from Louisiana and Florida, who very eloquently have been discussing over the past several weeks the fact that one of the greatest attacks on the process of representative government has taken place since the January 5, 1993.

Back in the 95th Congress, when we looked at legislation that was moving to the floor of the House, fully 85 percent of the rules which came to the floor bringing legislation for us to consider were open, allowing for free and fair debate, and 15 percent of the rules were restricted.

□ 1730

By restrictive rules, I mean, of course, Members who represent today 600,000 Americans who were prevented from being able to stand up on the floor when they were considering legislation and offer amendments.

We have seen since that time when only 15 percent of the rules being restrictive, we look most recently at the 102d Congress when 66 percent of the rules were restrictive, preventing Members from having the opportunity to represent their constituents and stand up on the floor of the House and offer amendments.

Now as we have moved into this 103d Congress, since January 5, we have had 10 major pieces of legislation which have been considered here on the House floor, ranging from the motor-voter legislation, family planning, family and medical leave, extend unemployment benefits, a wide range of measures, every single one of them have been gag rules preventing Members from having the right to stand up and represent their constituents.

I think the important point that needs to be made here is not that Members' right are being violated, but the

rights of the American people are being violated. There are literally millions and millions of Americans who are disenfranchised by virtue of the fact that their Representatives cannot stand here in the well of the House and offer an amendment. That is really what has happened.

The American people are being told very arrogantly by the majority leadership in this institution that representative government does not work, that we know better for you than the person who you elected to represent you.

Unfortunately, that has existed throughout the entire 103d Congress as we are here in mid-April.

Now, one of the things that we have done, we are so frustrated, and it is not just Republicans, it is not just minority Members, but Democrats, too, have been prevented from having the right to offer amendments. So one of the things that we have done on our side, we have established the Republican leadership task force on deliberative democracy, specifically geared toward looking at this problem.

I happen to believe, as I have said, that this is probably the greatest attack on the process of representative government that we have seen in literally decades. I cannot imagine what would be a greater attack on the process of democratic government than preventing elected Representatives from having the right to amend legislation.

There are a wide range of things that have been used to prevent us from working our will on legislation in behalf of our constituents. For example, there is something known as the 3-day layover provision on legislation. It is a very simple and basic thing that came into place, came into effect in 1970. What it says is that there should be 3 days for a committee report to be available for Members before they have to vote on legislation.

So what do we do? We consistently waive that 3-day layover measure. In fact, on 77 percent of the rules that have been considered in the 103d Congress, the 3-day layover period provision has been totally thrown out the window.

Let us look again at the history of this. In 1972 the average length of measures that were considered here on the House floor were 3.2 pages and constantly people were allowed to have 3 days to read, work with their staffs, and look at measures before they voted on them. Today the average length of measures that we consider here is 12.8 pages. So if you look at the very small number of pages that existed in the early 1970's and 3 days to consider it, and today the longer bills that we have to look at and the fact that we have in many cases virtually no time to even read these measures at all, it is again a very serious attack on the process of representative government.

Now, as I look at the constant waivers that we have on the 3-day layover provision, one must ask, would an individual embark on a major contract for the purchase of a home or an automobile or any small business person without having had the opportunity to look at it, whether that person is expert on it or a staff member or an assistant? No, of course not. And yet the Representatives in this House are consistently being told that they have to vote on measures without having the opportunity to look at those at all.

Over the past few weeks we have had very rigorous debates on the budget. One of the other things that we do consistently is that we waive the Budget Act. This debate that we went through on consideration of the budget is something that was taken very seriously on the House floor, and yet when we upstairs in the Rules Committee consider this, what happens is that we throw it out the window, meaning that there is very little meaning to what it is that we are actually doing when we are trying to pass and put into place a budget.

Then, of course, the attack on the amendment process itself. Democrats and Republicans sit in line up in the Rules Committee. My friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL, Mr. GOSS, and myself sit there and listen to expert witnesses who have very valid ideas, like the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. They come before our committee and they request the opportunity to consider their amendments on the floor of the House. And what happens? Consistently on party-line votes we see the leadership sit there and vote no, denying the rights of Members to even consider these ideas on the floor of the House in full view of the American public.

So I think that the goal of our task force on deliberative democracy is to let the American people know that one of the greatest attacks on representative government has taken place in the first 3½ months of 1993.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and I and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] will work diligently to try to ensure that the rights of not only our minority Members, but the rights of Democrats are recognized so that they can in fact offer amendments on the House floor and that the arrogance of the Democrat leadership will not continue to stifle the will of the majority Membership of this House, Members on both sides of the aisle who want to have the rights of their constituents recognized.

So Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for giving me the opportunity to share in his time and I congratulate those who want to struggle in behalf of greater democracy, of greater opportunity for the rights of their constituents to be heard here on the floor of the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for his very valuable contribution to our leadership in the Rules Committee. He does a great job up there. Unfortunately, he and Congressman GOSS, Congressman QUILLEN and Congressman SOLOMON are vastly outnumbered up there, and as a result we do not have the kind of fairness we should have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address our colleagues tonight to point out as a member of the task force on deliberative democracy from the Republican conference, this topic of this special order that the gentleman has taken out is extraordinarily important, not just to me and to the gentleman from California who preceded me, and to the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Florida who are here and others who have spoken on this issue, but frankly it should be a major concern to every American, because what we are talking about is the erosion of the role of the House of Representatives which has always been known as the greatest deliberative body on Earth.

□ 1740

Unfortunately that label really is in name only. It is no longer applicable. We can no longer debate the issues affecting the American people on the floor of this House unless precleared by the omnipotent Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, which is comprised of nine Democrats and four Republicans. So, we know how they might be inclined to rule, but never before have they ruled so excessively strict as they have in the 103d Congress; and what has happened in this Congress is that the rules have virtually been changed to repress the rights of the minority to discuss issues that are of great, great importance to the people of this country.

In the House of Representatives today, playing by the rules these days usually means abusing all normal standards of fairness. It means trampling the rights, and stifling the voice, of the minority party in Congress—and, therefore, of all the millions of people represented by conservative Congressmen nationwide, be they Republican or Democrat.

Here is one example: When a voter registration bill came before the Congress earlier this year, the bill was known as the motor-voter bill or, as I called it, the auto-fraud bill, and I was convinced that a number of its provisions would have made voting fraud easier. In subcommittee I had offered

20 amendments to help reduce the potential of fraud because I wanted an opportunity to offer at least some of the most important of those amendments here on the House floor; and I was outvoted in subcommittee, and that was fair. I took 12 of those amendments to the full committee, and I was outvoted there, and that was fair. But, when I asked the Committee on Rules for the right to present those amendments here on the House floor, I was denied the right to present even the first amendment. In effect the Committee on Rules said:

> We have confected the legislation. It's good for our purposes. Take it or leave it. Vote it up or down. By the way, we've got a majority, so we're going to take it, and you do not have the chance to even address your proposed amendments on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I never had a chance to offer those amendments. The omnipotent, omnipresent, omniprejudicial, and omnipartisan Rules Committee exercised its tyrannical tendencies and shut me out entirely. They wouldn't even let my amendments have a fair chance before the entire House membership to stand on their own and to be voted on individually.

No open hearing. No debate. No chance to improve the bill. No vote on those very well-intentioned amendments. In fact, there was no fairness in the system, and such a situation is not unusual. It goes on consistently in this House of Representatives on virtually every bill that we have voted on in the 103d Congress. The despotic majority has placed what we call a closed rule on every single major bill that has reached the House floor this year.

This means that if Republicans have any ideas whatsoever about how to improve a bill, those ideas will not even be considered in the light of day—and they do not stop at just Republicans, I might add. If any Democrats have any ideas that do not jibe with the party dictates of the conference majority, then they are out of luck, and they cannot present their ideas on the House floor.

What I would like to know is what are the Democrats afraid of? Are they afraid that their ideas and their positions will not be able to withstand public scrutiny? Do they think that Republican ideas are inherently more popular, and thus, that the only way to defeat us is to keep the American people in the dark and not allow us to discuss our views on the House floor?

The American people are too smart for that. In a series of town meetings I have held in the last several weeks in Louisiana, dozens—even hundreds—of my constituents have asked me why the Republicans were being steamrolled when we tried to offer ways to reduce the deficit.

They wanted to know why my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], was not allowed to offer his alternative budget proposal to cut the deficit. They recognized that his alternative was very, very attractive. His proposal would have limited the growth of Government to 2 percent per year without raising taxes and would have substantially improved President Clinton's budget package.

Now I had to tell my constituents that the Committee on Rules would not allow the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] the right to present his ideas on the floor of the House, and let me tell my colleagues that they were outraged when they heard about it.

Because of the Committee on Rules railroad job, Mr. Speaker, the American people, they found out and have understood every time we have explained it, they understood that the American people were denied any chance at being alerted to the Burton option and, thus, were denied any chance to urge their own Congressmen to exercise a vote on that option.

I hasten to add that this was not just a partisan objection on my part. My objection is supported by independent, nonpartisan expert analysts like Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute and Thomas Mann of the Brookings Institution. They testified before Congress this year that, "restrictive special rules should not become the norm" and "should be used only when absolutely necessary." They characterized the frequency of restrictive rules as, "a disturbing trend which should be rolled back."

Now those are nonpartisan, independent experts on activities of the Congress of the United States, and what they are saying is that the practice of the majority who govern the legislation of the House of Representatives has become so stifling, so overwhelmingly restrictive that the American people do not have an adequate opportunity to have their voice heard on this great deliberative body's floor.

The statistics show that unfortunately the warnings of Mr. Ornstein and Mr. Mann are not being heeded. In 1977–78, just 15 percent of all bills had restrictive debate rules. In 1991–92, that number had jumped to 66 percent. That is terrible, but even worse than that, this year the number of restricted rules has been 100 percent. That is not just terrible; it is a travesty. As a result, democracy in Congress suffers as it has never suffered before.

As bad as the problems are with the Rules Committee, they really constitute only a small part of the larger pattern of abuses of justice by the House majority leadership. This is the same leadership that allowed all the scandals to happen in the last few years: the House banking scandal, the restaurant scandal, the post office scandal. We had peole convicted for cocaine abuse. We had people who were manipulating bank funds for their own purposes.

In the wake of those scandals, the liberal leadership promised reform. What we got, though, was even more deformed than it had been before.

First, in a move uniformly criticized even by the liberal news media, the leadership forced through a rules change which lets delegates from U.S. territories to vote on the House floor. It is absurd. In one case, it means that 47,000 American Samoans, people who don't even pay full U.S. taxes, will have the same vote in Congress that my 610,000 taxpaying constituents have. That is just plain nonsensical.

The new House rules also include a rolling quorum provision which makes it even easier for committees to pass bills to the full House without having a majority of committee members even present.

The old rules allowing rampant proxy or absentee voting in committee were bad enough that I had made it a priority for change last year when I sat on a special reform task force. But instead of changing the rules to discourage absenteeism, the new rules that we have just passed encourage it.

Finally, the liberal majority passed a new rule which could be seen as a power grab for the office of the Speaker. Usually, when bills go to conference committees to iron out differences between House and the Senate versions, which iron out the differences between the versions passed by each House, the committee leaders appoint the conference members.

□ 1750

The committee leaders appoint the conference members. Under the new rule, the Speaker can toss out a conference member for any reason and name his own replacement. This means nearly dictatorial powers in the hand of the Speaker, because anyone who does not agree with him could possibly be thrown out on his ear.

For example, if a conservative wants to protect a House amendment which limits taxes, but the Speaker wants taxes raised, the Speaker can now replace the conservative with someone who will vote against the amendment. That means less protection for every taxpayer in America, and it is not right.

Well, we could go further. Once again I want to tell my friend from Indiana, Mr. BURTON, how much I appreciate his taking the time and yielding me time so we can discuss these terribly important issues. But we could go on about other travesties of justice that occur to deprive the Members of the House of Representatives their rightful fairness and their ability to debate important issues on this floor.

But the point remains unalterable: Today the U.S. House of Representatives no longer operates as a deliberative democracy. Instead, it operates as a rubber stamp for the entrenched elite

who rule the Democratic caucus and, hence, ultimately rule the entire House of Representatives, much like the Politburo used to rule the toothless Soviet Congress in the worst days of totalitarian communism.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the America I believe in. I do not think it is the America that my constituents or the constituents of every Member in this Congress believe in.

But that is the system of the House of Representatives, and it needs to be changed. It needs to be corrected. The Committee on Rules needs to be brought back into focus to carry out the functions as it was able to carry them out and guide the process of the house debates without over duly influencing the outcome and restricting and stifling the ability of Members to discuss issues of great importance to them and to the future of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we must bring deliberation back into democracy in the House of Representatives. We must make this House worthy of the country it is designed to serve. It will not be worthy again until the Committee on Rules and the leadership bring fairness back into the system and restore the right of amendment and the right of full, free, and open speech in assembly to what was known as the people's House.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that some of this might sound like sour grapes, because we are in the minority and we do not have the House of Representatives and we do not have the Senate and we do not have the Presidency. But it is more than that.

This year President Clinton has proposed to the people of this country $402 billion in new taxes and fees; $402 billion. In addition to that, on tax day this year, on April 15, he talked about an ad valorem tax which could cost another $100 billion. So you are looking at $500 billion in new taxes and fees, which is more than double and close to triple the largest tax increase in U.S. history.

Mr. Speaker, what relevancy does that have to the discussion the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] was just talking about and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] was talking about and which the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and I will be talking about?

Well, we proposed alternative budgets. One of those alternative budgets the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] alluded to a moment ago was the 2-percent solution, which would freeze all Government spending at a growth rate of no more than 2 percent over the next 5 years and would reach a balanced budget in 7 years without a tax increase.

That would have stimulated economic growth, would not have cost any jobs, would have created jobs, and would not have taken any more money out of the pockets of taxpayers of this country.

Contrast that with President Clinton's proposal which is $402 billion right now in new taxes, plus another $100 billion or so with the ad valorem tax, and all the spending he has been talking about, with no real reduction in the deficit. What you come up with is one plan which will get there without raising your taxes, and another one which is going to get there by raising your taxes through the ceiling.

The bottom line is that the Committee on Rules upstairs, run by the tyranny of the majority, would not even allow us to debate the 2-percent solution, which would not raise your taxes. That was the straw that broke the camel's back as far as I was concerned. When they did that, when they issued that closed rule that would not allow us to even debate a budget that would get us to a balanced budget in 7 years without a tax increase, and at the same time they were ramming through President Clinton's budget proposals, we said that was enough.

That is when we started calling vote after vote after vote and using dilatory tactics within the framework of the rules of the House to bring this place to a halt until they allowed a modicum of fairness.

Out of that came this Republican Leadership Task Force on Deliberative Democracy in the House of Representatives. This task force has come up with a policy that we are presenting to the majority which we hope will bring back comity to this House and bring the Committee on Rules into the realm of reality so we can bring open rules to the floor and bring such things as a 2-percent solution to the House.

The gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY], to whom I am going to yield, coauthored the 2-percent solution with me. She and myself and others who represent 550,000 to 600,000 people could not have our voices heard, and, hence, our constituents' voices could not be heard in this body on things very important to not only them but the entire Nation.

So that was the genesis of this problem. I want to congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Rules for their diligence. I am talking about the Republican colleagues on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for trying to get these rules opened up so we could bring these very important issues to the floor of the House so the people's will could be expressed openly in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I think that may happen in the future. I would just like to say even though we are debating tonight the Republican leadership task force on this issue, if the majority in this House continues to use the tactics they have employed in the past, that is, bringing closed rules to the floor and thus not allowing our constituents to be properly represented and not allowing these legislative proposals we are talking about to be discussed and debated, then we will once again go back to these dilatory tactics that will bring this place to a halt and cause a lot of problems for the majority as well as the minority.

We hope that will not happen, but we want everybody to know if this does not work, we will once again return to the policies that will bring about a modicum of fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for bringing all of this up on the floor today. I also want to point out that on the proposal we had, the gentleman mentioned the fact that we would get to zero deficit spending in 7 years and there would be no tax increase. I think one other important point that the gentleman did not mention is that we were cutting spending by $848 billion during that time, by having that flat freeze with just the 2 percent added on.

I think that is what people are talking about, let us cut spending. That was a very important part of it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman brought up a very valid point. The fact of the matter is President Clinton's proposals in 5 years are still going to have a deficit of around $240 billion or so, depending on who you are talking to. I think it is going to be much higher than that.

Contrast that with our proposal that would not raise any taxes, and we would have been on a plane toward a balanced budget in 7 years without a tax increase and cuts of $848 billion. I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] for her contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], who is a very valuable member of the Committee on Rules who does a yeoman's service for everybody in this country.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding and for his very much on target and stimulating comments on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the beauty of the democratic system that our Founding Fathers set up was the principle of proportionate representation. That is what is at stake here, one man, one vote. That is an idea I think we understand in this country, the idea that everybody would have a voice in the people's palace. Whether that voice was directly to the representative or indirectly to the representative is debat-

able. It does not make a great difference, as long as that voice was out there.

We have talked a lot about the fact that all of those voices are not being allowed to be heard. It is not only the voices, it is the issues in many cases that are not being allowed to be heard because they are shut off by the Committee on Rules. So what I would call some very meaty, timely issues that the American constituency is saying please deal with this, please talk about this, please work you will on this, and then please come to a more sensible decision than we are presently seeing with the rules that we have to live with today and the costs that we have to bear today, do that. This is what we are asking you to do, those of us who pay your salary, we the American taxpayers and constituents.

□ 1800

And we are precluded from doing that. The things gets cut off, throttled, as it were, at the Committee on Rules level.

That is not the democratic system or the representative form of government at work doing its job.

I think that that was the idea, but I would say that the reality of the House of Representatives in 1993, that is, since the 103d Congress has been in session, that process has not worked at all.

We have heard some commentary tonight that 100 percent of the rules so far on the major legislation that we have addressed, and we have not addressed very much major legislation in this first 100 days, as we all know, but what we have addressed has all been under restrictive rule.

Now, some has been more restrictive than others and some, perhaps, lends itself to some type of restriction, to be totally fair. But the fact is that comprehensively, the conclusion is that we have been unnecessarily restrictive because of the arrogance of the majority leadership. That is an unmistakable fact, and that is why we have gone and, in good faith, trying to deal as best we can within the system, gone and created a task force, chaired by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], our ranking member of the Committee on Rules, that discusses what actually this decline of the deliberative democratic process entails.

Is it really there? The answer is yes. It really is there. It is happening. It is happening right now in the 103d Congress, why we have issued a report, which we will make public at a press conference at 11:30 tomorrow, and why there are some conclusions and some recommendations for some doable things in there that, if we can get the majority to agree with, will lead to, I think, some very beneficial changes in the way the Committee on Rules does its business and, therefore, the way business of the House of Representatives is done on the floor and through the wonders of modern technology made available to so many Americans in their living rooms through C-SPAN.

There are so many Americans being shut out of the process by this restrictive rules process. I have heard my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] this evening say that it was millions. In fact, we did some calculations. We think it is about 250 million so far in the 10 pieces of legislation that we have discussed, if you take a look at the 165 amendments or 163 amendments that have been suggested and the very few that we have allowed on.

If you do a process of arithmetic with that, it looks like it is fair to say that some 250 million Americans have not had their representative voice, have not had a chance to speak here.

Well, are these important subjects? The answer is, you are darn right they are important subjects. We are talking about things like the budget. We are talking about taxes. We are talking about health policy. We are talking about voting rights. We are talking about mandated employee benefits. We are talking about things that come into our mail boxes, that come across our telephone lines and our fax lines every day about which every American should have the say, if they want to, and this is the place they want to come to have that say. And that say has been systematically tred upon by, I think, the majority leadership in what I call the exercise of absolute power, the arrogant exercise of absolute power.

When you start talking about the magnitude of some of these proposals, I think that these things do very much trigger interest in America.

Let me just quickly run through a couple of the proposals that I think are perhaps of more interest than some of the others, and this is an arbitrary list. It could be one of dozens.

Proposals such as whether we should pay for new spending rather than adding additional debt to the national debt. That is our children and grandchildren. We already know that bill is at about $17,000 per man, woman, and child in the country and will go up about 50 percent to about $25,000 per man, woman, and child in the country under the Clinton administration 5-year budget, leading to a national debt of $6.2, or more, trillion by the end of 1998.

The point that the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland made about getting at cutting spending, that is of interest. Yet proposals have been shut off.

Another proposal, whether any increase in our national debt should be tied to an ironclad balanced budget amendment or the true line-item veto. My Lord, how much time have we devoted to waltzing around with that here? We still have not gotten anywhere on it.

Our problem is, we cannot allow, it seems, the majority of the Committee on Rules will not allow the real meat of the subject to come to the floor and, consequently, all being done behind closed doors, and the American public is not being allowed to see this. And we are getting nowhere. The American public deserves to see this. These are things that have been talked about in campaigns.

These are devices or mechanisms that are well-known to the American people, and they want to know why are we not talking about them on the floor of the House. And the answer is, the Committee on Rules will not let us do it in a way that the American public is asking that we should do it.

Whether our local election supervisors should have the power to ensure that dead people, and people who are not citizens, are not allowed to vote. Surely, that gets at the essence of democracy. Yet there are amendments that were shut off, as the gentleman from Indiana well knows, in the Committee on Rules.

Whether HIV-infected immigrants, and people with full-blown AIDS in other countries, should be allowed to come and live in the United States at a time when our national health care system is already overburdened, and we are not doing anywhere near as well as we should in dealing with the AIDs problems and the HIV infection problems we already have presently, domestically in our borders in this country. Another area of great concern.

Whether we should change the current policy of restricting acknowledged homosexuals from joining the military. Whether that is a top priority or not in the Nation's business, it is certainly a top priority of discussion and was initiated by the Clinton administration as a first order of business. It has created a firestorm of what I will call commentary across our Nation, leading to inevitably some type of action, I would suppose, or at least debate in the U.S Congress. And that is an area where there is a tremendous amount of interest, and we have several times tried to make amendments in order to get that to the House floor so that the House of Representatives can join in the discussion at this point. And we have been forestalled.

Each of these issues, and many others, of course, have been shot down because it is a 9-to-4 situation in the Committee on Rules, and the minority cannot prevail. And whatever the majority wants, the majority seems to get.

So instead of being the gatekeeper for orderly legislation to come to the floor, the Committee on Rules had ended up as an enforcer for the absolute will of the majority that run the place.

I think I will make this observation. Rather than helping break gridlock, which we talk about so much here, what is happening is that the Committee on Rules has actually gone about and is locking up the right to speak in what I will call the gridlocker. We cannot get all of the things we should be talking about out of that locker. And, of course, we need to be doing it because the people we work for are asking us to.

If there is one thing Americans understand, it is fair play. And they understand blatant unfairness, and they understand that something is wrong. And we hope that our report on the decline of deliberative democracy, which we hope every Member will read, will begin to spell out what exactly is wrong. And when the unfairness that is clear becomes obvious to everybody in America, perhaps we will be able to build enough pressure to correct some of our problems.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would like to ask my colleague a couple of questions here.

He serves on the Committee on Rules, and he has watched what is going on.

As has been stated before, up until just a few short years ago 85 percent of the rules were open. And then in the last Congress, it went to 66 percent of the rules were closed, where we could not propose any amendments.

Now it is 100 percent of the rules are closed.

I just wonder, in your opinion, since you have seen these proposals coming out of the White House from the Clinton administration, if this is not a move to completely gag the minority and just to ram through President Clinton's proposals with minimal debate before the American people realize what is in these proposals.

Mr. GOSS. I think that that would be a generally fair characterization. And certainly, you would have that perception, if you sat in the Committee on Rules meetings.

I, of course, cannot speak to the motives because I am not privy to the decisions that are made in the majority. But I would say that that is a fair assessment, with this clarification, that 100 percent of the rules have not actually been fully closed. They have been restrictive.

I will make only that distinction. They have been mostly closed, and they certainly have not been fully open. And as I say, there are a couple of cases where we have had amendments allowed, so that would be technically correct. So they have not been fully closed, but I think that is part of it.

There is an incredible irony there, if the gentleman will continue to yield to me.

□ 1810

That is what we heard so much. We have 110 new Members. Of course, we have all these procedures where we waive the holdover requirements, and it is very important that Members read legislation and understand what they are voting on. When we waive all those holdover requirements and ram this legislation through, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has suggested, people really do not know what we are voting on.

Quite often we say we take these issues up year after year after year, so we always know what we are voting on. Wrong. We have 110 new Members here, and they have not been here year after year after year to be involved in these issues, and of course, new things are happening with these issues and new points of view have come to this body, because we have 110 new Members, welcome new points of view. They should be heard on these issues, and if they are stifled, we are not getting the full measure of the benefit of the wonderful will of the House of Representatives. It is being cut short for some surrogate wisdom somewhere that has been basically usurped by a very small handful of majority leadership.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The gentleman from California mentioned the 3-day layover rule. I can remember in recent years when they started going to the closed rules, they would bring a 15-pound piece of legislation tied up in string and set it on that desk and expect us to vote on it within a couple of hours. The transition rules were not even in the legislation, and nobody knew what was in it, and it involved hundreds of billions of dollars, of taxpayers' dollars, that was going to be spent, and we were voting totally in the dark without any chance to review it.

We probably could not have reviewed it adequately in 3 days anyhow, but we did not even have the benefit of 3 days to have our staffs take a look at what they were trying to do. That is when all the pork and the waste and the fraud takes place in this legislation, in the waning hours of the Congress.

That is why I think it is grossly unfair, and I would like to have the gentleman comment on this briefly, it is grossly unfair for the majority to waive those rules, to bring this thing down here and to ram it through without the minority even having the right to review or to propose amendments to it.

Mr. GOSS. Obviously, it is unfair, and one of the things that our report on the decline of deliberative democracy does is not only make those editorial type comments and conclusions that the gentleman from Indiana has so well portrayed, but backs it up with facts and figures of what in fact has happened and been the documentary proof of the procedures so far in the 103d Congress with the Committee on Rules.

Of course, as the gentleman knows, the word deliberative is in the title of this task force, because this is a deliberative body. This is not a place where we rubberstamp what another executive branch wishes to do, whether it is in the same party or another party.

We do have the separation of powers, and how many times we heard the separation of powers arguments involved when we had a Republican administration in the White House. I think the same principles apply, that we do have, indeed, a separation of powers. We are not here to work for the President of the United States. We are here to work with the President of the United States and to provide counsel and wisdom and our best experience and our best advice to whatever the President's program may be, but we represent the people we work for, the people in our districts.

That is what makes democracy work, that cumulative experience of the grassroots working up through representative government with the leadership from a different branch of government, and, of course, the other branch overseeing the constitutional questions that come along inevitably as we go about our business. That is what deliberative democracy is.

If we had to take a test, if any Member of Congress had to take a test on any piece of legislation that they passed, I would be curious to see how well they would be able to do in terms of all the provisions of what is in that legislation.

My guess would be that most Members have not read every single piece of legislation that they vote on, and I think that would be safe ground. I think we do need to afford not only the time but the incentive to be better acquainted with the legislation.

I think the gentleman's point about deliberative democracy is particularly true. Perhaps one other irony I might allude to. Of these 110 new Members we have, I believe 63 are in the Majority party, and of course, they campaigned on change. How much have we heard about change?

It is sort of curious to me that the freshman Democrats seem to have fallen into lock-step behind the party mandate. We have all these party line votes now, and even though we are the ones now in the Minority party, the Republican party, trying and attempting to break through what in fact has become a total gag, and to get a chance to talk about change on the floor, we do not have the support of the Democrat freshmen that we would expect.

I think one of the points that the gentleman has properly alluded to is that our job may very well be to point out in appropriate ways where there is dissembling going on and where there is duplicity going on, so that everybody understands exactly where anybody actually is on one of these issues involving change, whether they are truly for change or whether they are just saying they are for change.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He is obviously one of the more eloquent Members of the House. He does a great job on the Committee on Rules.

I would just like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that this Republican Leadership Task Force on Deliberative Democracy in the House is not sour grapes. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, if I were speaking to America, that the issue is whether or not we are going to take a course, take a course of action that is going to lead to $400 billion or $500 billion in new taxes without really substantially reducing the debt and the deficit, or are we going to get control of spending in this House and balance the budget and get on with doing what the people of this country want.

We proposed a 2-percent freeze on Government spending that would get us to a balanced budget in 7 years. The Committee on Rules would not even allow us to debate that on the floor of the House. Remember what I said, Mr. Speaker, that would have balanced the budget in 7 years without any new taxes, and it would have frozen Government spending at no more than a 2-percent growth, and would have cut $848 billion in pork and waste out of Government spending. That is what the American people want.

They would not even allow us to debate it on the floor. They literally gagged the Minority so we could not even debate it, because they wanted to ram through President Clinton's proposals of $402 billion in new taxes and fees, $180-some billion in new spending.

The only cuts they were talking about were in the area of defense, and over a 5-year period, instead of balancing the budget, or a 7-year period, we were going to end up with an additional $240-some billion a year in deficit.

As the gentleman from Florida so aptly put it, instead of the debt and the deficit going down, by 1998 we would have a minimum of $6 trillion national debt. We believe, many of us believe, that that national debt by the year 1998 or 2000 is going to be between $8 trillion and $13 trillion.

If that occurs, the interest alone on the national debt will be well above half of all the tax revenues coming in. If that ever occurs, we are going to have them printing money to pay off a lot of the debt so we do not have to pay interest on it, and we could very well have hyper-inflation. We could have bread costing $20 a loaf and milk costing $200 a quart, because we do not get control of the spending problem around this place.

That is a direct result of the Committee on Rules, controlled by the Democratic majority, not allowing us to bring balanced budget amendments to this floor, line item veto amendments to this floor, budgets that will balance themselves in a 5- or 6- or seven-year period without tax increases, because they want to ram through their proposals that are age-old tax, tax, tax, spend, spend, spend, and elect, elect, elect. That is their goal. It has been in the past and it is now.

The American people. Mr. Speaker, ought to know these things. They ought to be writing to their Congressmen and Senators across this country and saying, "Eliminate these gag rules. Bring everything to the floor for a vote. Let the American people see in this body, the people's body, really what the issues are, and let them know who is voting for higher taxes, who is voting against them; who is voting for a balanced budget, who is voting against it; who is voting for line item vetoes, and who is voting against them."

Once the American people know the facts, as Abraham Lincoln said, then they are going to make the right choices. Lincoln said, "Let the people know the facts, and the country will be saved." That is just as true today as it was the day he said it.

I say to the Committee on Rules, Mr. Speaker, let us let the people know the facts. Quit keeping them in the dark. Quit gagging the minority, and let these things be debated openly and fairly on the House floor.

□ 1820

FRIENDLY ALLIES SHOULD NOT SPY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, congratulations are in order for the Knight Ridder News Service for once again exposing the threat to the United States industry from spying by our friendly ally, France. This is not the first time the news service has tried to warn the American Government and business about a serious threat to industry.

This past weekend a story, whose headline read "French Spies Target U.S. Businesses," written by Frank Greve from the Herald Washington Bureau, exposed the massive threat to United States technology by the French.

The source for the information was a memo which "was unsigned, undated and stamped Defense Confidential." It dated from mid-1989 to 1990 and arrived at the Herald Washington Bureau in a plain brown envelope and was written in French on French paper.

Frank Greve wrote about the espionage plan which targeted 49 high-technology companies, 24 financial firms, and 6 U.S. Government agencies. He also pointed out that the French "sought advance knowledge of the bargaining positions of American negotiators in trade talks involving France."

The 21-page assignment sheet was prepared by the French equivalent of the CIA according to Greve. It is considered authentic and has, according to informed American sources, been confirmed as accurate by some of our Government officials.

Twelve allied countries have targeted U.S. business. The article listed France, Japan, Italy, Taiwan, and West Germany as having stepped up spying on United States businesses since the end of the cold war.

Industries targeted by our allies are electronics, defense, and aerospace.

All types of tactics are used to get information from American business from rifling briefcases in hotels to planting moles or informers in companies.

Although the American Government has warned our allies about such illicit tactics, we still continue to suffer from spying.

The most coveted U.S. secrets are "Research, test results, production engineering and sales strategies for Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas, makers of commercial airliners. Both compete against the French-led European conglomerate Airbus Industrie."

Another industry is the advanced helicopter research by Bell Helicopters, Sikorsky and Boeing, particularly on the V-22 Osprey, which takes off like a helicopter and flies like an airplane.

Information on stealth technology is also sought at Lockheed, General Dynamics, and McDonnell Douglas.

Commercial banks, investment houses, and venture capital firms are not immune to spying. According to Mr. Greve, the French mainly wanted the names of lawyers, consultants, and financial organizations, involved in European expansion plans or joint ventures.

The reason this story is so important not only is the competitiveness that U.S. industry loses through theft of information, but also because there is a debate in the Federal Government on what role the CIA and other agencies should play to bring this spying to a halt.

Many government heads claim they cannot stop economic espionage, but we did at one time through Project Socrates at the Defense Department. When that project was closed out, it was set up privately and still functions in the private sector, telling businesses how they can stop the espionage, and when a certain kind of firm is acquired, just what will be threatened next in a business.

There is no reason for American business or the U.S. Government to tolerate this spying. We have an answer in

the private sector—it is called Technology Strategic Planning in Stewart, FL.

Listen to the list of companies that are targeted—and remember this is just from one of our friendly allies—France.

They are:

Allied Signal Aerospace Co: Inertial sensors, star sensors, altitude control on global positioning system—research in military aviation, cruise missile propellants, high-altitude turbojet propellants.

Babcock & Wilcox Nuclear Power Division: Future nuclear products and services.

Ford Aerospace Corp.: Telecommunications and weather satellites.

Hughes Aircraft Co.: Telecommunications and weather satellites, particularly the HS 601 communications satellite. Inertial and measuring systems. Fiberoptics in antitank weapons. Phoenix 54 C air-to-air missile technology. Electro-optical sensors. Air-to-ground, ground-to-air, and air-to-air guidance and control systems. APG/71 combat aircraft radar technology.

Litton Industries, Itek Optical Systems Div.: Optical components and mirrors for satellites. Electronic Warfare Systems Group: New technologies for ships and aircraft.

Kearfott Guidance and Navigation Corp.: Accelerometers, inertial navigation equipment, star sensors used in the Trident II D-5 missile.

Lockheed Corp.: Advanced tactical fighter development, particularly stealth and aerodynamic research, infrared and passive sensors. C-130 and P-3 sales strategy. Problems with the C-5 cargo plane. Activities of Orab subsidiaries. Long-range, antiaircraft radar technology.

Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories: Military-related research.

McDonnell Douglas Corp.: Civilian aircraft sales strategy. Production capacity and costs. Foreign partnerships. Military sales efforts in the Middle East, Asia, and Europe. Local partners. Stealth technology. Short takeoff and landing version of the F-15. Helicopter sales effort. Strategic defense initiative research. Tracking satellites. Ground surveillance tracking system. Battle management command, control, and communications system. Delta rocket launcher. Advances launch vehicle. Aerospace plane.

Tail rotor suppression technology. LHX research. C-17 developments. Advanced tactical fighters programs. F-15, AV-8 sales efforts. Marketing of detection and communications systems.

Martin-Marietta Corp.: Liquid fuel boosters for Titans 2, 3, and 4 rocket launchers, particularly the Titan 3. Pershing 2 technology. Zenith star laser. Space-based interceptor. Tethered satellites project. Space probes. Technical problems with the advanced detection and targeting system.

Development and marketing of ground-to-air missiles with vertical firing capability. Electro-optics research.

Motorola Inc.: Marketing of cellular phones in Europe. Military applications of digital signal processors. Development secure wireless communications systems for top government and corporate officials.

Northcorp Corp.: Gyrolasers. Infrared sensors for MX and Midgetman. Electro-optical sensors for guided weapons. Airborne electronic warfare technology.

Perkin-Elmer Corp.: Electro-optical systems. Mirrors for lasers.

Rockwell International Corp.: Global positioning system satellite. Scramjet engine for aerospace plane. Future shuttles. Space station energy production work package 4. Metals and composites for aerospace plane. Strategic defense initiatives. Space based interceptor. B1-B bomber problems.

Textron Inc., Bell Helicopter Subsidiary: Helicopter sales strategies. V-22 Osprey development. Sales strategy for the LHX helicopter. Marketing efforts in Africa. Cadillac Gage Subsidiary: Local licensing agreements overseas. Textron Inc.: Landing gear.

TRW: Military telecommunications satellites, particularly fleet satellite communications phase 2, defense satellite communications systems.

United Technologies Corp., Pratt and Whitney Division: Aircraft engine sales. Foreign joint ventures. Twenty space station contracts. Solid rocket propulsion systems. Scramjet for aerospace plane. Sikorsky Aircraft Division: Helicopter marketing plans.

Joint ventures, particularly efforts with Westland Aerospace Ltd., to penetrate European markets. Electromagnetic interference problems on S-70 Blackhawk helicopters. Norden Division: Guidance technology for ground-to-ground weapons.

Westinghouse Electric Corp.: New generation radar technologies. Sales strategies—local partners and joint ventures. Technology for detailing electromagneting interference. Combat plane upgrades.

The Boeing Co.: Commercial airliner sales tactics. Production capacity. Technical problems with existing aircraft. Development of future 757 and 767 models. Orbital aircraft research. Cost, production and use of new composites, resins, and alloys.

Litigation with Airbus, particularly through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in Geneva. Strategic defense initiative research. Equipment for special forces. Offsets for Saudi companies in Saudi Government contracts. Priorities with European partners. Ground-to-air missile and communications research.

V-22 Osprey technology and marketing plans. Electronics in E-6A TACAMO aircraft. Space station series 1 contracts.

□ 1830

I might just point out, Mr. Speaker, that the list goes on and on, and I am going to stop at this point on the list for tonight, because I want to do this in about three different parts so the people of our country will understand what is happening, and that many of our so-called friends are doing everything they can to undermine our economy and to steal our technology, and all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that America needs to wake up and wake up big.

A HISTORY OF BUDGET SUMMIT AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I always begin these special orders when we are speaking essentially to an empty Chamber to make that point that although there are not many Members here we know that there are many who are watching C-SPAN, many members of the public who are watching C-SPAN, and we hope that the information communicated here may be of use to all of our citizens, particularly the viewers who are watching.

A number of us held town hall meetings during the district work period, and I wanted to just report back to the House what I found out at my town hall meetings. I had about six of them, and they occurred during the week leading up to Easter Sunday.

I found an overwhelmingly strong response on the part of our constituents. We had, I think, the least number of people we had was around 100, and at several of the town halls we had 120 or so and at one of them in Placerville we had over 350 people in attendance. This was a town hall specifically on the economy. Each one of them was on the economy. It was advertised as such.

People showed up and had a lot of interest, and basically I do not have my charts with me tonight, but I have had them on the floor before for special orders. I made the presentation showing kind of what has been the history of these big-budget summit agreements that we have had in the past, and we talked about 1982, 1984, 1987, 1989, and 1990. So there have been five major budget summit agreements over the decade of the 1980's including the one in 1990.

Each of those promised immediate tax increases of varying amounts, and each of them also guaranteed spending reductions. The interesting feature of each was that we always got every dime of the promised tax increases. However, we never got a single penny of the promised spending reductions.

So here we go again in 1993 with basically the same old tried and failed for-

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 6) 21

mula. We are once again being offered by the President, this time President Clinton, a promise of immediate tax increases staged throughout this 5-year period, and then the promise of spending reductions.

I have made this presentation again at the town hall that, based on history, you could not fail to conclude really that the pattern is likely to repeat itself once again because if you take a look at the Clinton administration budget, the tax increases are coming early, and the promised spending reductions are always in the out years, I believe, beginning in the fourth and fifth year. Also, and this was something that I think really grabbed the attention of the people who participated in our town halls, when you realize that during this Clinton plan, during the first 4 years of the 5-year plan, we are going to add another $967 billion to the cumulative national debt, almost $1 trillion, and probably by the time the numbers come in it will be well over $1 trillion, because another thing that these charts revealed, discussing previous budget summit agreements, those charts revealed that the projected deficit always ended up being worse when the numbers were finally in than what they were projecting, and sometimes it was twice as bad, and sometimes, like in this fiscal year, it ended up being three times as big as what they had projected in the 1990 budget summit agreement for fiscal year 1993.

Well, here we are in 1993, and the truth of the matter is it is going to be three times what their projection was. So this was a disturbing fact to most people that we were adding maybe $1 trillion, in round numbers, and I think it would be fair to say we are adding $1 trillion in cumulative national debt, and this is even more disturbing, because people were, I think, willing and, frankly, most people, I believe, in this country would be willing to engage in the shared sacrifice or the belt-tightening that is being talked about if we really felt that we would get a good result.

You know, they say that sacrifice is giving up something good for something better. Well, what is the result that we achieve under the Clinton 5-year economic plan using his own numbers? This is what disturbed, I think, most people deeply. It disturbs me deeply.

Using his own numbers, after the most massive tax increase in history, after all the new spending for domestic programs, using his own numbers, at the end of the fifth year, what is our annual national deficit? After all, all of this shared sacrifice, all of these tax increases, all of this new domestic spending, all of this is being done under the rubric of improving the economy and reducing the deficit.

So what is the deficit annually, using the Clinton numbers, assuming all of his proposals are enacted into law without change; what does he say the deficit is annually? In 1998, by his numbers, we will have an annual deficit of $228.5 billion. You know what that means? The next President, or Clinton himself should he be reelected, is going to have to come in, and the first item on his agenda will be this national fiscal emergency, because we have a $228.5 billion annual deficit, and we have to do something about it, folks, and we will get another proposal for the same sort of phony proposal we have had in the past that has never worked, that has always given us immediate tax hikes which came through and will give us promised spending reductions none of which has ever come true.

I guess it is time to say the emperor has no clothes. This is a phony plan for rejuvenating this country. It certainly will not reduce the deficit.

It will make matters tremendously worse, because we will have added $1 trillion to the cumulative national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF].

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I just would like to add our experiences up in Merrimack, NH, some of the town meetings, but across all the way to the coast.

Basically, first of all, I would like to congratulate the Senate again today for holding firm.

□ 1840

That was a good vote for America and a good vote for the taxpayer, and also for our grandchildren and the kids who are not going to have to pay off that debt. And I hope they continue, and I certainly give them a great round of applause.

You know, I was able to attend about 20 town meetings—95 of them in my first session back in 1991—I have done about 20 town meetings in the last 2 months. I was lucky enough to combine and join forces with Senator PHIL GRAMM on Saturday at Merrimack, NH. We had about an hour and a half up there. We had probably about 150 people. It was kind of interesting.

We started out with pretty much of a bipartisan group. We took a straw vote at the end, and we had some eight people who were in favor of the stimulus package and the balance were against it as it is now written.

A very interesting thing is that in our town meeting we kind of talked a little bit about accountability and what this little card represents, this voting card. I asked somebody, as I do with you, "Do you happen to have a Master Card? Or a Visa or American Express?" There was always somebody in the audience who could give it to you. But the difference is that there is usually a limit on that. In other words, they had either hit their limits or there was a little left on it to go. So the risk is not as great. But the potential, representing some 550,000 to 600,000 people, with this card here it has no limit; and we were talking about accountability.

In the State of New Hampshire, for example, we talked about a State that has had some real tough times and just now coming out of it, and we are still fighting real hard to get availability of capital. We are slowly putting jobs back, although we still have an 8-percent unemployment rate.

What I am really concerned about is that I heard the President's speech on February 17, I heard him say four things which I certainly agree with: One is that we want to get our economy turned around and get a sustained rate of growth; two, we want to put people back to work; three, we want to solve our health care problems; and four, we want to live within our means.

I think it is absolutely critical that we stated those four objectives. So far, I have been a little bit disappointed in seeing the commitment by words only in terms of a plan to reduce the deficit.

What we are really seeing is a tax plan, particularly the energy tax portion of that $71 billion, that is going to really hurt New Hampshire particularly, and New England. We are working very hard to make sure people are aware of that, that it is a very regressive tax; 7½ cents tax on gasoline for those people who have to drive to work.

Everything that you have on—your shoes, your socks, all your clothes, your tie, your shirt—are all going to be affected by that Btu tax. If you look at the effect on New England, and New Hampshire in particular, $124 per person, per capita, additional taxes as a result of just the Btu tax. And there are more.

I think we have to revisit that tax. Not only are additional taxes being asked of us—you know, we are willing to sacrifice, we are willing to sacrifice if we can balance the budget. But this plan does not do that. I think we need to revisit the goals.

I think we also need to take a look at defense. If you look at what President Bush's plan was in terms of cutting back $50 billion in defense, I think that made sense. He had a plan, it took it down in a businesslike manner, but we are still going to be able to defend ourselves from any crisis that might come up around the world.

But now we are taking $127 billion out of defense to pay for additional spending; some of which I think is a good return on investment. We should look at things like prenatal care, WIC Program, the Head Start Program, and make sure that they have accountability. We ought to make sure that we make the right investments. But we should be funding those programs by cutting back unnecessary waste, programs that are no longer of any value.

Frankly, the stimulus program, there are some things in the stimulus program that should be funded; and the same thing with the $5.7 billion extension of unemployment benefits that we did about 6 weeks ago. That should have been funded as well.

So I think it is time, and certainly New Hampshire in our town meeting—the meeting that I did with Senator GRAMM came back very conclusively with, "Let's cut the spending first. Let's take a fresh look at defense, but make sure we are not gambling away the future security of our country." Also, "Let's make sure we take a look at all these tax increases and maybe put them last, not first; let's make sure we cut back a lot of that waste and inefficiency in the Government first."

That is kind of what we found out up in New Hampshire. I think that is a good sign for the country as well.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, that was very similar to our experience in California. I think the point the gentleman makes is very good. This time we should begin with the Government in terms of making sacrifice. I think our citizens have made the sacrifice over the decade of the 1980's and at least on five separate occasions where we had tax hikes first and promised spending reductions. Now we are being offered the same formula. It did not work in the 1980's. I would just suggest, as the gentleman has, let us have the spending cuts first and then we will talk about any increase, any necessary increase, in tax hikes, if there be any at all, down the road.

Mr. ZELIFF. You know, when George Bush made his fatal mistake in 1990, you can see what happened. We agreed, as a Congress, then—and I was against that, as the gentleman in the well was—but we agreed to $164 billion tax increase. You see what happened to the revenue curve. The revenue curve went down. More unemployment came as a result of that fateful decision.

Now what we are doing is going twice that in terms of tax increases, and I think history will be our judge that we are going to have more unemployment and the economy is not going to grow as it should.

So I think the more that we take from the private sector and add to the public sector, it is going to hurt us in the long run. And history will be our judge.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I have read that the Clinton economic plan could cost between 2 million and 3 million jobs in this country, amazing as that sounds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to jump in on this and thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF].

But getting back to the chart of the gentleman, the one on the Bush budget summit of 1990, we went back, in our office, and researched what tax increases in budget summits resulted in. It has only been since 1982 that we have had six budget summits; five of those have called for higher taxes.

Not one single one has come close to the deficit reduction level that was promised. What we did was we made a little chart and said do higher taxes decrease the deficit? The answer is "no." There is absolutely no way, whether you are a liberal, conservative, Republican, Democrat, from the North, South, East, or West, there is no way you could ever prove or show any correlation between higher taxes and lower deficits.

What I have found in our town meeting—and I had probably in the heart of the South, actually the Okefenokee swamp in Waycross, GA, where Pogo, among many others, lived—but that was in the deep South. Yet they were saying the same thing that you were hearing in New Hampshire and that you hear in California: Cut spending first. Those three words over and over again.

An interesting part, along with that, is that people were saying, "When are you two parties going to get along? When will the Democrats accept the Republicans? When will the Republicans accept the Democrats? When are you going to work for a better America?" Yet, when I told them that the President of the United States stood in the well of the House and said, "Give me your specifics," and the Republican Party, under the leadership of JOHN KASICH, offered 35 specific ideas that would not detract from his budget but enhance it with lower deficit numbers and deeper cuts, 35 amendments were rejected along a party-line vote. An 84-page deficit alternative was offered and yet voted down on a party-line vote.

When I tell them that, then they say, "I guess we know who the part of the problem is," and it is the same crowd that controlled the House for over 30 years.

Mr. ZELIFF. I have to relate a story. There was a 12-year-old in the audience on Saturday morning, a guy named Duncan Stebbins, who has a small company. Frankly, he paid $84 in income taxes this year; and 12 years old, I thought that was pretty neat. He captured the hearts of everybody in that crowd.

Basically, what he said was, "I am 12 years old, and I have a company and I am trying to create revenue, and I am happy to pay taxes. But if you keep taking away more and more of what I create and earn, what benefit is there for me to keep working like I am working at 12 years old after school?" You know, out of the mouths of babes, I mean it was amazing.

So then I went down and I asked him a couple of questions after about an hour into our town meeting. So I said, "Duncan, I am a businessman like you, and I think we can understand each other. What do you think of all this discussion on the stimulus package and the economic plan?" And he said, "It is pretty confusing." I said, "Well, I have to agree it is.

"Well, let's put the numbers down, let's just call it $300 a year. Let's say you have a projection for the next 5 years in your little business, which happens to be running in the black. Let's make sure it stays that way, but God forbid, let's just say it is $300 a year over the next 5 years, $300 a year in debt, that is going to accumulate to $1,500 at the end of those 5 years.

□ 1850

"Now, what would you do right now? If you had just set up a plan, would you be spending a lot more money right now or would you be maybe cutting back on some expenses? What would you do? What would your priorities be?"

Well, he said, "I wouldn't have any choice. I would have to cut back my expenses first."

And I said, "Well, you know what kind of climate we are in. Do we raise prices now, or raise taxes in a small business? Would it be a good time to raise taxes?"

His answer came back again, "It wouldn't be a good time to raise prices, either, because frankly we have a delicate economy down there and the more my taxes are raised, the less I am going to sell."

So out of the mouths of babes come gems. We are talking about the same thing relative to lots more billions of dollars in the economy on a national basis; but I thought he had a way of just kind of bringing that right down to focus pretty well.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, absolutely. I had a similar experience. It is amazing how these thing happen. But an 8-year-old, a young fellow named Buck Moon came up to me. It was the last question in our town meeting. We said, "OK, we have time for one more question." Nobody came up, and this young fellow, Buck Moon, walked up and said, "Sir, I want to know why my parents' tax dollars have to pay for the sickle fin chub fish."

And I said, "Buck, if you find out, you will probably find out about the same time I do, because there are a lot of Members of Congress who want to know why your tax dollars are going to catalogue an atlas for sickle fin chub. We have never heard of that fish in our part of the country."

I think he was hitting the nail on the head. Folks are tired of pork barrel spending. The $28 million for the city of Washington, DC, to pay part of their debt, and $23 million for Fortune 500 companies to learn how to be more energy efficient, as if the Ford Motor Co.

needs the EPA to tell them when to turn off a light bulb. The sum of $1,400,000 to draw pictures of statues, $3 million for a pool and a gymnasium, $5 million for a beachfront parking lot. It just goes on and on.

I think the point that Buck Moon was making is that this is not what the Government is supposed to be doing with my tax dollars and my daddy's and my mommy's tax dollars.

But as the gentleman said, gems of wisdom come out of the mouths of babes, and that was an example of it.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the sooner we can all in the Congress here, and I know the gentleman does it for California, we need to somehow think as we press that button and we vote yea or nay on new taxes and new programs, I kind of think of Peter Kelly, who was my head selectman up in my little town of Jackson, population 642. He is a logger.

How many more cords of wood does Peter have to cut in order just to stay even? Just take the energy tax. In order to stay even with the energy tax, how many cords of wood?

Or back in Manchester at the Merrimac Restaurant on Elm Street or the Back Room Restaurant, how many more meals do they have to serve in order to stay even with just the energy tax?

I think the more we start to do that, the better off we are going to be in terms of putting in sensible taxes.

As a very last resort, you look at taxes, but we have so much misuse and waste of resources here that that is a place where we really need to start. I think it is irresponsible for us not to do that.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes a good observation. I guess we are in a weak economic recovery, except in California where it is still in a recession.

It is inescapable to me that if we have this kind of a hike in taxes, we will end the recovery and head back into the recession. We cannot afford to do that.

Our people are hard pressed. You talk to just about anybody, unless they truly are wealthy, they may be making decent salaries, couples who are sort of upwardly mobile, but even they do not feel exempt from the economic pressures. They are hard pressed. They have big mortgage payments, car payments. They are not flush with money.

There are people on retirement who have basically fixed incomes who have seen their income drop due to the drop in interest rates, for example. Now the Clinton administration is going to increase from 50 percent to 85 percent the taxation on their Social Security benefits.

Americans are hurting. People ask, "What is going to happen to my children and my grandchildren? What is going to happen to my own family?" It is a legitimate question to ask.

In California now not only are we saddled with a recession, and that seems destined to go on for at least a couple more years, now we are faced with defense cutbacks. We have seen jobs lost by the tens of thousands now, and then we are having the base closures proposed, and of course, we are 11 percent of the entire country, so we are dragging the whole country down in effect by what is going on.

I think the only way to reverse this is to get a handle on excessive Government spending and to do what we can through tax cuts to stimulate new investment in job-creating enterprises.

I will give the President credit for that. He has proposed, albeit I think in too narrow a fashion, but he has proposed modification of the capital gains tax. I hope that we can make that more significant, because I think that will do more to create good jobs and improve people's lot than any other thing that has been proposed.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have a bill that I tried for over 2 years to put in, H.R. 2359, the investment and capital gains reduction bill. I think, frankly, if we would stick to incentives to take risks, to get entrepreneurs to put risks out there, to be able to invest in the future of their companies, expand their companies, ultimately they will hire more people. That is the way to create more jobs. You are not going to create jobs by painting town halls and doing the kinds of things that are listed in this stimulus package.

I just think he is on the right track with the idea of the investment tax credit and modified capital gains, but we ought to open that up. I do not know what we are afraid of.

Another thing is that I believe when it comes to base closures, I have a bill in on enterprise zones. Put an enterprise zone on a base that has been closed and let the private sector supply the money in terms of economic impact aid and stuff like that.

Why does the Government keep having to bail us out all the time? Why can we not put private sector initiatives in place that will create private sector investments?

I think we would blow the doors off a place like peas if we have enterprise zones. Why are we waiting? It is a great idea.

Again I applaud the President looking at it. It is an idea we have talked about.

When America wants change, I think America wants these kinds of positive changes. They want a capital gains reduction to free up capital. They want investment tax credits that are going to put jobs out there. I think investment tax credit is the best single thing we can possibly do to create jobs. But I do not think they want 600 pages of spending programs to create change. I think that is an important issue as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the thing I have heard over and over again, along with investment tax credit and capital gains cuts, is less regulation. The businesses that I have talked to in my district, and I know they are the same as in the gentleman's district, they do not wake up in the morning worrying about what new program the Government might pass to help them. They worry about what the Government is going to do to them. They say, "We have had enough. We don't want Uncle Sam as our business partner. We just want a good environment to do business in and we will give the consumers the best products at the best prices available. We are not afraid of foreign competition or American competition. Just get Uncle Sam out of our way."

Along that line, businesses have been hit hard by this package, 34- to 36-percent increase in corporate rates, less deductions for entertainment, the CEO high salary tax penalty and the Btu tax in Georgia is going to cost our businesses an average 6 percent across the board.

Now, that is not if you have a law firm or an accounting office, but if you are in manufacturing or farming or you have a lot of energy you are using, it might be as much as 10 percent, and that is a tremendous tax. All these things are going to be passed on to that middle-class taxpayer in the form of higher goods and services, that middle class person who was promised by this President a tax cut, and instead they are going to get hit indirectly by business taxes and directly from the Btu tax and a change in their own tax rates.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I had the pleasure of going up to Wilmington, DE, and speaking. I spent 17 years at the Dupont Co. prior to 1976. I had a chance to visit with the top management, Ed Willard, the chairman of the board.

□ 1900

Over dinner, Mr. Speaker, after we had our meeting, I asked, "Mr. Chairman, what effect does the changing corporate income tax rates, plus the energy tax have," and of course Dupont is a worldwide company that is involved. The cost of energy is very evident in most of their products. "What effect would it have on your business? What effect would it have on employment?"

And frankly he said, "You know, it puts us in a tough situation, but basically it puts us in a position that we're going to have to cut back product programs and people because in order to compete worldwide we're not going to be able to just raise prices."

My colleagues can see that the only people that can raise prices seem to be the Federal Government. Everybody else is in an uncertain economy where competition rules the roost, and there is a case again where they cannot raise their prices. They have to manage their businesses by cutting back waste or cutting back expenses. In this case it is going to affect unemployment and put more people out of work.

So, my colleagues, I think that somehow we have to revisit going back to the four goals of the President's plan as he described here on February 17: turn our economy around, a sustained rate of growth, put people back to work, solve the health care problem and live within our means.

Mr. Speaker, if it does not do that, then it is a bad idea.

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely. If the gentleman would yield, the message I got is very clear along those lines.

One other thing we have not discussed that our folks are asking is what does the budget do for health care. We are going to get hit with this $250 billion tax increase. Is that going to take care of my health care problem?

Mr. Speaker, when I said, "No, there was no provision for health care in that budget," they are saying, "Well, what's the big tax increase for," and, when I tell them that the likelihood is that another tax increase is going to come on the middle class in the very near future, probably in this fiscal year, they were shocked, and they are saying, "No health care provision?" and we are seeing it. It is a big burden on them already, but the health care, there was not one dime of this that was earmarked for health care reform.

Mr. Speaker, that was very disturbing for the folks back home.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, if I might jump in here, in the last week we have heard the President's own lips now: a value added tax to pay for health care on top of this broad based energy tax, which is kind of like a value added tax in the way it works. So that would be, as my colleagues know, two highly regressive taxes levied.

And then today we read in the paper that Mrs. Clinton has floated the idea on top of these other taxes, that we may be levying a tax on the value of one's health care benefits. In other words, they figure out how much one gets in health care, which is roughly for a family about $4,000 a year, I believe, or $4,500 a year, and then they will treat that as if it were part of their income, and, whichever bracket one falls into, then they will pay taxes on that additional so-called $4,500 of income.

So, I mean it really, if it were not so serious, it would be funny. It is just amazing how many new taxes are pouring out of these folks, and they have not even reached their first 100 days yet, and the promise was that they were not going to tax the middle class. Indeed they were going to relieve the tax burden on the middle class.

Well, I know we have someone following this special order, someone following us. I appreciate the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] participating tonight. There will be further discussion of the issue of regulation coming up, which is an equal, if not greater, drag on the economy, even than the enormous problem of the deficit and the cumulative debt, and its is something that needs to be discussed thoroughly, and we need to work to develop a majority approach that would be effective to dealing with that and addressing that problem.

LESSONS WE CAN LEARN FROM RUSSIA

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk on renewing America, lessons we can learn from Russia. My colleagues may remember that back on January 25 I talked about renewing American civilization and the importance of confronting how badly we need to renew our own country and to look at the problems we face, problems in the economy, problems in our school systems, problems in health, challenges on crime and drugs, and that in fact America itself is at stake. I suggested that we cannot maintain a civilization with 12-year-olds having children, 15-year-olds killing each other, 17-year-olds getting AIDS, and 18-year olds getting diplomas they cannot read and that we have to in very basic, fundamental ways renew America if, in fact, we are going to be able to give our children and grandchildren a truly civilized country.

Recently, thanks to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the Democrat majority leader, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the Republican leader, I was able to go on a trip with them to Ukraine in Russia. It was an amazing experience: 7 days seeing a dramatic scale of change. And yet when I was done with the trip, I was most impressed with lessons I thought we could learn here at home, lessons about change in Russia that can be applied here in America, and it occurred to me that, beyond telling them what to do, that we should watch them, watch their courage, watch their willingness to go through so much and recognize that maybe we Americans should be a little humble, and maybe we should respect two nations, Ukraine and Russia, which are going through so incredibly much.

In the case of Ukraine, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over 700 years, almost 750 years, there is a chance for real freedom. There was a very brief period of freedom right after the Russian Revolution of 1917, and it did not last long, but now the Ukrainians have the possibility, the dream, that they can be free.

There are tremendous changes in the Ukraine. They are no longer a part of the Soviet Union. There has been a change in the flag, a change in the military, a change in the economic structure, a change in the political structure.

And, Mr. Speaker, when one moves north, to Russia, they find a similar scale of change. They find a people that I have been carrying and showing back home in Georgia where I have been visiting high schools and sharing with the young people in the high schools this 5 ruble note which I brought back home, and, interestingly, right up by the 5 it has CCCP which is in the Cryilic alphabet U.S.S.R. or Soviet Union. I say to my colleagues, when you realize that the new notes say "Bank of Russia" and no longer say "U.S.S.R." it begins to give you a flavor for change when you know that the new higher denomination notes no longer have Lenin's picture on them.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was walking through at one point, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] pointed to an area where on his previous visits there had been a huge portrait of Lenin lecturing, I believe, to the workers and the sailors during the revolution, and that portrait was up there, someone told me who had seen it on television, as recently as President Bush's visit which, I believe, was in early January. This was in the Kremlin. Now that has been replaced by a 19th century painting of Russia, a more traditional painting of pre-Communist painting.

I walked in Moscow to what used to be Zherzinsky Square. Felix Zherzinsky was the founder of the secret police, then called the Cheka, later called the KGB, and in that process we had the remarkable experience that, first of all, it is no longer Zherzinsky Square because Zherzinsky's statue is gone. It is now down by Gorki Park made famous by the mystery novel of the same name, and it is there almost as a tourist attraction.

So, the square had changed. The KGB headquarters had changed. A few blocks down the street the Communist Party headquarters that used to run the Soviet empire was now just a political party. In fact, so many streets and squares had changed their names that many Russians were finding it hard to get around town because they kept trying to go to a street that no longer existed, and somebody would say, "Meet me at the new street," and they had to say, "Oh, you mean the old street," and they would have to talk out what was going on.

It is a remarkable period of change. The flag has changed back to the classic Russian flag, no longer the hammer and sickle on a red flag. The name has changed. No longer is it the Soviet Union, but now Russia. The scale had changed. No longer Eastern Europe, the Baltics, Ukraine, Kerzatskan, and all the outlying areas, but instead pulling back to Russia itself.

□ 1910

The government had changed. No longer the head of the Communist Party, but instead the President, freely elected, of Russia. And the structure of the economy was in the process of changing. Marvelous stories.

The head of McDonald's mentioned that in order to get McDonald's an area of land that they could build the first McDonald's in Russia on, and it is the largest McDonald's in the world, serving over 30,000 people a day. It has 27 cash registers, it employs 1,860 Russians, led by a Russian woman named Olga who has been trained to be a franchise manager for McDonald's. It is a marvelous facility.

In order to have a land register, which they had not had in 70 years since the Revolution, they actually xeroxed part of the Fulton County, GA, land register and sent it over so that the McDonald's head could give it to the Moscow city government to see what a land register looked like. That is the scale of change.

The head of the Coca-Cola facility of Coca-Cola in Russia, a brilliant young man, 29 years old named Craig Cohan who had been really working very diligently to create a free enterprise environment and to share one of America's most famous products at a modest profit with as many people as possible, told us this wonderful story, that they wanted to have a sidewalk, what is called a kiosk, which would be a little stand here, they wanted a stand that was shaped like a Coca-Cola can and wanted it to be large enough to have people inside and to have refrigerated equipment so in the summer they could sell Coke.

The can happens to be exactly the same size as an SS–20 missile and is now being built for them by the SS–20 military factory, which is in the process of conversion because they are no longer building SS–20s.

They wanted panels to put up, metal panels to put up that would last, that said Coca-Cola, and the MiG–29 factory called and said, "We can build the panels." So MiG–29 factory workers are now making Coca-Cola panels to help them advertise.

Again and again and again a scale of change we can hardly imagine, a level of courage that we have to recognize. So I want to suggest, first of all, that we Americans have to respect and have to recognize what an enormous human risk the people of Russia are taking, and we have to ask ourselves, if they are this prepared to change their country, how much are we prepared to change our country?

When you realize, for example, that in the length of time it took for three Americans to be killed in Somalia, and each of them was a national story, 48 Americans were killed in the District of Columbia. Sixteen Americans were killed in our national capital for every American killed in Somalia during that period. You recognize obviously that we need changes in the United States.

When you recognize that one-third of the high schools in Chicago rank in the bottom 1 percent in college scores, one-third of them, you recognize how much we need change in America.

When you look at the impact of three and four generations of welfare, whether it is in West Virginia or in Checkwood Homes in Atlanta, you recognize how much we need change.

I would start by saying the No. 1 lesson I brought back from Russia was our need to be prepared to change boldly and dramatically and with courage. The Russians are going through an 85-percent drop in military procurement. They are shrinking their military from 5 million to 1,500,000.

We were told that just to house the officers' families and the senior noncommissioned officers' families who will come back from the empire, who will return to Russia, they need 350,000 housing units for officers and their families, and 100,000 units for senior noncoms.

The forces coming back from East Germany alone are about the size of the entire U.S. Army. That is the scale of change which is breathtaking, bold, revolutionary, and we need to do more than applaud it.

If Russians who have lived for 70 years under communism can be expected to learn market incentives, privatization, decentralization, free markets, private property, then why cannot Americans in Baltimore, New York, Detroit, Philadelphia, Atlanta, also be asked to learn?

If they can privatize their apartments in Moscow, why can we not find a way to privatize public housing in America?

If they can find a way to encourage people to shift from working for a bureaucracy that is very, very inefficient to working in a free market economy, why can we not find a way to take welfare and turn it into a work requirement and encourage everyone in America to actually earn a living and create an environment where everyone goes to work?

It was fascinating. We went in Nizhni Novgorod, again an example of change, a city 200 miles east of Moscow that used to be called Gorky, which was closed to all Americans. It has now taken back its older name of Nizhni Novgorod and it has dramatically privatized. It is sort of the Silicon Valley of Russia.

The reason it was closed historically was it was the center of electronics and physics research. It is the city that Andre Sakharov was exiled to.

A tremendous scale of change there. They auctioned off virtually all the trucks in the city and created private trucking firms. They are auctioning off businesses in the city on a regular basis. They gave all of the citizens of the city 10,000 ruble vouchers that they could come in and use to buy stock in a company. They could pick the company to invest in.

The day we were there we went to their auction house and looked at their insipient stock exchange. We interviewed every day working Russians who had shown up to apply to buy stock with their 10,000 ruble vouchers.

They were in the process of genuinely privatizing on a scale that we in America could hardly imagine, something which if it were done in New York City would dramatically change the entire culture and environment of the most bureaucratic city in America.

As we watched this happening, we went and visited what used to be the Lenin radar factory, 30,000 employees. They showed us the radar they had designed, the long wave radar designed to defeat the B–2, or to find the B–2, and allowed us to go through it. They offered to sell it to us for $10 million in hard currency and told us that they are in the process of making the transition of 30,000 workers away from military procurement for the Ministry of Defense, toward the free market.

They showed us television sets, they showed us coffeepots, they showed us a range of goods they were now creating which they were having to learn to market.

Now, that is a scale of change which we looked at, we applauded, we supported.

But my first point would be that if the Russian people can be expected to have that much change, if they can be expected to learn that many new things, if they can be expected to be that effective, then we Americans have an obligation to replace our welfare state.

If their centralized bureaucratic command system is wrong, then so is the Health Care Financing Administration. If their redtape-ridden central bureaucracy is wrong, then so is much of the Food and Drug Administration.

If in fact the things we tell them we were to apply to ourselves, we would this year pass dramatic change.

As it is, the Russians are rushing into dramatic change. We are frankly, if anything, tippy-toeing in the wrong direction and doing the wrong thing.

So my first report back is on sheer courage, which I admire in the Ukrainian and Russian people, and which I be-

lieve the American people should ask of their political leadership.

The second striking thing I thought was the constant repetition of two goals. When you would ask Ukrainians and Russians what do you want, what kind of future do you want, they would say, "We want to live in a normal country and we want to be civilized."

Now, these are very delicate words. Russia is a great civilization. It is important to remember that Kiev was a very, very important city many hundreds of years before Washington was founded. It is important to remember that the people of St. Petersburg were already actively living in their city almost 80 years before Washington became a city. It is important to remember that there is a long and rich and vital Russian culture and Russian civilization.

But what they meant by the words "normal" and "civilized" were something remarkably like an America without violent crime. They meant the rule of law, private property, contract rights, incentives, the right to dream, the right to work hard, the right to create a better future. They meant the kind of opportunities and the kind of neighborly relationships and the kind of teamwork which at our best Americans take for granted, and which we are tragically losing as our civilization decays.

I was very struck with how wise the Founding Fathers were and how much the basic desires of humans, whether it is in Japan or Italy, whether it is in Brazil or Germany, whether it is in Russia or America, the basic desire of humans, the right to own property, the right to work hard and keep what you have earned, the right to have controls over your life and to choose what is going to happen to you, the right to speak out, the right to have free elections, the right to take an argument to a court that you trust you will get justice and not some political decision. That all of those things join us together and we should be more aggressive and tougher minded in insisting that America be normal and be civilized.

Anyone, by the way, I would just say to my colleagues, that anyone who doubts what I am talking about, watch any major city's local news for 3 nights. If you think the local news of New York or Atlanta, of Washington or of Los Angeles, the bloodshed, the rapes, the armed robberies, the murders, if you think that is normal and civilized, we need to have a long talk about what you think would be abnormal and uncivilized.

□ 1920

The fact is, we have allowed a level of decay in American civilization which risks making us abnormal and uncivilized, and we have an obligation to go back and to reestablish what are the rules of American civilization. What do you have to learn to truly be American. What are the basic habits of obeying the law, the work ethnic, the willingness to honor the other person's free speech and to have your own right to free speech, the importance of the secret ballot and of elections. What are the key principles that every American should be required to learn, and what should the Government do to reestablish a normal and a civilized world, because we in America want that fully as much as the Russians. And both we and the Russians want the right to pursue happiness.

And our civilization, of course, has taught us, from the Founding Fathers on, that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights.

I would suggest that for the people killed, the 48 people killed in the District of Columbia, they lost all their constitutional rights. They had lost everything their creator endowed them with. They lost the dream of a future, and that those people deserve a Government strong enough and a country committed enough to be normal and civilized that they could today be pursuing happiness.

So second, in addition to courage, I would argue that we need to focus honestly and courageously on the need to be normal and to be civilized and to insist on it.

The third point I would make is about economics. What works? It is a large, centralized bureaucracy with centralized planning, with college graduates who are taken into rooms in the National Capital, who work on computers and design 5-year plans? Is that the best way to run an economy?

Or is it better to have market incentives and decentralization and privatization and free enterprise?

I must say, I found one of the most fascinating experiences in the whole trip was realizing that we are preaching one thing to President Yeltsin and the Russians and practicing another in Washington, that in Russia we are saying, "You need less bureaucracy, you need less redtape, you need more incentives, you need more privatization, you need more decentralization, get power out of Moscow back to the local communities, get power away from the bureaucracy back to the marketplace, have the marketplace set prices and set incentives."

I could not help at one point but think with all the talk in Washington about wage and price controls, maybe there is a Rutskoy Wing of American politics and maybe all the people who we say are bad in Russia, when they talk about not having a market, Rutskoy is the Vice President of Russia and somebody who has talked about reestablishing wage and price controls, if wage and price controls are wrong in Russia, then they are wrong in American health care. If wage and price controls do not work in Russia, they will not work here either.

If, in fact, we want to go to a decentralized, privatized market-incentive oriented system, then we, frankly, should abolish the Health Care Financing Administration, rethink the whole process of health care from the ground up, and go to a system dramatically more in favor of the individual and the family and the right of choice and the right to have access based on your personal interest with your personal insurance dealing with your personal doctor. A totally different model than the ones you hear about in Washington, DC.

In fact, ironically, the worst examples of redtape we ran into, both in Ukraine and in Russia, as redtape involving the United States International AID Program.

The Agency for International Development was consistently a disaster; it was as bad as anything in the Russian bureaucracy. Place after place after place in Moscow, in Kiev, in Nizhni Novgorod, in St. Petersburg, we ran into examples of State Department bureaucracy and AID bureaucracy that were so slow, so unresponsive, so ridiculous that it was an embarrassment to America. And it was destructive of freedom. And it is clear that of the money we have, in fact, allocated already, a very large amount of it is simply tied up in the redtape and in the bureaucracy of the American Government.

And in a very real way, we are our own worst enemies. This is not just a problem with international aid.

I noticed in the Wall Street Journal, in an article on Housing and Urban Development, where I know that Secretary Cisneros is a very sincere and a very intense person, who genuinely wants to continue to build on the things that Jack Kemp did when he was at HUD and who genuinely wants to revitalize the inner city, this is a paragraph from the Wall Street Journal article, talking about the problems of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, again, as an example of how much we are failing to listen to what we tell the Russians:

> Adding to difficulties is that HUD for years has been "a garbage heap" for political incompetents, says Roger Wilkins, a professor of history at George Mason University. A demoralized work force, whose numbers have fallen to 13,500 from 17,000 a decade ago, is struggling to keep things going. In a devastating portrait of the agency, the Clinton transition team on HUD warned that "a long-term pattern of fundamental systematic mismanagement . . . threatens the provision of vital services to millions" of Americans. The HUD team was headed by Andrew Cuomo, the son of New York Gov. Mario Cuomo and now an assistant secretary-designate at the department.

Let me say now, at the beginning of the Clinton administration, that the advice I would give to President Clin-

ton and his team is to be as bold in redesigning HUD and redesigning the Department of Agriculture and redesigning the Department of Labor and redesigning the Department of Health and Human Services, to be as bold as we hope the Russians will be in redesigning their economy, to recognize that the American command bureaucracy, the American centralized capital, the American system of having Government civil servants massively dealing with tons of redtape is in its own way as ineffective, as destructive, as expensive as anything we complain about in Moscow, and that if market incentives and decentralization and privatization encouraging individuals, encouraging the private sector, if that is good for Russia, then it is good for the United States, and that we ought to bring back home the lessons that many Americans are learning.

When we were in Nizhni Novgorod, there are over 40 American technical advisers. I turned to one very bright young woman who was there, who worked as an adviser on privatization.

I asked her whether she, when she got done, would she come back home to Washington and help us apply to our major cities the lessons she was learning in Russia.

She said, yes, and she said she was absolutely convinced that if we had the courage and the imagination to apply it here that we would, in fact, be able to dramatically change in remarkably short time, not 10 years, not 20 years, but instead 10 months or 20 months, to change things dramatically.

I just suggest to you, imagine, if you will, taking, whether it is the West Virginia welfare system, which is the worst State system in the country, or whether it is the District of Columbia or New York or Atlanta, if we were to try to have the same scale of change in the structure of Government, the same reduction in bureaucracy, the same privatization and decentralization, the same establishment of market incentives that we are watching happen in Russia or watching happen in Ukraine, how dramatically different would our cities be 2 years from now.

I think the answer is obvious. They would be remarkably healthier, remarkably better and well worth our paying the time and the attention to do.

My fourth point, after courage, the need to be normal and civilized, and the importance of the right economic pattern, my fourth point would be that inflation is frightening and it matters. This 5 ruble note I was talking about was worth about $7 3 years ago. It is worth half a penny today. From $7 to half a penny.

They have inflation at 1 percent a day.

We talk about 2, 3, 4 percent a year. Under President Carter it reached its post-war peak of 13 percent. And we thought it was terrible. We thought the wheels were going to come apart. We had a 21-percent interest rate, and we thought, how can we survive it. One percent a day. It went from about 720 rubles to the dollar the first day we were there to 7.28 the next, to almost 760 by the time we left.

□ 1930

You literally, if you went shopping, they would check for that day's price in converting U.S. dollars, because the difference was that dramatic.

I would suggest that the scale of inflation we are seeing in Russia should be a warning to us about our own debt, should be a warning to us about the need to make sure that we are able to have a stable dollar, should be a reminder that the interest rates, which in the last year have begun to return toward a normal level, have in fact for over 20 years been artificially high because of the threat of inflation.

The Russian experience of inflation—and inflation robs everybody; it robs every property holder, it robs every person who saves, it robs every senior citizen, and in Russia the people who have been hurt the most are the retired and the older citizens who are living on a fixed income and who do not have their income going up at the rate of inflation.

In those settings we have an obligation, I think, to remember that balancing the budget, paying down the debt, not charging to our children and grandchildren an enormous deficit, not having a huge interest payment, that those are not just lessons for Russia, those are lessons for America.

Our drawing the line now, particularly as the baby boomers become more mature, as they begin to plan for their retirement in 20 years, that it is very, very important that we take the lesson of inflation and what it is doing to Russia and we make sure that America moves toward a stable dollar and moves toward a sound currency with lower interest rates, so when people do save they know it is real money and when people prepare for their retirement they know that it is real.

The fifth thing I learned after courage, being normal and civilized, going to market incentives in the economy, and the importance of stopping inflation, the fifth thing was one, frankly, I had no idea I would learn, and it was one which was purely an accident.

We were in Nizhni Novgorod, a fabulous city on the Volga River in early April. It was still chilly. There were huge icefloes. As a Georgian, we had about 4 inches of snow once this year which stopped Atlanta for 2 days, and we were here in a city where there were literally 30-foot-long icefloes going down the river. The Volga is about the size of the Mississippi at St. Louis.

For lunch we went to the American Restaurant. It was fascinating, and I was intrigued by it. We came in and Neil Diamond was on the tape recorder singing "Coming to America." There was a huge American flag on the wall, and they served southern fried chicken, which as a Georgian I appreciated.

Then I got to talk to the owners. The fifth point I would make would be on being American. The owners were wonderful. They were from Houston, TX. I talked with their daughter today to get the story down straight and to make sure I understood all of it. It was fabulous.

Let me tell the Members briefly about them, because it illustrates the point I made back on January 25 about renewing American civilization and what a remarkable country America is and how in so many ways we may be the first universal nation that draws people together and has people work together and live together in a way which we are being reminded so tragically in Bosnia is not as common as we wish it was.

The couple were Victor and Mary Khoury, and this is their story. Mary Khoury was born in Jerusalem. She grew up in Kuwait. She married a man of Greek descent. They had four children. They came to Houston, TX to seek their fortune. They found their fortune. She ended up getting divorced.

She then found a man who was an entrepreneur in Houston and who was successful, and she married him. Victor, however, was born in Amman, Jordan, went to school in England, and then came to America. They were married. They have four children.

I talked today with their daughter, and I hope I get her name right, Neusha Petro, a lovely young lady, on the phone. There are two daughters and two sons. The older daughter has graduated from the University of Houston in business, the younger daughter is going to graduate this spring from Southern Methodist University.

They have an older son who is in the U.S. Army. In fact, he was a tank commander, when I talked to his mom, but he is now at the Ranger camp in Georgia, and they have a younger son in college at St. Stephens in Austin, TX.

It was fascinating to me, because here they were serving a Tex-Mex Middle Eastern menu in the middle of Russia, 200 miles east of Moscow, in an American restaurant, and they were totally American. While they may have grown up in the Middle East, they had absorbed the essence of the American culture. They were optimistic, they were open, they were hard-working, they were entrepreneurial, they believed in creating a better future.

They went to Russia seeking an even more interesting career than the one they had already had in Texas. They went initially to help advise on a hospital, found an opportunity to open a restaurant, had never run a restaurant before, and now were running such a

successful restaurant that they employed quite a number of Russians.

They were teaching everybody around them the free enterprise system and the idea that you can dream, you can pursue happiness, you can seek opportunities, you can have incentives.

They are building a genuine team. Mary Khoury was telling me that when they have their anniversary, they have it with the staff at the restaurant. They treat the restaurant staff as their family. She on occasion bakes cakes and tries to do things to build morale and to maintain a sense of togetherness, the kinds of things that Dr. Edwards Deming, with his emphasis on quality, would appreciate so much.

It just drove home to me what a unique thing it is to be American, not to be defined by your race, not defined by your birthplace, not defined by your religion.

Being American is defined by an attitude and a set of principles and a way of life and a style and an approach that is open and that says, "We can do it together. We can build a better future, we can create a more powerful opportunity, we can leave our children better off. Together we can work, we can create, we can invent, we can get the job done."

The Khourys are absolutely, totally as American as apple pie. The restaurant is a wonderful place. I hope any of my colleagues or anyone else who happens to read or to listen to this will themselves, should they ever get to Nizhni Novgorod, go to that wonderful hill looking out over the Volga and have at least a brief meal, some wonderful food. It is the only Tex-Mex Middle Eastern restaurant in that part of Russia, and it is a remarkable place.

What it reminded me of was how remarkable all of America is, how precious our country is, how much we take it for granted, how easily we have been allowing it to decay.

As I have said before, learning to be American requires recognizing that every generation has two waves of immigrants. One is geographic. They are people from overseas like the Khourys. The other is temporal, their children. Both waves of immigrants, both the geographic immigrants and the temporal immigrants, both those born overseas and those born in America, have to learn what it is to be American. For the last two generations we have not had the courage, the commitment, the drive, the willpower to insist on everyone learning to be an American, so that everyone can pursue happiness, everyone can enjoy the rights that their Creator has endowed them with, everyone can have a chance to have a better future, a safer future, to leave their children with a better opportunity.

Everything I have learned said two things to me: One, as we look at public policy in the next few weeks, and I hope that the Clinton administration will take these ideas seriously, that they will in fact go toward market incentives, decentralization, privatization, that they will recognize the importance of controlling spending to fight against inflation, that they will commit themselves to the changes necessary in our great cities and the changes necessary in our welfare state to have schools that work, a health system that works, to eliminate the bureaucracy which is so maddening at the Health Care Finance Administration, to eliminate the bureaucracy and the redtape which is killing American jobs at the Food and Drug Administration, to recognize the need to rethink, to be bold, and to come in with the kind of changes that are at least as great for America as the changes we expect of the Russian people.

Second, this fall I am going to teach a course at Kennesaw State College on renewing American civilization. We are going to take these ideas, the ideas of personal strength, which are so clear in Russia and the Ukraine and so necessary everywhere in America, the concept of quality as taught by Edwards Deming and as practiced by Victor and Mary Khoury and so many other people, and which I saw being practiced at McDonald's and practiced at Coca-Cola and practiced by many people across Russia, the concept of technological progress.

When we learn, for example, that Russian banking has no electronic funds transfer, that all of the checks are still handled at the central bank by hand, we understand all of a sudden how important, how dynamic, technology has been in America in liberating us and in creating efficiencies and in giving us greater choices; the concept of entrepreneurial free enterprise, going out and getting the job done, which we saw over and over among Russians, among Americans, among Ukrainians, as people pursued a better life in this new world; and then the concept of learning the lessons of American people, what it is we need to learn about ourselves to reestablish and strengthen being American.

Then I hope in this course at Kennesaw State to apply it to economic growth, to health, and to saving the inner city. I believe if we Americans would focus on those three first, if we would make sure we were growing economically, and I can tell the Members, when we see the level of concern in the economy of the Ukraine and we see the level of concern in the economy of Russia, it reminds us how important economic growth is in a free society.

When we think about applying it to American health, applying all of the principles we are telling President Yeltsin, and applying it to reforming the American health system, the principles of market incentives, decentralization, privatization, all the things we would tell the Russians, we get a radically different approach to health and a much more classically American approach to health than the things I have been reading in the newspapers.

Finally, we must save the inner city, because it is impossible to have a healthy America with cities that are violent, with neighborhoods that have schools that do not work, with young people who are not getting educated to work in the world market, with jobs that do not exist.

□ 1940

In order for us to truly once again be a normal and a civilized country, to apply to us the terms the Russians apply to themselves, we must save our inner cities.

Last, I am going to talk about 21st-century citizenship, because Victor and Mary Khoury to me are indicative of the future. Good Americans from the Middle East living in Nizhni Novgorad or citizens of Houston, TX, in that kind of a world. And Mrs. Khoury told me that she called her four children regularly, and she actually spent a good bit of money every month on her long-distance phone bill. And when I talked to her daughter today in Houston she said that yes, her mom had said that I might be calling. So yes, there is a certain amount of intimacy that is maintained, a price that is paid economically and in time to keep family together and to keep citizenship up and community up. How are we in an age of CNN, and jets, and faxes and telephones, how are we going to be citizens that have an effective, a healthy, a civilized, and a normal country in the 21st century?

The reason I am going to teach this course at Kennesaw State on Saturday mornings is that I honestly believe those of us who are in elective life have an obligation to back out of everyday politics, to back out of 30-second TV commercials, to back out of the kind of normal fights that occur so often on this House floor and ask ourselves fundamental questions.

The Italians voted over this weekend to replace their current political system. The Brazilians are voting today on their political system. The Japanese political system is under tremendous pressure. In Ukraine and Russia the political system is changing radically. In the United States in the 14 States that voted on term limitations, 77 percent of the American people voted for term limitations in those 14 States. Certainly that is a decisive example, and if this Congress were to put term limitation on a national referendum to apply across the board, my guess is that it would pass by almost 3 to 1.

So you have a political system under pressure. You have an American culture under pressure. You have a welfare state, bureaucracy collapsing. And

I do not think we can solve that just with normal politics. I think it takes a serious intellectual commitment to understand how we replace the welfare state, how we create an opportunity society, and how we renew American civilization.

I hope from our part to build on the tremendous lessons of courage and persistence, of idealism and heroism that we saw in Ukraine in Russia, and I hope to draw from that in teaching this course this fall at Kennesaw State.

I urge my colleagues to take similar opportunities to really work at thinking in fundamental ways what does America have to become if we are going to give our children and our grandchildren a normal and a civilized country, if we are going to create for ourselves and for our descendants the opportunities, the safety, the freedom that our parents gave to us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. QUILLEN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for the week of April 19, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SISISKY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

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

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, on April 28.

Mr. HOYER, for 60 minutes, on April 22.

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 60 minutes, on April 22.

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

Mr. HERGER, for 60 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 60 minutes, on April 22.

Mr. WOLF, for 30 minutes, on May 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. CALVERT in two instances.
Mr. GINGRICH.
Mr. QUINN.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. WELDON.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. FIELDS.
Mr. SAXTON.

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

Mr. BAESLER.
Mr. BOUCHER.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. DEUTSCH.
Mrs. MINK.
Mr. SANDERS in three instances.
Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. SABO.
Mr. STARK.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
Mr. LEVIN.
Mr. ENGEL in two instances.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Ms. WOOLSEY.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. HUGHES.
Mr. DURBIN.
Mr. STOKES in two instances.
Mr. VOLKMER.
Mrs. MEEK.
Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

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

Mrs. FOWLER.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. GRAMS.
Mr. KYL.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. FAWELL.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
Mr. PASTOR.
Mr. TEJEDA.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
Mr. VISCLOSKY.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Ms. SHEPHERD.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mrs. UNSOELD.
Mr. CONDIT.
Mr. KLEIN.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 326. An act to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes.

S. 328. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 22, 1993, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1068. A letter from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting notification of transfer of funds pursuant to section 9110(a) of the Defense Appropriations Act of 1993; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1069. A letter from the Directors of Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a joint report on the technical assumptions to be used in preparing estimates of National Defense Function (050) outlays for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to Public Law 101-189, section 5(a) (103 Stat. 1364); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1070. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize consent to and authorize appropriations for the United States contribution to the 10th replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1071. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Asian Development Bank Act to authorize consent to and authorize appropriations for the United States contribution to the fifth replenishment of the resources of the Asian Development Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1072. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Audit of the District of Columbia Public School System's Personnel, Payroll and Budget Practices," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1073. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Audit of the District of Columbia Public Schools" Internal Accounting System, REMCIS," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1074. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of the Presidents' exercise of his authority under 610(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2364(a)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1075. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of

political contributions of Victor Jackovich, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1076. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Eric James Boswell, of California, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1077. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Mark Johnson, of Montana, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Senegal, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1078. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Alvin P. Adams, Jr., of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1079. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Marilyn McAfee, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guatemala, and members of her family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1080. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of William Thornton Pryce, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Honduras, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1081. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of E. Allan Wendt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1082. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1083. A letter from the President, African Development Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the African Development Foundation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1084. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949, pursuant to Public Law 102-484; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1085. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of S. 662, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1086. A letter from the Chairman, First South Production Credit Association, transmitting the annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1992, pursuant to U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1087. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 1992 Annual Report of its activities, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78w(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1088. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1089. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending section 5379 of title 5 U.S.C; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1090. A letter from the Acting Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Pay Act"; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

1091. A letter from the Secretaries of Defense and Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report on the implementation of the health resources sharing portion of the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense health Resources Sharing and Emergency Operations Act" for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 8111; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

1092. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1993"; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Education and Labor, and Armed Services.

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. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 153. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 103-61). 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. PENNY (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 1753. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the participation in primary and general election debates of any candidate who receives public financing, and to establish criteria for participation of certain candidates in election debates; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PENNY (for himself, Mr. SABO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 1754. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for election day registration for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PENNY (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GUNDERSON);

H.R. 1755. A bill to enforce the guarantees of the 1st, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States by prohibiting certain devices used to deny the right to participate in certain elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. MICHEL):

H.R. 1756. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. McHALE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. WISE, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 1757. A bill to provide for a coordinated Federal program to accelerate development and dissemination of applications of high-performance computing and high-speed networking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 1758. A bill to revise, codify, and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to transportation, as subtitles II, and V-X of title 49, United States Code, "Transportation," and to make other technical improvements in the Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. BLACKWELL):

H.R. 1759. A bill to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Works and Transportation, and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. FROST, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON):

H.R. 1760. A bill to amend the Job Corps Program of the Job Training Partnership Act to establish a program to provide education and job training services to youths who have been convicted of nonviolent criminal offenses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1761. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend special treatment rules under the Medicare Program for regional referral centers and to permit a hospital that fails to qualify as a regional referral center under the program as a result of a change in geographic classification to decline such change and qualify as such a center; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. GUNDERSON):

H.R. 1762. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States for the creation or enhancement of systems for the air transport of rural victims

of medical emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Ms. SNOWE):

H.R. 1763. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to health professional shortage areas; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1764. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend until October 1, 1994, the period during which Medicare-dependent, small rural hospitals may be paid under alternative reimbursement methodologies for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 1765. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws, mergers and service allocations entered into by certain hospitals in low population areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 1766. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Emergency Medical Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANCASTER (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. GUNDERSON):

H.R. 1767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the issuance of tax-exempt bonds by certain organizations providing rescue and emergency medical services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1768. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make miscellaneous and technical changes to the Medicare Program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming (for himself, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 1769. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require that, in considering the application of a hospital to change its geographic classification for purposes of determining the amount of payment to the hospital for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under part A of the Medicare Program, the Secretary of Health and Human Services find the hospital's wages to be comparable to the wages of hospitals in the geographic area in which the hospital is applying to be classified if the average hourly wage of hospital is at least 85 percent of the average hourly wage of hospitals paid in such area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GUNDERSON, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. DURBIN):

H.R. 1770. A bill to provide incentives for physicians to practice in rural areas and in rural medically underserved areas; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

H.R. 1771. A bill to reduce infant mortality in rural, underserved areas by improving access to needed health care services by pregnant women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 1772. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program of making grants to the States for the operation of offices of rural health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 1773. A bill to reauthorize the rural health care transition grant program established under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to give preference in making grants under such program to hospitals that establish consortia with other providers in the communities in which the hospitals are located, and to revise the frequency of the Secretary's reports on the program to Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 1774. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of grants for rural health outreach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 1775. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include services provided by interns and residents at federally qualified health centers that provide services in a rural area in determining the amount of payment to hospitals under part A of the Medicare Program for the indirect costs of medical education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1776. A bill to facilitate and assist in the economic adjustment and industrial diversification of defense industries, defense-dependent communities, and defense workers that are adversely affected by the termination or reduction of defense spending or defense-related contracts; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, Small Business, Education and Labor, Public Works and Transportation, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina):

H.R. 1777. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 1,8-Dichloroanthraquinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 1778. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit the reimbursement of expenses incurred by a medical facility of the uniformed services or the Department of Veterans Affairs in providing health care to persons eligible for care under Medicare; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DANNER:

H.R. 1779. A bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 401 South Washington Street in Chillicothe, MO, as the "Jerry L. Litton United States Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FIELDS of Texas (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 1780. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to authorize State maritime academies to reimburse qualified individuals for fees imposed for the issuance of certain entry level merchant seamen licenses and merchant mariners' documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 1781. A bill to amend the Federal election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit nonparty multicandidate political committee contributions in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1782. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to apply the hazard ranking system under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to areas in the Chesapeake Bay Program in the same manner as such system is applied to areas in the National Estuary Program; jointly, to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 1783. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include service during World War II in the U.S. merchant marine as military service for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1784. A bill to provide for a demonstration project to improve provision of certain benefits under the Social Security Act through a private aid program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 1785. A bill to make various budget cuts and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Energy and Commerce, House Administration, Natural Resources, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Government Operations, Agriculture, Ways and Means, Post Office and Civil Service, Education and Labor, and Appropriations.

By Mr. KREIDLER (for himself and Mr. SWIFT):

H.R. 1786. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to require the inspection of meat and poultry to determine the presence of microbial contamination that can cause food poisoning or infection in humans, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to develop appropriate labeling to warn purchasers of meat and poultry of potential microbial con-

tamination and give proper handling and cooking instructions to destroy microbial contaminants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 1787. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for uniform coverage of anticancer drugs under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACHTLEY (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to promote lending to small business concerns in States in which there are a declining number of federally insured financial institutions; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1789. A bill to provide for the tax treatment of certain distributions made by Alaska Native corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 1790. A bill to provide for the treatment of Indian tribal governments under section 403(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 1791. A bill to restore reductions in veterans benefits made by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. WELDON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KING, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GALLO, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1792. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to require that any regulation establishing or increasing a fee or charge for a person engaged in the carriage of goods or passengers by vessel for hire be issued after notice, hearing, and comment and on the record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BYRNE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mrs. MEEK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHENK, Ms. SHEPHERD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. REED, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. YATES, Ms. ESHOO, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. FURSE, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. McKINNEY, Ms. LONG, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 1793. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure gender equity in education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLATTERY:

H.R. 1794. A bill to amend the Truth in Savings Act to delay the effective date of certain regulations; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LONG, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY):

H.R. 1795. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assist schools and educational institutions in the elimination of sexual harassment and abuse; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 1796. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to persons who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1797. A bill to prohibit the designation as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Preference any country that engages in certain actions regarding nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon components, and nuclear weapon design information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1798. A bill relating to the application of the Generalized System of Preferences to Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1799. A bill making accession to the Treaty for the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons a condition for designation as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Preferences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. UNSOELD (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1800. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that needs of pregnant and parenting teenagers are addressed by the education system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 1801. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a National Clean Water Trust Fund and to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to use amounts in that fund to carry out projects to restore and recover waters of the United States from damages resulting from violations of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 1802. A bill to ensure equity in education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give citizens of the United States the right to enact and repeal laws by voting on legislation in a national election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give citizens of the United States the right to propose amendments to the Constitution by an initiative process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to designate the week of April 17-24, 1994, as "Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to insist that the removal of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein from power should be a condition for the cessation of economic sanctions by the United Nations against Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution establishing the Ad Hoc Joint Committee on Labor Relations for the Capitol Police; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H. Res. 154. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that any general appropriation bill making appropriations for the Veterans' Administration may not make appropriations for any other department or agency of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. WELDON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KING, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GALLO, and Ms. KAPTUR)

H. Res. 155. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require economic impact statements for reported bills and amendments that create or increase any taxes, duties, or other fees on the maritime industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Res. 156. Resolution repealing rule XLIX of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. Res. 157. Resolution referring the bill (H.R. 1752) for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Earnest Sands [Ret.] and Roger Sands to the chief judge of the U.S. Claims Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

96. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to support for Guam in its quest for commonwealth status; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

97. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the Fast Flux Test Facility at Hanford; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 9: Miss COLLINS of Michigan and Mr. Kopetski.

H.R. 14: Mr. STOKES, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. MINK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms.

CANTWELL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 26: Mr. DICKS and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 59: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 65: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WISE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 66: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 94: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 109: Mr. WISE, Mr. HAMBURG, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 123: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mr. INGLIS.

H.R. 124: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KIM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. INGLIS.

H.R. 133: Mr. ORTON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 140: Mr. HOKE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 147: Mr. LINDER and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 153: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 166: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 207: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 212: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 214: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 225: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 242: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 303: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SARPALIUS, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 313: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 325: Mr. GRANDY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. STARK, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WELDON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WISE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MINK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 326: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SWETT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. KING, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 348: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. LONG, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 349: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 353: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 355: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 356: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 357: Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 407: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 408: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 429: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 462: Mr. BUYER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SABO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DOOLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 465: Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 468: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 498: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 501: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MCCURDY, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 502: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 508: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. COX, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 538: Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 561: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. HOKE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 567: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 591: Mr. COYNE and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 602: Mr. STUMP, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 608: Mr. PETERSON of Florida and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 643: Mr. PORTER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. DANNER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SWETT, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 649: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 667: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 672: Mr. WELDON, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 723: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 739: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BUNNING.

H.R. 743: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 749: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 778: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. WISE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 784: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 789: Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ORTON, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. CONDIT, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SHAYS, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 799: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MANN.

H.R. 811: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 827: Ms. MEEK, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FISH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 852: Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 962: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. CANADY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. FURSE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. KING, Ms. DANNER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 975: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 986: Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 998: Mr. PETE GEREN.

H.R. 999: Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1007: Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 1009: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1026: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1036: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 1067: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 1105: Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. FISH, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. EWING, and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 1123: Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1125: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1126: Mr. COX and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1129: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1130: Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1141: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 1146: Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1151: Mr. EVANS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1164: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1168: Mr. DARDEN and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1172: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1174: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1194: Mr. MCHALE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MINK, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MEEK, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1200: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. WATT, Ms. MEEK, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 1242: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1277: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 1289: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1291: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1293: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HORN, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 1313: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. FRANK

of Massachusetts, Mr. REED, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1322: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 1396: Mr. MAZZOLI and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1406: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1414: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 1415: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1423: Mr. HENRY, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. KLUG, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FISH, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. THOMAS OF WYOMING, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. KING, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. LAROCCO, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1428: Mr. LINDER and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1455: Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1482: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1490: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1493: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1496: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. LEVY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1509: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 1543: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1560: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1565: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1578: Mr. GORDON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. WILSON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1595: Mr. EVANS, Ms. LONG, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. EWING, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1627: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PARKER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WISE, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 1637: Mr. SWIFT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KREIDLER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1677: Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1720: Mr. STOKES.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. PENNY, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MANN.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. ORTON and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. ROWLAND, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MANN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. REED, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. CARR, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.J. Res. 122: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. YATES, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. MINK, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LEACH, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. DORNAN, Ms. LAMBERT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KLINK, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Miss Collins of Michigan, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. DANNER, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SWETT, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. YATES, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ORTON, Mr. MINGE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WATT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. DEAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. SABO, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. HORN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WISE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ANDREWS OF MAINE, MR. NADLER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. BROOKS, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. KIM, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DICKEY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. MFUME, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SWIFT, Mrs. MINK, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. ROSE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. FURSE, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. MCHALE.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. WISE and Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma.

H.J. Res. 134: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KIM, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WISE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HANSEN, MR. ROSE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. CARR, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FISH, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. WATERS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. COX, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HUTTO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCDADE, Ms. MEEK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAXON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, MR. WELDON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Ms. FOWLER, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.J. Res. 147: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. GENE GREEN.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FROST, and Ms. SNOWE.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. BRYANT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SHARP, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. FURSE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. YATES, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. LEWIS. of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. HANSEN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. EWING, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WHITTEN, Ms. MEEK, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. TANNER.

H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. WOLF, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCURDY, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. DELAY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H. Res. 28: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. HORN.

H. Res. 38: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. MILLER of California.

H. Res. 139: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEVY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. KIM, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 151: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.